



THE CCWH NEWSLETTER

The Coordinating Council for Women in History

Getting From Here to There

Volume 45 issue 2 May 2014

Susan Wladaver-Morgan, Co-president

At the AHA conference last January, several CCWH members participated in a panel on present and future roles for the CCWH and our sister organizations. What follows is a shorter version of my piece of that panel.

Despite progress over the past 45 years toward the original goals of the CCWH's parent organizations—to support women who do history and to gain a greater knowledge of the women who lived it, we still have plenty of issues to tackle. I will focus on just three: addressing the half-hearted integration of the history of women into the scholarly mainstream, tellingly known as the master narrative; moderating the negative effects of technologically enhanced learning methods such as MOOCs—massively open online courses; and resisting the increasing proletarianization of women (and men) historians through the growing use of “contingent” faculty [since Rachel Fuchs and I discussed adjunct faculty in the November 2013 and February 2014 newsletters, available at <http://theccwh.org/news-2/newsletter/>, this section will be shorter than in my talk].

Many measures attest to the success of the field of women's history over the past 45 years: the flourishing existence of organizations such as the CCWH, the Berkshire Conference of Women Historians, which will meet outside the United States for the first time this month, and our many affiliates; massive numbers of articles, monographs, and even textbooks on the history of women; impressive prizes and awards that recognize excellence in research in women's history; and the fact that women who do study women's history now head departments, universities, and even organizations like the OAH and the AHA. In theory, these facts make women's history about as mainstream as a field can be, so what's the problem?

There are two related problems. First, women's history often seems to get swallowed up in women's studies or gender studies, which tends to marginalize research on half the population. Only small numbers of students—and self-selected students at that—may thus have access to our findings, and frequently even a smaller proportion of our colleagues. While gender studies have yielded invaluable theoretical insights, the experiences of individual women—their actual,

*“Despite progress
over the past
45 years ...we
still have
plenty of
issues to tackle.”*

In This Issue

- President's Column , 1-4
- Executive Director 4
- Public History 5
- Graduate Corner 6-7
- Book Reviews 8-14
- Member News 14-15
- By-law Revisions 15-19

long-silenced voices—too often remain unheard.

Second, despite the impressive output of innovative work in women's history for decades, these findings largely have still not made it into mainstream history. Here I refer you to a brilliant article by Susan Lee Johnson that appeared in the *Pacific Historical Review* in November 2010. Titled "Nail This to Martin Luther's 95 Theses as a model to demand reform of a profession and its academic priesthood that still feel free to ignore questions of gender. Scholars who wouldn't dream of attempting to write histories of the U.S. West without taking into account ethnicity and even class still treat gender as little more than an adornment, like a bow tacked on to show that, as enlightened people, they recognize that women have been part of the story all along (only we can still tell the whole story without getting too specific about how).

Like Luther, Johnson demands "true repentance" that can be judged sufficient only by those harmed by a system that has rendered women (and also people of color) largely invisible in the historical record for too long. She exhorts scholars "to be diligent in following the lead of those injured by the discourses and practices that have established disciplinary authority and of those engaged in advancing projects of equality, decolonization, and reconciliation." Indeed, she calls for nothing less than a gender historian's version of the kingdom of heaven—"the realm where power and privilege are always visible and always interrogated." Johnson was writing specifically about the history of the U.S. West, but the half-hearted integration of women into most fields of history shows that we must continue to insist on interrogating ALL relations of power and privilege in order to gain a fuller knowledge of the past. Women's history offers a powerful means to do just that.

The CCWH also needs to confront the growing reliance on technology in education, in terms of online courses and especially MOOCs. I don't deny the usefulness of technologies that allow teachers to bring in a vast array of resources (videos, scannable documents, etc.), that allow students to access and preserve sources from online databases and archives, and that allow both to communicate with each other more quickly and effectively. But technology also creates problems. For instance, who has not encountered work plagiarized from the Internet, despite programs designed to help recognize instances of such cheating? How can we even explain to students what plagiarism is and why it matters when they constantly navigate a sea of memes and other recycled information that seems to belong to no one and everyone?

Even more insidious, however, is the rise of MOOCs, which go far beyond normal online courses that give time-stressed students a chance to learn on their own schedules. Seemingly more democratic than regular enrollment in a college or university, MOOCs actually embody a corporate administrator's dream come true. In the December 2013 issue of *The Atlantic*, Timothy Pratt decried the trend toward what one of his sources termed "Walmarts of higher education." The piece went on: "the push for more efficiency in higher education often leads to lower quality....[T]here has been little research into the effectiveness of...MOOCs, for example, even as the number of students enrolled in them skyrockets. One of the first major studies of MOOCs, by the University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education [2013], found that only about four percent of those enrolled complete them." This does a serious disservice to students who expect to receive as good an education as anyone else. It also does a disservice to the wider public who will pay one way or another for what hasn't been learned. After all, who would trust a surgeon who received her anatomy training through a MOOC? Why should anyone expect better results in the humanities, which merely teach what it means to be a citizen and an educated person?

