



THE CCWH NEWSLETTER

The Coordinating Council for Women in History

Gender Equality? Or What's a Nice Person Like You Doing in History?

Rachel Fuchs

We have been gnashing our teeth and bemoaning the dearth of jobs in History for the past five years or more. Until now, we have not had a lot of data and have relied on anecdotal evidence, sensing that while some recent History PhDs have obtained academic jobs, a vast number have been languishing in adjunct or contingency positions, often for many years. Thanks to the efforts of the AHA we now have excellent data, and I refer all readers to the recent publication by L. Maren Wood and Robert B. Townsend "The Many Careers of History PhDs: A study of Job Outcomes, Spring 2013," easily available online. In this column, I just want to summarize some of Wood's and Townsend's findings in their snapshot of the employment of History PhDs as of Spring 2013 after they surveyed 2,500 men and women who earned their degrees between 1998- 2009.

The methodology for this study appears impeccable, given all the constraints of tracking people down and understanding what the title of "professor" really indicates. Depending on our general level of optimism vs pessimism, and how dire we thought the situation really was, we can see the glass either as half empty or half full: approximately 50 percent of people who earned PhDs during that time period were employed in tenure-track positions at 4-year colleges or universities. Is employment of half the History PhDs in tenure-track positions at 4-year institutions good news? It is, if only 50 percent of doctorates sought careers in academia and if the other 50 percent were in other fulfilling and desirable positions. As the authors point out, however, "numerous studies over the past two decades have found around 70.0 percent of history PhDs envisioning careers in the professoriate."

*"Is employment of
half the
History PhDs in
tenure-track
positions at
4-year institutions
good news?"*

In This Issue

- President's Column
- Executive Director
- Changing National Parks
- 2013 Award Winners
- Book Reviews
- Business Meeting

Gender Equality? continued.

We have no reason to believe that 20 percent fewer recent history PhDs now envision positions in colleges and universities than in the past. Assuming that 70 percent of recent PhDs desired tenure-track positions at institutions of higher education, what happened to that 20 percent who sought tenure-track positions at 4-year colleges and universities and did not obtain them? Most of that 20 percent are indeed working in the trenches as adjunct or contingency faculty. Approximately 15 percent of them are in non-tenure-track jobs at 4-year institutions with another 3 percent in non-tenure track jobs in community college positions; that totals 18 percent, which is obviously almost all the 20 percent who are indeed working as contingency faculty, usually without benefits, a decent salary, or sometimes even an office. In addition, if we consider that many of the 2.4 percent teaching at 2-year colleges in tenure-track appointments would rather be at a four-year institution, that accounts fully for the 20 percent who sought tenure-track positions at four-year colleges and universities and could not obtain them.

This snapshot taken in spring 2013 does not indicate how long those employed in non-tenure-track positions had been in working in that capacity or who left academia the following year – or, thinking positively, who obtained tenure-track positions the following year. So, with 50 percent in tenure-track positions, another 20 percent in non-tenure track positions, what happened to the remaining 30 percent? About 5 percent were deceased, retired, or not found. Approximately 24 percent had other employment in positions ranging from nonprofit organizations, to the government, to business, to teaching K-12, or were self-employed. History PhDs are a resourceful group, leaving academia when necessary. To parse the data further, it comes as no surprise that receiving a PhD from a top-ranked institution “improved the odds of making it onto the tenure track at a research university.”

Gender, and the situation for women PhDs, concerns us. The sample surveyed “included 969 women (38.7 percent) and 1,523 men (60.9 percent) with 8 unknown. This gender breakdown is consistent with data the AHA collected on the number of women who earned degrees during the years examined in this study.” Those of us who have focused on the category of gender may find the authors’ conclusion that “gender played little role in employment patterns across particular professions and industries” surprising. Almost 52 percent of the women compared with 50 percent of men in the survey held tenure-track positions at four-year colleges or universities. Furthermore, when we examine the pool, we see that only about 39 percent of PhDs went to women, so the proportion of all PhDs in tenure-track positions represents a considerably higher proportion of women than men in those jobs. Conversely, by roughly the same proportion, more men than women “occupied faculty jobs at two-year institutions or off the tenure track (21.6 percent as compared to 18.1 percent).” I encourage readers to consult Table 3 of the complete report to examine the gender breakdown by subject field. Women and men who teach as contingent faculty lead a life of frustration, teaching large numbers of classes and sometimes hundreds of students, with no job security, benefits, or sometimes even an office. Tenure-track faculty and university administrators rarely view them as colleagues and each year, or semester, they face possible unemployment. As they renew their attempts on the job market, data show that they stand a decreased chance of getting a tenure-track position if they have been out more than five years.

Executive Director Notes

Sandra Trudgen Dawson

Happy New Year to everyone! And happy 45th anniversary to the CCWH and predecessors!

2014 got off to an interesting start. I attended the AHA and was stranded—along with many other conference attendees—in Washington D.C. for two extra days!

Despite the delays, the conference went well. CCWH members and friends enjoyed our annual reception on Friday, co-sponsored this year with the Committee on LGBT History and the Association of Black Women Historians. It was a good time of celebration and conversation. The Annual Awards luncheon was another wonderful celebration of our 2013 award winners. Donna Sinclair was presented with the Prelinger award for her work, *"Multicultural Mandates: Transforming the U.S.D.A. Forest Service in the Civil Rights Era."* Dr. Yuko Miki was given the Nupur Chaudhuri Award for her first article, *"Fleeing into Slavery: The Insurgent Geographies of Brazilian Quilombolas (Maroons), 1880-1881."* Katie Knowles was presented with the Ida B. Wells Award for her dissertation, *"Fashioning Slavery: Slaves and Clothing in the U.S. South, 1830-1865."* This year, in an unprecedented decision, two graduate students won the CCWH/Berks Award, and another received an honorable mention as the pool of applicants was magnificent! Cassia Roth was awarded \$1000 for *"Criminalized Births: Reproduction, Medicine and the Law in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 1890-1940"* Courtney Wiersema also received \$1000 for her dissertation, *"All Consuming Nature: Provisioning and Inequality in Industrial Chicago, 1833-1893."* And finally, Kristen McCabe Lashua received an honorable mention for her dissertation titled, *"Children at the Birth of Empire, c. 1600-1760."* Please read about their work in the newsletter and on the website at www.theccwh.org. The committees are to be commended for their excellent (and difficult) choices. The CCWH really has a wide swath of junior scholarship that promises to shape the future of the discipline.