Another problem with MOOCs is the increasing marginalizing of person-to-person teaching, coupled with a reliance on a few superstars in the profession, especially those from Ivy League and other well-known schools. Even a recent article by Kevin Werbach of Penn's Wharton School in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, which stressed the advantages of MOOCs faculties with inexperienced teaching assistants, now that the distant rock stars are doing the heavy lifting."

and objected to the use of the star metaphor, noted: “You can bet that, for all the talk about freeing faculty members to focus on personalized instruction, some cash-strapped administrators will try to replace the master teachers on their own the advantages of MOOCs and objected to the use of the star metaphor, noted: “You can bet that, for all the talk about freeing faculty members to focus on personalized instruction, some cash-strapped administrators will try to replace the master teachers on their own faculties with inexperienced teaching assistants, now that the distant rock stars are doing the heavy lifting.”

Such administrators portray MOOCs as a responsible way to keep down educational costs, much as the early captains of the Industrial Revolution insisted that mechanization and mass production allowed them to offer more goods to more people at lower prices. And yet, I can’t help thinking of the quote from E.P. Thompson’s *The Making of the English Working Class* that got me hooked on history in the first place:

I am seeking to rescue the poor stockinger, the Luddite cropper, the “obsolete” hand-loom weaver, the “utopian” artisan...from the enormous condescension of posterity. Their crafts and traditions may have been dying. Their hostility to the new industrialism may have been backward-looking. Their communitarian ideals may have been fantasies....But they lived through these times of acute social disturbance, and we did not.

Folks, he’s talking about us—our crafts and traditions. The social disturbance of our own time is just as immediate and destructive.

Finally, we need to resist, with as much energy and savvy as we can muster, the proletarianization of academia through the use of “contingent” faculty. Those same poor “cash-strapped administrators” are just as likely to employ adjuncts as the “inexperienced teaching assistants” noted above, and with the same rationale as for MOOCs—economics and efficiency. Unlike teaching assistants, adjuncts have already earned advanced degrees, often doctorates; many have years of teaching experience and have published books and articles. Nevertheless, they have to make do with course-by-course employment that leaves them barely above the poverty line and with no time or resources to do their own research. And contingent faculty face worsening work conditions and less secure employment, even as the ranks of administration continue to metastasize.

The increasing use of adjuncts affects both women and men, and attacks on tenure, direct and indirect, mean that more of us may well find ourselves in this situation. But [as I wrote in my message last November] this is a feminist issue because the way institutions treat adjunct faculty today is the way they have been treating women professionals all along, following a long-standing pattern in the wider society. Historically, as women’s presence in particular fields increased, the pay, conditions, and respect for those kinds of work tended to decline. With women’s presence in graduate programs and academic employment increasing, institutions of higher learning have also begun eliminating security of employment and downgrading the conditions of work. The institutions involved, at all levels, sometimes rationalize this trend as allowing “flexibility” for employers and employees alike.

The point for the CCWH is that, by treating all adjuncts the way they have long treated women academics, university and college administrations are fostering a system that short-changes students in the present and devalues education itself in the long term, not to mention what it does to adjuncts—our colleagues—themselves right now. Administrators learned these destructive methods by practicing them on women, who had to fight harder for their degrees and professional standing than male academics did, every step of the way. Now these patterns are affecting our male colleagues too. We must work together to resist and reverse practices that harm ever-growing numbers of our colleagues and the very students we are supposed to be educating.

Getting From here to There, continued.

As feminists, CCWH members understand the necessity of making all structures of power and privilege visible, not just to each other but to our male colleagues and to the wider public, within academic institutions and beyond them. As historians, we have the scholarly tools to do it. And as an organization of women historians, we have a responsibility to continue integrating women into the historical narrative and insisting on our full participation in every aspect of historical endeavor.

Notes From the Executive Director

Sandra Trudgen Dawson

Since moving to the Midwest five and a half years ago, I have developed a healthy appreciation for seasons—especially spring! It took a long time but finally the bulbs have started to bloom and the trees are turning green! Happy spring to everyone! I would also like to express my gratitude for the vote of confidence you gave when you voted “yes” to my serving as executive director for another term Thank you! I will seek to serve the organization to the best of my ability.

The CCWH is celebrating its 45th anniversary this year! Please take a look at the website and the new 45th anniversary page (www.theccwh.org). We need your help. Do you have pictures from the past 45 years that you could share to make this page a truly memorable one? Do you have mugs or T-shirts from past CCWH celebrations? Can you send pictures for this page? Do you have memories you would like to share? Please send them to execdir@theccwh.org.

We also plan to celebrate at the Berks! Many of our members are presenting papers—please support them! We will have our 45th anniversary totes and T-shirts available for sale to help raise funds for our awards. They will be for sale near the registration tables—drop buy and say hello and support the work of the CCWH as it supports high school students, graduate students, junior and senior faculty with awards like the National History Day Award, the Ida B. Wells and the CCWH/Berks Graduate Fellowships; the Nupur Chaudhuri First Article Award; the Catharine Prelinger Award and the Joan Kelly Book Award. These awards are only really possible because of your membership and generous donations. Help the CCWH keep the funds healthy and growing so that this work can continue for at least another 45 years!