Thank you so much to all our hard-working award committee members for their dedication and expertise. I would especially like to thank Diana Wright, chair of the Chaudhuri award, Stephanie Moore, chair of the Prelinger, Brandi Brimmer, chair of the Ida B. Wells award, and Alexandra Nickliss for her work on the CCWH/Berks award.

The Executive Board discussed a number of new initiatives at the business meeting. One initiative is to start a "letters to the editor" section in the newsletter as well as a regular grad student corner that deals specifically with the issues of grad student life—research, writing, family—work balance, teaching and all the other demands students face. Please read the minutes in this newsletter and send me any comments you have at execdir@theccwh.org.

There have been many changes to the Executive Board this year. Carolyn Herbst Lewis stepped down as Outreach coordinator and Camesha Scruggs has stepped into that position. Melissa Johnson has completed her three years as grad student rep. Thank you! Kristan Wolf

Executive Director Notes *continued*

has taken the position of grad rep. Welcome! Brittany has finished her three years as newsletter editor. Thank you! We are currently looking for a new member to serve in this position for the next three years Please e-mail me at execdir@theccwh.org if you are interested. Liz Everton has also joined the Board as chair of the CCWH/Berks committee this year. Finally, Sarah Case has joined the Board as Public History Coordinator. We look forward to working alongside Sarah for the next three years.

The Board and I would like to say a big thank you to Susan Wladaver-Morgan who will stay on an extra year as co-president for our 45th anniversary year. Sara Kimble has agreed to continue as web coordinator; Kathleen has agreed to remain as treasurer and Whitney has agreed to continue her work as media and book review editor. Many thank to you all! **I have agreed to serve another term as Executive Director, pending approval by the membership. Please send your votes and/or alternatives to Susan at swladamor2@gmail.com or Rachel at rachel.fuchs@asu.edu**

Finally, we have CCWH T-Shirts and totes for sale! T-shirts are \$20 + postage and come in S, M, L, XL and 2XL. Totes are \$7. All the profit from the sale of the T-shirts and totes will go to our award funds this year. Please e-mail with your orders at execdir@theccwh.org .

Gender Equality? *continued*

The gender of those holding non-faculty positions was equally divided (25 percent of women and just under 24 percent of men). Finally, more women than men are independent scholars or otherwise self-employed. Is this a choice to accommodate childbearing and childrearing?

To help understand the effects of the changes in the job market on employment of History PhDs, Wood and Townsend broke the data down into shorter cohorts. The most distressing aspect of this data demonstrates that the percentage of PhDs holding tenure-track positions declined: Of the cohort who received their degrees from 1998 to 2001, just about 53 percent obtained tenure-track positions; a solid 56 percent of those who received their degrees from 2001 to 2005 found tenure-track positions; however, only 49.5 percent of degree recipients from 2006 to 2009 found tenure-track jobs, showing a decline with the onset the recession and the changes in higher education that were in their initial stages. Conversely, as expected, those in non-tenure-track positions steadily rose from 13.5 percent among those receiving their degrees from 1998 to 2001 to 25.6 percent of those in the cohort of degree recipients from 2006 to 2009. Those of our colleagues who comprise the 25.6 percent not in tenure-track jobs in spring 2013 demonstrate their commitment to becoming faculty members; they love to teach, and are usually excellent teachers, despite often alienating

treatment by their employing institutions and a lot of teaching with low salaries, resulting in demoralization. One wonders if this demoralization affects their teaching. They undoubtedly also have a commitment to continuing their research and to publishing, but a lack of funds for research and to attend conferences makes that well-nigh impossible. We can only surmise that the scene will worsen, with evidence that colleges and universities are moving toward hiring more adjuncts and fewer tenure-track faculty. Also unknown is how many History PhDs will simply give up their search for academic positions and use their education in related ways. Many already have.

A quarter of all history PhDs found employment outside of academia. While referring you to the Wood and Townsend report for the details, I want to point out that among historians employed in academic administration, non-profit organizations; the government; business; teaching K-12; in libraries, museums or archives, women were only “slightly more likely to be employed” in these positions than men (25.0 percent of the women and 23.9 percent of the men).

In many colleges and universities enrollment in history courses is in decline (unless those courses are required). Student preference is for practical training, especially in business and in STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) education. As a result, the shifting nature of higher education may result in even less demand for tenure-track history faculty and further increase in the “use” of contingent faculty. According to data from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) “By 2009—the latest year for which national data are available—75 percent of US faculty appointments were off the tenure track, and 60 percent were part-time.” Moreover, the AAUP states that faculty holding such contingency appointments are not generally included in shared faculty governance and recommends their inclusion.

Graduate programs in history are evolving. Many graduate departments are decreasing admission to their PhD programs because of the lack of jobs for History PhDs. Some have turned their attention to public history and are training historians for positions outside the professorate. As the 2014 hiring cycle is underway, and the number of tenure-track jobs remains abysmally low, what will happen to those who received their degrees prior to 2009 and had high hopes of securing a tenure-track job but are still serving as contingency faculty? What is the situation for historians who receive their degrees since 2009? One suggestion: at the very least, the institution that grants the PhD should provide their unemployed and under-employed PhDs with some support – whether use of letterhead; institutional affiliation for conferences, grants, fellowships and publications; library rights, and desk space. These needs are not gender specific, but if we take the lead for women, society as a whole benefits. Faced with the data from the AHA, I close with four questions: What should be the role of the CCWH? What are the obligations of tenured History faculty? What options should current graduate students consider? What is the moral, humane and intellectual responsibility of universities, the AHA and the CCWH to those historians who have recently received their doctorate and to those who aspire to the degree? I cannot pretend to have the answers, but the AHA has just named a committee to study the problems that adjuncts and contingency faculty face and we look forward to the results of the study. I welcome all ideas and comments in our new **Letters to the Editor** space in the newsletter.