How many of you are familiar with Open Access, Online, and Peer-Reviewed Journals? If any members are interested in a CCWH Online, Open Access, Peer Reviewed Journal, please contact me at execdir@theccwh.org or Susan Wladaver-Morgan at swladamor2@gmail.com. Finally, please continue to encourage your friends, students and colleagues to apply for the CCWH awards. The deadline for each award is 15 September 2014 and the 2014 applications are available on the website at www.theccwh.org.

Public History Column

Sarah Case

Where are the Historians in the National Museum of Women's History?

At the recent National Council on Public History conference in Monterey, California, several presenters noted a disturbing trend – the diminished role of historians in historical museums. Nowhere is this more clearly evident than in the controversy surrounding the National Women's History Museum (NWHM). Since 1996 NWHM has existed as an online museum, and its current president and CEO, Joan Wages, a professional lobbyist, has pushed Congress to create funding for a brick-and-mortar institution on the Mall in Washington, DC. Congress is now considering the proposal.

In an April 6 article in the *New Republic*, Sonya Michel describes her experience as a member of the museum's Scholarly Advisory Council (SAC). It was not until 2011 that Wages began consulting with professional historians. In their initial meeting with Wages, Michel and other historians voiced dismay with what they viewed as an unsophisticated, and even inaccurate, view of women's history, especially its focus on a celebratory narrative of winning increasing political rights and on prominent, almost exclusively white women. Later that spring, the museum created a Scholarly Advisory Council (SAC) made up of around twenty well-known professional historians. Although its members were committed to supporting the project, they soon become disillusioned about the possibility of having any real influence on the institution. Their suggestions, including hiring a PhD historian on staff and appointing scholars to the museum's board, were ignored by Wages.

Indeed, it became clear that Wages was not interested in seriously engaging with the SAC. According to Michel, she did not respond to requests by the council to have more input in exhibit content. A proposal from some members to create an exhibit interpreting issues of sexuality and reproduction was deemed too controversial. The museum continued to post online exhibits with out informing, let alone consulting with, the council. As a result, exhibits contained errors of fact and interpretation; one, according to member Kathryn Kish Sklar, "could have been written by a middle-school student."

As SAC members became increasingly dismayed with the museum and its leadership this spring, several members made the decision to resign *en masse*. As they prepared to do so, Wages preempted them by herself disbanding the council. Members viewed this as further evidence of her lack of interest, and perhaps even hostility towards, professional historical scholarship.

On April 1, the AHA sent a letter to Congress expressing its concern that the proposed bill to fund the museum does not require any involvement of professional historians. Wages, in turn, responded to this letter, denying a history of exclusion of professional historians. (Both are available online.) This conflict raises issues beyond this particular case, highlighting the problematic relationship that sometimes still (or increasingly?) exists between scholars and institutions that claim to interpret the past.

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 . Here is the current list of books for review:

- Cadden, Joan. *Nothing Natural is Shameful: Sodomy and Science in Late Medieval Europe*. Univ of Penn, 2013.
- Broad, Graham. *A Small Price to Pay: Consumer Culture on the Canadian Home Front, 1939–45*. UBC Press, 2013.
- Humphreys, Margaret. *Marrow of Tragedy: The Health Crisis of the American Civil War*. Johns Hopkins, 2013.
- Grant, Julia. *The Boy Problem: Educating Boys in Urban America, 1870–1970*. Johns Hopkins, 2014.
- Whites, LeeAnn, and Alecia P. Long, eds. *Occupied Women: Gender, Military Occupation, and the American Civil War*. Louisiana, 2012.
- Frystak, Shannon. *Our Minds on Freedom: Women and the Struggle for Black Equality in Louisiana, 1924–1967*. Louisiana, 2009.
- Bohm-Duchen, Monica. *Art and the Second World War*. Princeton, 2014.
- Dubois, Ellen Carol and Lynn Dumenuil. *Through Women's Eyes, Combined Volume*. Bedford/St. Martins, 2012.
- Forss, Amy Helene. *Black Print with a White Canation: Mildred Brown and the Omaha Star Newspaper, 1939–1989*. Univ of Neb, 2014.
- Coodley, Lauren. *Upton Sinclair: California Socialist, Celebrity Intellectual*. Univ of Neb, 2013.
- Mifflin, Margaret. *The Blue Tattoo: The Life of Olive Oatman*. Univ of Neb, 2009.
- Franzan, Trisha. *Anna Howard Shaw: The Work of Woman Suffrage*. Univ of Ill, 2014.
- Gold, Roberta. *When Tenants Claimed the City: The Struggle for Citizenship in New York Housing*. Univ of Ill, 2014..
- Lasser, Carol and Stacey Robertson. *Antebellum Women: Private, Public, Partisan*. Rowman, 2013.
- Winch, Julie. *Between Slavery and Freedom: Free People of Color in America From Settlement to the Civil War*. Rowman, 2014..
- Biesen, Sheri Chinen. *Music in the Shadows: Noir Musical Films*. Johns Hopkins, 2014.
- Langhamer, Chaire. *The English in Love: The Intimate Story of an Emotional Revolution*. Oxford, 2013.