***Gender Equality?* continued**

The deadline for submission of letters to appear in the next issue is April 15, 2014.

1. L. Maren Wood and Robert B. Townsend, "The Many Careers of History PhDs; A Study of Job Outcomes, Spring 2013. A Report to the American Historical Association. <http://www.historians.org/teaching-and-learning/current-projects/career-diversity-for-historians/the-many-careers-of-history-phds>. Accessed 20 December 2013. Page numbers refer to the downloaded pdf file.

2. Ibid., 2.

3. Wood and Townsend, 11, footnote 10; Robert B. Townsend, "A Profile of the History Profession, 2010," *Perspectives on History* (October 2010), <http://bit.ly/laUobal>. Data from <https://norc.org/NSFTabEnbine/#TABULATION> from the period from 2008 to 2010 indicate the percentage of doctorates women earned: 42.2 percent in 2008; 41.7 percent in 2009; 45 percent in 2010. Accessed 15 July 2013.

4. Wood and Townsend, 2.

5. When institutions hire history tenure-track faculty, they tend to hire those who received their degrees within the past five years, and most frequently during the previous year. For further data see Robert B. Townsend, "The PhD Gap: Worrisome Trends in the Hiring of Junior Faculty" *AHA Today*. <http://blog.historians.org/2012/09/the-phd-gap-worrisome-trends-in-the-hiring-of-junior-faculty/>. Accessed 12/21/2013.

6. See <http://www.aaup.org/news/new-report-contingent-faculty-and-governance>. Last accessed 12/29/2013.

Book Review:

***Bachelors and Bunnies: The Sexual Politics of Playboy.* Pitzulo, Carrie. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011. 240 pp. \$25.00. ISBN 978-0-226-67000-6.**

Reviewed by: Sam Stewart, Ohio University and Michelle Finn, University of Rochester

In *Bachelors and Bunnies: The Sexual Politics of Playboy*, Carrie Pitzulo argues that popular feminist discourse has failed to fully recognize the complex and often contradictory contributions of *Playboy* magazine to social history. Whereas critics have condemned the publication, which bills itself as "entertainment for men," for its arguably objectifying depiction of women, Pitzulo looks beyond the centerfolds of naked Playmates and early gender hostility to find an unexpected, and surprisingly feminist, perspective. On the one hand, *Playboy* seemed to offer male readers the sexist fantasy of a Madonna-whore combination that allowed them to have their chauvinistic cake and eat it, too. On the other hand, Pitzulo argues, the magazine has played an important role in the liberalization of sexual and political mores that, as *Playboy* founder Hugh Hefner has claimed, liberated men and women alike. Relating the complicated story of *Playboy's* legacy over the span of six chapters, Pitzulo provides a cohesive analysis of the magazine's editorial philosophies on gender, sex, and love, and demonstrates how those philosophies shifted over time to incorporate, and promote, feminist values.

Situating *Playboy* within the “eroticization of postwar popular culture,” Pitzulo spends her first chapter, “The Womanization of *Playboy*,” outlining the social and economic context of the magazine’s conception in 1953. Reacting to and reflecting anxieties over shifting gender identities, Hefner and the *Playboy* editorial staff addressed the perceived “crisis of masculinity” by offering in their publication’s pages a new version of manhood that was self-indulgent, consumer-oriented, hyper-heterosexual, and single. Denouncing marriage and, in the process, women, they generated sex antagonism that Pitzulo characterizes as a byproduct of their rejection of mainstream domesticity and traditional family life.

In chapter 2, “Inventing the Girl-Next-Door,” Pitzulo describes the ambiguous and possibly feminist nature of the *Playboy* Playmate, whose naughty-but-nice representation of female sexuality simultaneously indulged a male fantasy of carefree sex while giving credit to the libidinal interests of women in an age when their sexual expression was supposed to be confined to the marriage bed. Bringing the voices of former Playmates into the conversation, Pitzulo deftly explores *Playboy*’s complex mix of objectification and freedom and reveals how posing nude for the men’s magazine sometimes meant real opportunities, economic as well as social, for women.

Chapter 3, “Selling the Dream: *Playboy* and the Masculine Consumer,” examines the new model of masculinity that *Playboy* championed and the central role that consumerism played in creating it. Encouraging men to look not only at women, but at themselves and each other, the magazine advanced a lifestyle of high-class living centered on food, fashion, furniture, and fun. That the *Playboy*’s ultimate goal was to woo women into bed reassured readers that his seemingly “feminine” interests and consumer-oriented self-consciousness were indeed compatible with “real manhood.” Noting that its endorsement of capitalism and male-centered heterosexuality were far from radical, Pitzulo explains how “*Playboy* pushed the boundaries of acceptable heterosexual male behavior, but did so without presenting a drastic challenge to the status quo.”

By the 1960s, *Playboy* was evolving beyond its rebellious dismissal of traditional domesticity to present a more sympathetic attitude towards male-female relationships. In chapter 4, “Lack of Love is a Tragedy,” Pitzulo examines the sexual ideology and romantic values expressed in the magazine’s Advisor and Forum columns and how these values reflected the magazine’s maturing philosophy of equality and individual freedom. No longer all about guilt-free, hedonistic sex, *Playboy* now promoted love, responsibility, and monogamy, offering readers advice that was very much in line with the “new” feminist ideas about female sexuality and satisfaction.

Although his promotion of sexual liberation led Hefner to consider himself “a feminist before there was such a thing as feminism,” he and his magazine fell under heavy fire as the women’s movement gathered momentum in the 1960s and 1970s. Pitzulo considers the feminist critique of *Playboy* in chapter 5, “The Battle in Every Man’s Bed.” Emphasizing how the magazine supported women’s rights like legalized abortion and daycare for working mothers, Pitzulo laments Hefner’s puerile and

***Bachelors and Bunnies* continued**

and defensive stand against the more radical arm of the movement, unnecessarily alienating potential liberal allies. Pitzulo uses chapter 6, “Feminism, the Playboy Foundation, and Political Activism,” to reclaim *Playboy*’s role in advancing social freedom and equality. As she explains, “Hefner put his money where his mouth was when it came to supporting many feminist causes.”

Pitzulo’s study reexamines a cultural product that has been typically maligned as sexist and exploitative of women and reveals a surprising, albeit heteronormative, attitude of respect and tolerance for the personal and sexual needs of others as well as an important platform for the journalistic exploration of serious social and political issues. Of course, *Bachelors and Bunnies* does not deny the problems that *Playboy* magazine poses to a feminist consciousness; questions of power and objectification remain relevant to a discussion of the magazine, but they do not overwhelm the content of this book. Certainly, as an intricate account of *Playboy*’s history, *Bachelors and Bunnies* addresses both the magazine’s triumphs and shortcomings. Ultimately, however, Pitzulo is less interested in rearticulating popular feminist objections with *Playboy*, and more interested in expanding our understanding of an admittedly flawed cultural icon. Analyzed within the context of shifting gender identities and postwar conservatism, *Playboy*’s hedonistic fantasy of sexual liberation and sophisticated consumerism becomes strikingly complex.

Whatever your views of *Playboy* may be, *Bachelors and Bunnies* is sure to complicate them, and that is the true value of this work. Carrie Pitzulo skillfully reveals a magazine that has defied simple feminist/antifeminist categorization and contributed significantly to the shifting sexual politics of the 1950s, ’60s, and early ’70s.

"Changing National Parks To Tell the Whole Hi(story) of American Women"

Heather Huyck, President, National Collaborative for Women's History Sites

In December 2012, the National Park Service (NPS) and National Collaborative for Women’s History Sites (NCWHS) held a workshop “Telling the Whole Story” that brought together scholars, NPS employees, and NCWHS experts to analyze and strengthen women’s history preservation and presentation at the Sewall-Belmont House & Museum in Washington, D.C. The NPS partnered with the National Collaborative for Women’s History Sites, an 11-year-old non-profit organization which uses publications, workshops, training, website (www.ncwhs.org), research, and sessions at professional meetings to bridge between women’s history scholarship and place-based women’s history.

Goals emerged from that gathering to strengthen and increase women's history in the 402 units of the National Park System, with their 275 million annual visitors who learn American history in informal but very powerful settings (see www.nps.gov). The NPS also has major preservation programs responsible for the 2700 National Historic Landmarks and 88,000 National Register of Historic Places properties. Through identification and support of such historic places, NPS plays a major role in protecting our heritage. This workshop built on various NPS efforts to preserve and interpret a more inclusive American History, with similar efforts for Latinos, African Americans, LGBT, and Asian Pacific Americans. Few people appreciate the extensive research that informs NPS decisions, actions and presentations; the Women's History workshop's goals and resulting actions can affect the very questions NPS asks and the research presented to the public. While women are (or should be!) included in each and every ethnic groups, not every American woman belongs to one of them; all American women have historically had shared circumstances as U.S. citizens (however limited that definition was for centuries). From the 2012 workshop a Women's History Initiative, eight goals emerged to provide guidance for greatly increasing/improving the preservation and interpretation of women's history, both inside the NPS and outside it working with partners. The goals called for women's history to be fully included in internal NPS policies and in the preservation of historic places and preservation/ interpretation of park and resources. The NCWHS with expertise in the many facets of women's history works with the NPS to ensure that as our American stories are told, they fully recognizes all American women's lives and experiences.

In March 2014, NCWHS and the NPS will present a four-session webinar-based course, "Telling the Whole Story: Doing Women's History at Your Site" to help NPS people find, research, and integrate Women's History into parks and historic sites. Historic sites have great opportunities to "do" women's history with their tangible resources of landscapes, buildings and artifacts and their millions of interested visitors. The NCWHS will share this webinar-based course with others in the near future. "Telling the Whole Story" provides an introduction to women's history as practiced at historic sites; it reflects current scholarship and adult learning theory.

Sadly, even today we must still argue that women were present, active and had considerable agency at every historic site. Too often, asking about women at a park visitor center desk is met with the insistence that there weren't women there. Yet National Parks, which are owned by all of us, need to do more to recognize that the history of women-- as half the taxpayers and voters-- should be fully honored and thoughtfully told. Civil War battlefields must consider the effects that black women had in that war and how it affected formerly enslaved black women. Great Men's homes need to fully recognize *all* the women present there and how women's actions, attitudes, etc. affected those men. Ironically, because so many sites are domestic spaces, showing women's lives is not difficult as long as one avoids undocumented romanticism.

Actually, the variety of women's and girls' lives and activities found in the parks remains amazing:

- Elizabeth Cady Stanton feared falling off a mule as she descended into Yosemite Valley;
- A couple who spent decades living alone in Glacier Bay, Alaska;

Changing National Parks continued

- Adeline Hornbeck successfully homesteaded at 10,000 feet above sea level—her large cabin remains near the huge fossilized sequoia trees at what is now Florissant Fossil Beds;
- The ship captain's wife who brought her midwife with her as they returned from India to San Francisco (the baby did fine)
- The woman who opened a Cents Store in her Salem, Massachusetts, kitchen to earn her living.

Every park has such stories—bringing them together forms a fascinating and distinct history. President Lincoln died in a boardinghouse across from Ford's Theatre, a common livelihood for women before apartments were common, as were dressmaking, millinery, and domestic work. Women's work (of all kinds, paid/unpaid, associated with the home and outside of it) has changed over the centuries but generally remains inadequately recognized, squeezed into a domesticity more reflective of nineteenth-century ideology than historical reality.

When you go to parks and see their programs and products, while there are some major bright spots, you will probably be surprised by their scanty women's history. NCWHS wants to help the NPS find ways To Tell The Whole Story; we invite you to join us in that effort—the stakes are simply too high not to succeed. If you want to know more, please go to our website, www.ncwhs.org and go to the Report on the workshop held a year ago.