Graduate Student Corner:

The Call to Activism: Challenges for Graduate Students

Beth Hessel, Graduate Rep.

At the Women in the Historical Profession luncheon at the recent OAH conference in Atlanta, Barbara Ransby used the recent Florida case of Marissa Alexander to raise the imperative for historians to join with activists to protect the documents of black women and other socioeconomically or racial-ethnically underrepresented groups lest we lose their histories to inattention. Her clarion call echoed at other venues at the conference. Tom

Dublin and Kitty Sklar, for example, have dedicated much of their efforts these past seven years to locating and digitizing documents from global women's organizations and important black women suffragists through the Women and Social Movements project. A panel honoring Roger Daniels noted his prodigious efforts in the 1970s to support the Japanese American redress movement while prolifically publishing histories of the WWII incarceration of Japanese Americans. Instances abounded at the conference of distinguished historians who have found the sweet intersection between their professional vocation and their social values in the public sphere.

I found these examples inspiring and frustrating at the same time. At one point, Ransby suggested that linking our professions and social activism might require sacrifices: fighting for funding for a line for a resident activist in the department instead of a graduate scholarship, or seeking grants to work with local social movements instead of researching and writing another book. Her comment highlights the quandary in which many graduate students and junior faculty find themselves: in a tight – some would say dismal – marketplace in which service to the larger community counts for far less than publications, conference papers, grants, and teaching evaluations when seeking a first job or tenure, how can emerging scholars make the kinds of sacrifices Ransby calls for? Our own CCWH Co-President Rachel Fuchs wrote an article for the last CCWH newsletter about the difficulties women already have getting full-time, tenured positions in academia. How do we add one more thing?

Like many of my cohorts, I engaged in social activism during college and first career, only to find those commitments get pushed to the side as I worked to build my CV. Many of us have supported causes in which we believe. Many of us are preparing for careers in history not just because we are fascinated with the past, but because we believe the past and present are inextricably linked. We hope to use our research and writing in service to current causes, problems, and people. Yet the demands of graduate school can be overwhelming, and the job market discouraging. There doesn't seem time to get involved with political campaigns, campus efforts to unionize the cafeteria workers, the local women's shelter, or the struggling GLBTQ organization, or whatever issue or group pulls on our conscience. One of my colleagues recently lamented that although she had once been very active on issues related to her dissertation, once she started the research and writing process, her activism fell to the wayside. Now finished and adjuncting while looking for a job, she is reconsidering how she can reconnect in meaningful ways.

As historians, we are in unique positions to intersect with activists and organizers. As Ransby pointed out in her talk, we need to get beyond the "student immersion" model in which we (or our undergraduate students) offer our knowledge and skills for short periods of time to organizations. People seeking social justice do not need such condescending attitudes. As historians, we bring something more valuable than knowledge to social activism. We bring, I hope, the patience and openness to learn that comes from long immersion in the archives. We bring, I hope, the desire to gain as much from our interactions as we give, and the passion to make sure the stories do not get lost.

Because much of the conversation at the OAH about the need for more activist historians seemed focused at established professors, I want to get the conversation started among us graduate students and junior faculty. How important is activism to you? Have you managed to maintain your connections to organizations and movements during the rigors of graduate school? What have been the challenges you have faced? How do you envision participating in the public sphere in the future? Send me your thoughts and stories at beth.hessel@tcu.edu. I will use your ideas and experiences for a future column here in the CCWH newsletter.

Book Reviews:

Go West, Young Women: The Rise of Early Hollywood. Hallett, Hilary A. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013. 314 pp. \$29.95. ISBN: 978-0-520-27409-9.

Jennifer M. Black, University of Southern California

In *Go West, Young Women*, Hilary Hallett weaves a complex and thoroughly-researched narrative about female celebrities, Hollywood, and the New Woman in the first decades of the twentieth century. Drawing upon biographies, cultural history, and media studies, she argues that the early film industry afforded new opportunities for women's independence, and helped to cultivate an image of the self-made female starlet whose glamour and self-sufficiency appealed to the largely female fan-base of film in the 1910s. These sexually-assertive women navigated paths that broke with traditional Victorian gender roles, and thereby foreshadowed a new type of femininity that took further shape in the 1960s and 70s.

Hallett begins by engaging the various themes that inform her story: massive westward migration after 1900, the lure of California first as an agricultural promised land and later as the film "capital" of the world, rising Nativism at both the national and local levels, the "New Woman," an emergent movie fan culture, and a growing push toward censorship as 1920 approached. Chapter one details the rise of the first movie starlets—especially America's first "sweetheart," Mary Pickford—and how these women fashioned autobiographies that emphasized their own wit, charm, and level-headedness in actively seeking fame and fortune. As Hallett shows, such women appeared to be adventure-seekers; they were smart and witty, combining pseudo-masculine traits with natural feminine beauty and a quintessentially American go-getter attitude that ensured their success and appeal to fans.