Call for Papers

Tenth Southern Association for Women Historians Conference
Re-membering/Gendering: Southern Women, Historical Tourism, and Public History

June 11-14, 2015 College of Charleston, Charleston, South Carolina

The Southern Association for Women Historians (SAWH) invites proposals for its tenth triennial conference, to be held June 11-14, 2015 at the College of Charleston in Charleston, South Carolina. Co-sponsored by the College of Charleston, The Citadel, and Clemson University, the conference provides a stimulating and congenial forum for discussing all aspects of women's history. Its program seeks to reflect the best in recent scholarship and the diversity of our profession, including university professors, graduate students, museum curators, public historians, and independent scholars. We invite sessions on any dimension of southern women's and gender history and particularly welcome presentations that explore the conference themes: public history, tourism, memory, historic commemoration, and marketing southern history.

The program committee seeks proposals for the following:

1. Panels (We prefer to receive proposals for complete, 3-paper sessions but will consider individual papers as well).
2. Roundtables (Informal discussions of a historical or professional issue)
3. Working Group Discussions (Informal discussions of pre-circulated papers)
4. Scholarly Shorts (Five-minute presentations of a research project)

Scholars interested in chairing or commenting on a session are invited to submit a 500-word vita.

More information on these presentation formats, submission guidelines, and the submission email address is available from the main conference page <http://thesawh.org> The submissions deadline is August 1, 2014. Inquiries (but not submissions) may be directed to Blain Roberts, program committee chair, at broberts@csufresno.edu.

CCWH 2013 Award Winners:

Ida B. Wells Graduate Student Fellowship

Katie Knowles, “*Fashioning Slavery: Slaves and Clothing in the U.S. South, 1830-1865.*”

This dissertation examines varied sources as Uncle Tom’s Cabin, Eastman Johnson’s genre paintings, archaeological dig reports, runaway advertisements, published narratives, plantation records, the WPA ex-slave narratives, and nearly thirty items of clothing with provenance connections to enslaved wearers. Our imaginations often depict enslaved people of the antebellum U.S. South drudging through fields in drab, rough, monochromatic attire. Barefoot and ragged, these imaginary slaves project a picture of uniformity and mindless drudgery. This research seeks to reveal the complexities surrounding clothing and slave life in the antebellum United States South. Race and gender are important categories of analysis throughout my project as both were interwoven into the lived experiences of enslaved people.

Though relatively few garments survive today, the voices of enslaved people and the records of their oppressors provide a rich narrative that helps deconstruct the many ways in which slaves encountered clothing. Clothing played an integral part in the daily life of enslaved African Americans in the antebellum South and functioned in multi-faceted ways across the antebellum United States to racialize and engender difference, and to oppress a variety of people through the visual signs and cues of the fashion system. By combining written, visual, and material sources this study demonstrates the imperative that dress be a central part of the analysis as scholars continue to explore slavery in the U.S. South.

CCWH/Berks Graduate Student Fellowship

Cassia Roth “*Criminalized Births: Reproduction, Medicine, and the Law in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 1890-1940.*”

Cassia’s dissertation examines women’s birthing and fertility control practices during Rio de Janeiro’s turn-of-the-century modernization process. It argues that state preoccupation with poor women’s supposed inclination towards fertility control, particularly abortion, infanticide, and child abandonment, created a criminal culture surrounding pregnancy and childbirth. Thus, the Brazilian state barred poor women from the only position allowed to them: motherhood. This project first illustrates how the institutionalization of the field of obstetrics pushed to move the birthing process into a hospital setting to combat what doctors saw as high stillbirth rates. Despite the increased criminalization of midwifery and state efforts to build public maternity hospitals, births continued to take place at home without a licensed practitioner. Fertility control occurred within this context of low access to medical services. Thus, the second part of this dissertation shows both women’s agency in engaging in fertility control practices and the state’s reaction to these practices. While these women were condemned in the public sphere for committing abortion or infanticide, the rate of judicial prosecutions remained low. In particular, the law viewed the practice of infanticide as incompatible with a woman’s inherent maternal nature. Finally, this project examines how the public suspicion around abortion and infanticide expanded beyond actual fertility control to encompass poor women’s pregnancy and childbirth. Poor women’s difficult deliveries or stillbirths were viewed as potentially criminal by the Brazilian state. Cassia is currently completing her dissertation and will use the CCWH/Berks award to support her during the writing phase.

Courtney Wiersema, “*All Consuming Nature: Provisioning and Inequality in Industrial Chicago, 1833-1893.*”

“All Consuming Nature” is a natural history of class in nineteenth-century Chicago. It asks how and why a handful of elites wrested power from a vast underclass and an unruly urban environment in the decades following the Civil War. I answer these questions by exploring the environmental relationships that produced and sustained inequality in Chicago. I argue that Chicago’s bourgeoisie attained power not just by subjugating people, but also by subjugating the urban environment. Elites used their wealth and connections to distance themselves from natural forces like disease and decay, forces that sickened and weakened the bodies of the poor. My dissertation charts the rise of Chicago’s inequality by focusing on the feminized labors of provisioning, chores such as finding water and preparing food that all households needed to survive. I trace these labors over time and across Chicago’s classes, revealing how the bourgeoisie avoided the impure foods, contaminated water, and cold nights that so often plagued lower-class Chicagoans.

Catherine Prelinger Memorial Award

Donna Sinclair is a Ph.D. candidate in Urban Studies at Portland State University (PSU) and has worked as a public and oral historian since the late 1990s. She now teaches U.S. History, diversity courses, and Public History as an adjunct instructor at Washington State University Vancouver and at PSU.

The Prelinger Award will allow her to complete her dissertation, “Multicultural Mandates: Transforming the U.S.D.A. Forest Service in the Civil Rights Era.” Sinclair’s dissertation project examines the extension and limitations of liberal democratic rights within a bounded historical context that connects environmental and social history with policy, individual decision making, gender, race, and class in American history. It documents major shifts in a homogeneous patriarchal organization, constraints placed upon women and minorities, and identifies tools for change. It tells a story of expanding and contracting civil liberties that shift from women and people of color to include the differently-abled and LGBT communities. It includes oral history as a tool for empowerment and a key to uncovering individual narratives that help to explain historical institutional change. With gender and race as primary categories, this inquiry shapes an historical narrative that is evocative, meaningful, and critical to understanding federal bureaucratic efforts to meet workforce diversity goals.