Chapter two shows how female journalists—such as Louella Parsons—produced a fan culture that mythologized Hollywood as part of a female-centered leisure space. In fan magazines, journalists cultivated a female fan culture by appealing to the fans' own fantasies and holding up female celebrities as model women leading the way for women everywhere. In the face of public scrutiny, Parsons and others played a crucial role in "recasting actresses as feminists who respected traditional arrangements in the domestic sphere," and thus helped to bolster the status of both the actresses and the film industry as a (relatively) wholesome endeavor (97). Buoyed by their own efforts and the efforts of female journalists and fans, these "women-made women" helped ensure the film industry's massive growth in the 1910s by attracting a diverse female fan-base (103).

Moreover, Hollywood itself came to embody a "bohemian" aesthetic that championed artistic freedom and challenged the restrictive sexual mores of the previous generation. The next three chapters examine this bohemian lifestyle, the growing discussions in and around movies regarding sexual desire, and the ultimate backlash orchestrated by censors towards 1920. As a new Bohemia, Hollywood "sparked much of the heat that fueled the twentieth century's revolution in sexual behavior and attitudes," in Hallett's view (124). Screenwriters, journalists, and others initiated a public discussion about love, sex, and marriage that advocated more egalitarian relationships and an increased awareness of women's sexual pleasure and fulfillment. Women, according to Hallett, were central to this development: their economic success and egalitarian ideals fostered a social environment that favored reimagining the marital relationship as one based on mutual sexual chemistry and satisfaction, on shared intellectual interests, and on emotional intimacy. A key contribution of

Hallett's text is her suggestion that these discussions of female desire and emancipation prefigured many of the ideas that would be associated with sexual liberation and companionate marriage several decades later. "Hollywood" thus became both a place and a cosmopolitan culture built upon women's social, economic, and sexual freedom (151).

These ideas of sexual emancipation, egalitarian gender roles, and expanded opportunities for women found their way to the silver screen, and drew intensifying criticism from the moral right. Blaming the rise in juvenile delinquency on the movies, a coalition of Nativists, religious leaders, and social reform groups (such as the General Federation of Women's Clubs) spearheaded a campaign to limit representations of sexuality in film and fan culture. These calls for censorship culminated, in part, with the sudden death of actress Virginia Rappe and the ensuing media frenzy that surrounded comedian Roscoe "Fatty" Arbuckle's trial for his role in the matter Hallett argues that the Arbuckle scandal provided the proverbial "last straw" in a mounting attack on the perceived licentiousness and immorality pervading Hollywood (the place and its products). As she suggests, censors and many newspapers criticized Hollywood for endorsing "sex roles that endangered impressionable young women" (207). By 1921, the censors helped pass a new Production Code that limited representations of sexuality and women's social independence on screen, while many studios instituted "morality clauses" for their players to ensure proper behavior in public and private.

To be sure, this is a book about Hollywood—the place, the film industry, their products, and the idea of celebrity that became associated with the name. Though Hallett gestures to some ways this story had broader implications for the nation writ-large, these suggestions remain elusive of further development. For example, Hallett's discussion of Hollywood Bohemia could be strengthened by a more detailed comparison to other spaces of artistic production in these years—such as Harlem or Greenwich Village. Also absent is a detailed discussion about the place (if any) of Latinas and African Americans in this story—as fans, actors, writers, or intellectuals. To be fair, adding such material would have required extending an already densely-researched book, which may have further complicated her narrative.

Regardless of these criticisms, Hallett has written a thoughtful and engaging discussion that builds evidence upon evidence, chapter upon chapter until the very end. In particular, Hallett's assertion that the public visibility of female celebrities in the 1910s opened up a new space to re-imagine femininity and women's emancipation is an especially compelling one. Useful both for its tightly-constructed chapters and broader narrative of women's history, this book will surely appeal to both students and scholars interested in the interwar years, the entertainment industry, and the theme of women's emancipation more broadly. It is thus a welcome contribution to women's history in the west in the early twentieth century.

Conquest: The English Kingdom of France 1417-1450. Juliet Barker. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012. 512pp. \$29.95. ISBN 978-0-674-06560-4.

Whitney A. M. Leeson, Roanoke College

Juliet Barker's *Conquest* provides readers with a compelling recounting of what happened to "the English kingdom of France"—a term she prefers to "the Lancastrian occupation"—following Henry V's triumphal victory over the French in 1415 at the Battle of Agincourt, a story she told masterfully in *Agincourt*. Given the rather remarkable lack of a narrative history covering the last thirty years of the Hundred Years War (1337-1453), Barker's *Conquest* fills an obvious lacuna in the literature. While academically not on par with Jonathan Sumption's definitive history, (*The Hundred Years War: Volume I: Trial by Battle*, 1990; *Volume 2: Trial by Fire*, 1999, *Volume 3: Divided Houses*, 2009), undergraduates and general readers interested in the period will find Barker to be the better raconteur.

The story unfolds chronologically, beginning with Henry V's 1417 invasion of France to make good on his claim to the crown of France through his great-grandfather, Edward III, who was the only surviving grandson of Philippe IV, and ending with the wholesale slaughter of English troops in the Battle of Formigny, the fall of Caen, and the loss of Cherbourg in the spring and summer of 1450. The madness of Charles VI created a power vacuum in France that Henry V readily exploited once the dauphin's retainers treacherously murdered John the Fearless, Duke of Burgundy, thereby putting an end to any hope of a Burgundian-Armagnac alliance against the English. As a result, the Burgundians backed Henry's dynastic claims in the 1420 Treaty of Troyes, recognizing him as the regent of France during Charles VI's lifetime and heir to the throne when Charles died. Unfortunately for the English, Henry V's untimely death, most likely of dysentery, created difficulties, many prompted by his unwise decision to entrust the upbringing of his eight-month-old son by Katherine of France to his rather quarrelsome and self-aggrandizing brother, Humphrey, Duke of Gloucester, and his, perhaps, equally manipulative uncle, Henry Beaufort, Bishop of Winchester.

In the end, Bedford's valiant efforts to maintain two kingdoms were in vain. Bedford's death at age 46, the defection of Burgundy, and the damaging terms of the Treaty of Arras seriously jeopardized the English kingdom of France: The bitter rivalry between Gloucester and Beaufort, coupled with perennial financial mismanagement by the crown's councilors, destroyed it.

The ways to lose a kingdom are many but for the English ineptitude, negligence, duplicity, and relentless self-promotion were more than sufficient to do the job. Barker's *Conquest* is also a story of courageous deeds and memorable heroes such as career-soldier and brilliant military strategist John Talbot, better known as "the English Achilles," and the unwavering earls of Arundel and Salisbury who both died on the battlefield fighting to save the English kingdom of France. But for the proverbial man-on-the-ground, the vicious war of attrition waged between the supporters of Henry VI and Charles VII was anything but glorious. Soldiers following a scorched earth policy routinely sacked towns, mercilessly murdering civilians and pillaging their storehouses. Marauders did likewise. Political instability prevented the administration of justice and the inhabitants of northern France suffered the repeated blows of siege warfare, bitterly cold winters, disease, and famine. The narrative Barker constructs—part political and military history; part social history—oscillates between a somewhat monotonous description of pitched battles, long-lasting sieges, and unending castle trading by various military commanders, and human-interest stories featuring knights jousting in mines, refugees fleeing for safety, families divided by civil war, and captives awaiting ransom.

Conquest is certainly no social history, but the few excerpts Barker features bring a much-needed sense of humanity to her story of how the English lost their kingdom on the continent. It is unfortunate that there are not, at least, a few more pages devoted to the experiences of women such as Denise Le Verrat, a Parisian who found herself uprooted from her home and deprived of the companionship of family and friends when Paris fell to Armagnac forces because she had married a Lucchese merchant with strong English ties. The dauphin's administrative officials expelled Denise's beloved husband and when she received permission to join him in exile, they declared her to be a rebel and confiscated her property. Denise's mother appealed her case to the parlement of Paris arguing that divine and canon law dictated her daughter obey her son-in-law's command to join him. The judges disagreed, arguing that Denise had a duty to obey her prince before her husband. They upheld the forfeiture of her property and declared her to be guilty not only of joining the English but increasing enemy ranks when she took her four children with her to Rouen.

Readers will find the maps of France in 1429 and 1436, as well as the tables detailing the English and French royal lines, useful for understanding the unfolding saga of events. Barker's Conquest is most definitely Anglocentric and readers should know that despite the appearance of a fully-armored, crowd-inspiring Joan of Arc on the book's dust jacket, she is portrayed as a minor character whose contribution to the Armagnac cause had little long-term impact. Charles VII likewise receives short shrift and readers wanting to understand how he won back France with the use of well-trained professional troops, a heavy investment in advanced artillery, and the development of an increasingly centralized government to help pay for it all, will not find it here.

No Man's Land: Jamaican Guestworkers in America and the Global History of Deportable Labor.

By Cindy Hahamovitch. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011. Paper: \$24.95 ISBN: 9780691160153.

Reviewed by Torrie Hester

In *No Man's Land: Jamaican Guestworkers in America and the Global History of Deportable Labor*, Cindy Hahamovitch explores the history of guest work through a case study of the H2 program, which, although begun under a different name, ran from 1943 to 1986. The program brought in thousands of guestworkers from the Caribbean—the majority would eventually migrate from Jamaica. Florida's sugar industry is foregrounded in the book because it was the largest employer of H2 workers. Guestworkers represent a relatively novel form of labor in world history. They are deportable if they do not meet the terms of their temporary-work contracts and, as Hahamovitch writes, “[u]nlike immigrants who stay, settle, and in some counties naturalize, vote and qualify for social services, guestworkers exist in a no man's land between nations; they provide labor to their host societies but often fall outside the protections of those societies' labor laws.”(2)