This project began with a service learning partnership between the Forest Service and PSU in 2004. Under Sinclair’s direction, students collected more than 30 interviews with diverse employees and leaders. The stories that emerged involved race and class based systems of the sharecropping South, the agricultural fields of the Southwest, rural and urban Western and Eastern communities, and serendipitous connections to government programs that have shaped lives. These and dozens of other interviews collected by Sinclair with agency leaders and employees at the national level ground a history that also draws from government and agency reports and archival materials. Additionally, and perhaps most importantly, by placing women and people of color at the center, rather than the periphery, this project opens new windows to understanding the role of women and minorities in shaping historical institutional and social change.

Nupur Chaudhuri First Article Award

Dr. Yuko Miki, "Fleeing into Slavery: The Insurgent Geographies of Brazilian Quilombolas (Maroons), 1880-1881." *The Americas* 68, no. 4 (2012): 495-528.

Thank you to the CCWH for this great honor. Research and writing of “Fleeing into slavery” took me to various locations in Brazil, from Rio de Janeiro to little —explored regional repositories and into the rich world of quilombolas (maroon) women and men whose textured lives I tried to represent in this article. Their testimonies shed light on the complex reasons why some enslaved people fled in the late nineteenth century and which challenges the long-standing image of maroon communities as a largely colonial and African form of slave resistance. Mothers fleeing with their children, for example, became a way to claim freedom and citizenship.

Book Review:

Women Constructing Men: Female Novelists and Their Male Characters, 1750-2000, ed. Sarah S. G. Frantz and Katharina Rennhak. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2010. 280 pp. \$32.95. ISBN 978-0-739133-66-8.

Reviewed by Rachel Pierce, University of Virginia

Women Constructing Men begins with a challenge to Virginia Woolf's assertion that "[w]omen do not write books about men" (1). The compendium of essays, compiled and edited by Sarah S. G. Frantz and Katharina Rennhak, collectively aim to redirect current literary analysis towards the study of masculinity within novels. This is a project they believe earlier feminist scholars have largely ignored, due to their focus on women and femininity and the corresponding assumption that patriarchy privileges male authorial constructions of masculinity. Frantz and Rennhak argue this failure to examine women's depictions of literary masculinity implies "that male authors were and are solely responsible for constructing literary masculinity, and on the other, that masculinity in female-authored texts . . . is natural" (3). The book thus aims to reassert the authority of the female literary voice and the history of women's participation in constructing masculinity within fiction.

Arranged chronologically, the essays can be roughly divided into two sections. In the first set of essays, which range from the eighteenth through the nineteenth century, marriage and the nature of male homosociability appear as prominent themes, the primary arenas in which women can investigate masculinity. Female authors often explore the relationship between these themes and masculinity by using a male first-person narrative which, as Katharina Rennhak notes in her analysis of Anne Plumptre's novels, allows authors to reconstruct masculinity from the inside out, starting with the thoughts of their narrators (47). And in large part, masculinity is assessed by these authors and their female characters in relation to financial and behavioral stability, and essayists in *Women Constructing Men* work within this paradigm to determine the ways in which female authors conceptualized nurturing and reliable husbands.

Virginia Woolf stands alone as the only early twentieth century author analyzed in the volume, a place holder between women constructing men at the turn of the nineteenth century and female authors from the modern women's movement forward. While the majority of previous essays focus on constructions of ideal masculinity in men, Woolf's *Orlando* steps outside of the marriage paradigm and explicitly deconstructs gender itself, depicting a sex change that, as Richter notes, "seems to work from the outside in rather than from the inside

Women Constructing Men *continued*

out” (168). Woolf thus represents a shift towards depicting gender as a construction and performance with an unclear relationship to biological sex.

The last set of essays extend the themes and issues introduced with Richter’s analysis and confront a more multicultural set of literary subjects whose actions and gender roles exist outside of purely heterosexual relationships which should and must end in marriage. These are pieces of fiction (and corresponding analyses) that deal more directly with feminist scholar Anne McClintock’s notion of gender, race, and class as “articulated categories” that “come into existence in and through relation to each other – if in contradictory and conflictual ways,” a framework referenced in Katharina Rennhak’s essay (46). Thus, these last essays explore how recent female novelists conceptualized gender roles within relationships laden with gender, class, sexuality, and race-based power imbalances.

Implicit in this project is an attempt to find and compile the ways in which female literary authors have confronted, challenged, and destabilized patriarchy. As Sarah Ailwood notes, female authors attempted to demonstrate how patriarchy actually injures men as well as women. A central project, then, is determining whether and how “good” masculinities can survive within a world structured by patriarchy. While female authors stretched and reshaped masculinity, these essays also demonstrate the difficulties inherent in rewriting gender roles to benefit women. Female writers were and are confined by contemporaneous societal norms. Even Anne Plumtre, a more overtly feminist writer than many others covered in this volume, “seems to inevitably also partake in the patriarchal discourse that writes into existence the Victorian ideal of the domestic self-made man,” as Katharina Rennhak observes (63).

If the volume intends to display the vast fields of literary analysis yet to be mined, it is enormously successful. Race, class, and sexuality need greater attention, and whiteness is a category left unexplored. Literary audiences and the reception of woman-authored texts are similarly untouched. Furthermore, all of the essayists focus on one author apiece, when comparing a variety of authorial voices and constructions of men and masculinity would be an equally if not more fruitful method of analyzing how masculinity is constructed through contestation and contradiction. Yet this is a start. Much more must be done to understand how female writers’ attempts to “write attractive male partners into existence and to imagine gender and gendered relations which serve their interests” have both destabilized and strengthened “the binary, patriarchal, gendered order” throughout history (2).

Prelinger Report:

Julie Enzer

Julie R. Enzer reports on a productive year as the recipient of the 2013 Catherine Prelinger Award. She defended her dissertation in March of 2013 and graduate from the University of Maryland in May. During AY 2013-14, she is a Visiting Assistant Professor in Women's Studies at the University of Maryland.