Hahamovitch situates the H2 guestworker program within a global periodization. The first era of guest work began in the 1880s and ended during the Great Depression, the second lasted from World War II into the 1960s, and the final period took off in the 1970s and continues today. The heart of *No Man's Land* is its contribution to understanding the second and third periods. Hahamovitch opens with efforts by U.S. agricultural employers to secure guestworkers from the Caribbean during World War II. Initially, U.S. federal officials negotiated with colonial governments like the British in Jamaica to bring in import workers. U.S. officials also set minimum wages, provided transportation, and even protected participants from some of the worst abuses of the American system of racial segregation. Following World War II, the U.S. government largely withdrew from the H2 program, leaving it in the hands of U.S. growers in the South. Hahamovitch argues the withdrawal of the U.S. federal government from the program's administration marked a critical turning point in the history of guest work. It was the moment when U.S. policy diverged from a more humane path, one that many European countries pursued, and instead, followed a path also pursued by South Africa—U.S. policymakers developed a “privatized guestworker program.” U.S. employers left in control of the program, largely without governmental oversight, used the deportability of their guestworkers to discipline and exploit foreign laborers. The H2 program, therefore, supplied some of the nation's largest commercial farms with very low-wage, racialized labor, and as Hahamovitch convincingly demonstrates, “arrested the development of wages and conditions for some of the nation's most neglected workers.”(11)

No Man's Land does not engage in great detail with the process of deportation; the focus is instead on illustrating the perspectives of governmental officials (both American and Jamaican), employers, and guestworkers. Hahamovitch explains why, when Jamaica gained independence from Britain, the new independent government continued to support the program. With unemployment rates ranging from 25 to 50 percent, Jamaican authorities endorsed the labor program set up by the colonial authority because it provided jobs, even if they were very exploitive. No Man's Land traces the ways that U.S. sugar growers, once they created deportable labor, fought to keep it. Hahamovitch is especially adept at telling the social history of the workers. She vividly describes the ways racialization and deportability impacted the lives of the Jamaican guestworkers and limited their options of redress. Jamaican guestworkers, for example, were paid on a "ticket distribution system."

Over time, employers rigged this system to pay the guestworkers even less. When some of the Jamaicans protested, they faced violent repression in the fields and in their deportation from the United States. Even when abuses in the ticket system came to light, as Hahamovitch proves with a breadth of archival documents, the U.S. and the Jamaican authorities failed to step in to protect the rights of workers.

No Man's Land is an award-winning book important to a broad array of historiographies. Hahamovitch's investigation of the intersection of the H2 program with racial segregation make this an important study for those interested in the study of race and Civil Rights. The monograph adds to the history of business by tracking the importance of guestworkers to the emergence of Florida as one of the world's largest sugar-producing regions. For policy history, No Man's Land illustrates the connection of the Cuban Revolution and LBJ's "War on Poverty" to Florida's sugar fields. No Man's Land complements the growing literature on Mexican guestworkers. It also raises important points about the costs of guest work to emigrant-sending countries. Hahamovitch writes provocatively, "[t]he Jamaican government has long defended the guestworker system as a foreign aid program that cost the United States nothing. But the H2 Program and its West Coast counterpart did more than send U.S. dollars to poorer countries. Perversely, sending counties sent foreign aid to the United States in the form of young men in their peak years of physical fitness."(8) With this breadth and depth, No Man's Land is an exceptional contribution to U.S. and global history.

The Ashgate Research Companion to Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe. Poska, Allyson M., Jane Couchman, and Katherine A. McIver, eds. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2013. 554 pp. \$149.95 ISBN 978-1-4094-1817-7
Elizabeth LaFray, Washtenaw Community College

The Ashgate Research Companion to Women and Gender in Early Modern Europe is an important volume for researchers in the field of early modern history, not only for what it offers in terms of historiographical analysis but also for its revelation of many opportunities for future scholarship. It confounds full summarizing in the space accorded here yet readers should know that it is a valuable companion to the study of women's lives, both lay and religious, during the early modern period, especially because of its interdisciplinary and comparative elements. The volume is divided into three parts: Religion, Embodied Lives, and Cultural Production. This thematic treatment of scholarship on women and gender in early modern Europe captures both the breadth and depth of the field while also tackling emerging areas of scholarship. At the same time, it emphasizes the key areas where historical events like the Protestant and Catholic Reformations played out in women's lives.

events like the Protestant and Catholic Reformations played out in women's lives.

In Part One: Religion, Elizabeth A. Leffeldt argues that a geographical paradox has traditionally framed the study of early modern female monasticism. She also notes, however, that works produced between 1990 and 2010 have begun to counteract this trend by sharing an interpretive framework that emphasizes the ways convents interacted with the world beyond their walls. (15) Similarly, Alison Weber argues for a change in the way literature by women religious has been studied. She suggests that comparative studies, incorporating women's history, gender studies, and the history of spirituality, will help scholars move beyond the usual focus on single language areas and single orders. (43) Marilyn Dunn, evaluating the state of scholarship on convent artistic creativity, emphasizes the double-natured character of convents as contemplative spiritual centers and institutions inseparable from the socio-economic dynamics of the secular world. (68) Kimberly Montford's examination of convent music integrates the spiritual with the secular as well, noting that nuns were not, as previously assumed by some scholars of early modern Europe, "marginal" figures, but "vital contributing members of the musical milieu..." (90)