With the Prelinger Award, Enzer conducted additional archival research and oral history interviews to transform her dissertation into a book manuscript. Titled *A Fine Bind: Lesbian-Feminist Publishers from 1969 through 2009*, the book examines the effects of the extraordinary lesbian-feminist print movement during the second half of the twentieth century.

During 2013, Enzer conducted fifteen oral history interviews with women involved in lesbian-feminist publishing and print culture. She also spent two weeks in San Francisco at Aunt Lute Books reviewing their archival files, talking with the current staff, and interviewing the founder and executive director, Joan Pinkvoss, and a week in Ithaca, NY reviewing the papers of Firebrand Books at Cornell University and interviewing the founder, editor, and publisher, Nancy Bereano.

Enzer reports that she published two articles in 2013, "We Couldn't Get Them Printed, So We Learned to Print: *Ain't I a Woman?* And the Iowa City Women's Press," co-author with Agatha Beins, Assistant Professor of Women's Studies, Texas Woman's University, in *Frontiers*, vol. 34, no 2 (Fall 2013) and "Whatever Happens, This Is": Lesbians Engaging Marriage" in *WSQ: Engage*, vol. 42, nos. 3 & 4 (Fall/Winter 2013).

Enzer writes: "I am enormously grateful to the donors and to the family of Catherine Prelinger for the gift that supports the award. The Catherine Prelinger Award gave me time and space during 2013 to write, think, and move my work forward. It was literally a transformative gift for me as a scholar and intellectual. In honoring Catherine Prelinger's life and work, CCWH made possible a new horizon for my life and work. I am grateful. I honor you for your gift and your service to women in history."

Interested in Serving the CCWH?

We are currently looking for a dedicated and organized person to take over the role of newsletter editor. The position is a three year commitment and is also a Board position. The CCWH publishes four newsletters each year. If you are interested, please contact Sandra at execdir@theccwh.org

Want to Review a Book?

Would you like to review a book and have it published in the CCWH newsletter? Contact Whitney Leeson at wleeson@roanoke.edu for the latest list of books to review.

Member News?

Do you have a new job? Have you published an article or book? Have you attended a workshop or conference that you'd like to share with members? Please send member news items to newsletter@theccwh.org by 15 April to be included in the May newsletter.

Graduate Corner:

Are you a graduate student with questions? Would you like someone to answer them? Do you have strategies that work to reduce stress or manage families, work and study? Send your questions and words of wisdom to newsletter@theccwh.org by 15 April for the May newsletter. We want to hear from you!

Letters to the Editor:

Send us your letters! Send us your ideas! What solutions do you have? What problems do you see? Send letters to the editor by 15 April for the May newsletter.

Business Meeting Minutes:

CCWH Business Meeting

January 2, 2014

Marriott Wardman Park, Washington, D.C.

Present: Sandra Dawson, Elizabeth Everton, Beth Hessel, Whitney Leeson, Camesha Scruggs, Peg Strobel, Susan Wladaver-Morgan

Rachel Fuchs, Melissa Johnson, Sara Kimble, and Kathleen Nutter participated via phone and Skype

I. Executive Director Sandra Dawson called the meeting to order at 3:45 pm.

II. The minutes from the 2013 business meeting were unanimously approved with corrections (date on minutes and other documents changed from 2012 to 2013).

III. The Board received board member annual reports. Please see attached.

A) Sandra Dawson, Executive Director (see written report).

1. Discussion arose about problems with CCWH/Berks Award, which resulted in two winners and honorable mention being named. The suggestion was made that all awards might have an honorable mention next year.

2. Discussion arose about the necessity to back up all emailed submissions for awards. An email archive should be set up for each year's applicants to each award.

3. Concerning changes to the board, there are two nominations for the Public History position, Sarah Case (the editor of *Public History*) and Amy Platt. Sandra suggested that since public history is a growing field having two public historians might be a good idea.

4. Discussion arose about the newsletter. Sandra asked Beth is, as a grad student rep, she could take over the newsletter. Beth could not commit to putting together four issues a year and wondered whether it would be possible to divide the newsletter into tasks. Sandra thought that it would be possible to have one person contact writers and another person complete other tasks. Beth suggested that there be a common email address to which both editors would have access, as is the case with the prize committees. Issues of financing were also raised. An account could be set up with a print shop, which would then send invoices to Kathleen.

5. Melissa (by phone), after confirming her departure in January, stated that it would be necessary to decide whether the newsletter is something grad students would be expected to do. She felt that an advanced grad student could, but that it would be too much for an early-stage grad student. Beth added that responsibilities must be listed up front. Melissa agreed to help with the newsletter until the appointment of a new grad student rep.
6. Peg suggested that she might be able to commit to a regular 500-700 word column from the National Collaborative for Women's History Sites with enough advance notice. This could begin April 15 or possibly January 15.
7. Topics were discussed for grad student-authored columns, including parenting, non-academic partners, the job market, and other logistics issues facing grad students.
8. It was suggested that regular board members commit to two articles per year. It is important to plan ahead. It was also suggested that the editors send out a list of general topics.

B) Susan has agreed to stay on as co-president for another year. Sandra will check whether this will require a membership vote. Sandra will also stay for another term.

C) There are costs associated with the T-shirts and tote bags for sale at the reception and in the Marriot exhibit area on Friday. They are being stored in the shipping and holding area, and the organization will have to pay \$23 for holding (based on the weight of the package). Peg will see whether it is possible to sell T-shirts and tote bags at the Committee for Women Historians breakfast.

D) Peg Strobel raised two points before leaving at 4:45

1. CCWH Anniversary Page: Nupur and Peg wrote a history of the CCWH up to 1995. Should a PDF copy of this document be uploaded to the website? Peg also suggested setting up a Flickr account for pictures. Peg will send a copy of the document to Sara. Sara suggested brainstorming content for the page.

2. National Collaborative for Women's History Sites: Peg talked about the history, mission, and successes of this organization. It does not have a presence at the Berks but might be interested in cosponsoring a reception. Susan asks whether NCWHS is an affiliate of the CCWH, and Peg and Camesha confirm that it is.

E) Susan Wladaver-Morgan, Co-President

Business meeting Minutes continued

1. As co-president, Susan presided over the 2013 lunch, wrote two co-president columns for the newsletter, put together a panel for the 2014 AHA, had the CCWH listed as a co-sponsor of the Western Association of Women Historians and **PCB**, conferred with Rachel and Sandra on finance and prize issues, and worked to resolve CCWH/Berks prize issues which will result in revisions to the by-laws.

F) Rachel Fuchs, Co-President, by Skype (see attached report).

1. Discussed search for data on women in the field. AHA and AAUP have been sources for data. In addition, Rachel is working with the AHA to get data on best practices for contingent faculty.

2. Rachel and Susan have worked together to resolve situations that arise over the course of the year.

3. Rachel asked about the possibility of including letters to the editors in the newsletter or comments on the website. Sara (over Skype) suggested letters to the editor because of difficulty of moderating comments. Sandra suggested that letters to the editor could be published on the website as well as in the newsletter. Sara suggested that a separate meeting be called to discuss the website.

G) Kathleen Nutter, Treasurer, by phone (see attached report).

1. There were some problems using PayPal for membership registration, and there is a question of where to include the PayPal fee on the budget statement.

2. Expenses for the AHA were higher in 2013 than 2012, but there were fewer administrative costs. The contributions to the Pascoe Memorial Fund in 2013 were half of what they had been in 2012.

3. Need to decide what to do about the CD for the Berks Fellowship Award, which is set to mature on January 15. Sandra suggests moving it to a money market account. Kathleen will check interest rates.

4. An account will need to be set up for the Prelinger Award, but it will need to be flexible. Sandra suggested a savings account or a new money market account. Nupur will be working on fundraising for the Prelinger Award in 2014, though it is unclear whether the donor will supplement the fund.

5. Sandra suggested rounding the Nupur Chaudhuri Article Prize account to \$10,000 and putting it into a CD or money market account. Rachel has contacted members about donating to the Chaudhuri prize fund.

6. Sandra Dawson went over the budget (see attached report).

1. Cost for the AHA luncheon was adjusted from \$1800.00 to \$675.00
2. Cost for the grad rep and outreach AHA assistance was adjusted from \$750.00 to \$800.00
3. Cost for the new brochures, postcards, and printing was adjusted from \$250.00 to \$380.00

H) Brittany Ferry, Newsletter Editor (see attached report, received in absentia).

1. May and August newsletters were short. Affiliates should be encouraged to submit material.

I) Camesha Scruggs, Outreach Coordinator.

1. CCWH Facebook page has been created and has 115 Likes.
2. There are 15 affiliates. Camesha sent list and email asking for form through websites and also sent email to potential affiliates
3. Camesha reported on the reception co-sponsorship with the Association of Black Women Historians. The ABWH is excited about future partnerships.

J) Whitney Leeson, Book and Media Review Editor.

1. Need to resolve scarcity of reviews. Sandra offered to send Whitney the membership list. Susan suggested getting in touch with other associations, such as the WAWH.

K) Sara Kimble, Website Coordinator, was unavailable to report (see attached report).

L) Sandra Dawson reported on membership (see attached report).

1. Sandra has reached out to former members who have not yet renewed.
2. Online membership has worked well. Kathleen added that the use of PayPal has been good for donations.

Business Meeting Minutes continued

M) Elizabeth Everton, CCWH/Berks Award Committee.

1. There were thirty-three applications this year. The quality of the applications was very high.
2. There were difficulties arising from miscommunication in the CCWH/Berks Award selection process. The by-laws are being revised to avoid future problems of this nature. One step might be to fix deadlines for review and discussion of applications.
3. While the online system worked well, there needs to be a more consistent system for verification of receipt of materials. Several applicants contacted the committee requesting verification of the receipt of their materials. Additionally, a number of applications were incomplete due to lack of a recommendation letter. Elizabeth suggested that procedure should be put into place to notify either the applicant or the recommender that the recommendation has not been received. It will be easier to notify the applicant.

N) Beth Hessel and Camesha Scruggs, Graduate Student Representatives.

1. Word is being spread about awards and membership.
2. Melissa and Beth were on an AHA panel.
3. Need to determine responsibilities for graduate student representatives. This has been clarified during this meeting.
4. Graduate student reps will be handling the newsletter.

O) Kathleen Nutter had two questions about items on the budget.

1. \$250.00 is allocated as an honorarium for the luncheon speaker.
2. Travel expenses for the executive director (\$500) and each graduate student representative (\$400 each) will continue to be covered.

P) Sandra Dawson had a follow-up statement about the website.

1. T-shirts and totes should be advertised on the anniversary page on the website.

Q) The meeting was adjourned at 6:05 PM.

CCWH Board Members 2014

Co-President (2011-2015)

Susan Wladaver-Morgan swladamor@gmail.com

Co-President (2013-2016)

Rachel Fuchs fuchs@asu.edu

Executive Director (2010-2014)

Sandra Trudgen Dawson execdir@theccwh.org

Treasurer (2013-2016)

Kathleen Banks Nutter knutter@smith.edu

Website Coordinator (2013-2016)

Sara Kimble web@theccwh.org

Outreach Coordinator (2014-2017)

Camesha Scruggs outreach@theccwh.org

Graduate Representative (2013-2016)

Beth Hessel beth.hessel@tcu.edu

Graduate Representative (2014-2017)

Kristan Wolf kristan.wolf@asu.edu

Book/Media Reviews (2014-2017)

Whitney Leeson wleeson@roanoke.edu

Fundraising Chair/ CCWH Historian

Nupur Chaudhuri nupurc@earthlink.net

Prelinger Chair (2012-2015)

Stephanie Moore Prelinger@theccwh.org

CCWH/Berks Award Chair (2014)

Elizabeth Everton everton@csp.edu

Public History Coordinator (2014-2017)

Sarah Case scase@history.ucsb.edu

CCWH
607 Emanuel Lane
Sycamore
IL 60178

PLACE
STAMP
HERE