The study of lay spiritual women is examined by Susan E. Dinan and Merry Weisner-Hanks. Dinan argues that within the culture of the Catholic Reformation, women could express their faith as nuns, wives, or members of active communities and "had more options than their Protestant peers did." (125) Her perspective is in great contrast to earlier studies that assumed that the nature of the Protestant Reformation changed women's worlds for the better, while Catholic women were left behind. Her conclusion also foregrounds the way in which Protestant studies have evolved in the last decade. Indeed, Weisner-Hanks argues that while research on women and the Reformation originally tended to focus on whether the Protestant movement was good or bad for women, it has in the last several decades increasingly focused on broader social, economic, intellectual, and political contexts. (131) Yet, she also notes that most surveys of the Reformation still lack a treatment of women's lives beyond marriage and the traditional presentation of women as 'helpmeets.' (140)

Part two, Embodied Lives, features the work of scholars treating issues of marriage, sexuality, and biology. Lianne McTavish examines maternity in early modern Europe, concluding that during that period there was a general shift away from the view of the maternal body as a mysteriously productive and potentially unruly womb toward the maternal body as "a measurable skeletal framework that could both support and impede reproduction." (187) Allyson Polska's treatment of marriage in early modern Europe suggests that scholarly focus on women in the last three decades has led to a re-evaluation of the importance of marriage in early modern society and a more complex understanding of the role of patriarchy. Jutta Gisela Sperling applies comparative perspective to the study of marriage in early modern Europe, arguing that the integration of scholarship on Islamic regions permits scholars to "overcome the gendered and Orientalizing polarizations of Mediterranean history." (215) A similar perspective is applied in Lyndan Warner's treatment of women's legal status. The problematic nature of "sex" as a category of historical investigation is discussed by Katherine Crawford, who argues that debates over the sexed body highlight the fluctuating quality of gender. (265) She also points to the need to be aware of the dynamics between historical and presentist thinking when it comes to the history of sexuality. Lynn Botelho addresses age as an analytical category in her study of old women in early modern Europe, providing the reader with interesting details about when old age was thought to begin and the place of old women in early modern society. Yet she argues convincingly that more research in general is needed before we can write confidently about them. Carole Levin and Alicia Meyer acknowledge a similar dearth in the discussion about early modern widows, suggesting that with regard to political power, further research on the political and fiscal power of the widow is needed. (345) Contesting the popular assertion, formulated by Alice Clark in her seminal study *The Working Life of Women in the Seventeenth Century*, that during

the early modern period women workers faced a decline in their options for lucrative and prestigious occupations because of options for lucrative and prestigious occupations because of the development of the capitalist economic system, Janine M. Lanza argues that “although the economic landscape changed for women, it did not necessarily mark a moment of decline in the early modern period.” (292) Maintaining the theme of disempowerment, Elizabeth S. Cohen insists that the term “marginalization,” broadened in its definition to include more than just those who were on the outside of normative society, allows historians to consider a variety of disempowered conditions across society. Thus not only gender, but also youth, disease and disability, crime, poverty, and social deviance can be leveraged for a more complex understanding of women on the margins.

Part three examines the cultural contributions of women in early modern Europe. It also effectively challenges the notion that women were unable to participate in literary, intellectual, medical, scientific, and artistic pursuits. Indeed, the study of the *Querelle des femmes* by Julie D. Campbell and Diana Robin’s examination of the rise of women intellectuals on the wave of humanism and technological advances during the early modern period reveal that women writers during this period can be looked to for the foundations of modern feminism. (400) Alisha Rankin emphasizes recent studies that show women to be regular participants in medical activities even as they faced limitations in the world of science. In individual chapters, Sheila Folliot, Sheryl E. Reiss, and Katherine McIver demonstrate that women producers, as well as consumers of art and material goods were active during the early modern period. The volume concludes with a thought-provoking examination of women, gender, and music. In it, Linda Phyllis Austern argues that while they had to overcome cultural obstacles to receive appropriate training, early modern women composers were well received by their contemporaries. She notes as well, the fluidity of the concept of gender during the period in her discussion of *castrati*. (517) Hers is the final chapter in a volume that achieves its goal—to study women and gender within an interdisciplinary framework while integrating women and gender into general historical studies.

Member News:

New Affiliate Member: The Society for the History of Women in the Americas shawsociety@gmail.com

The Society for the History of Women in the Americas (SHAW) is a scholarly association dedicated to the historical investigation of women and gender in North America, South America and the Caribbean, either within or between nation states and/or the northern or southern hemispheres. Founded by Professor Jay Kleinberg in 2008, the society was originally called British Historians of Women in the Americas (BHWAs) but was renamed in 2011 to reflect the level of international interest and involvement. SHAW provides an arena for researchers from across a range of disciplines to come together, offering a focal point in which their hemispheric gender concerns can coalesce and develop further.

In spring 2013, SHAW launched a new journal, *History of Women in the Americas* (ISSN 2042-6348). Produced in cooperation with the School of Advanced Studies Open Access Scheme, *History of Women in the Americas* is a peer-reviewed, open-access electronic journal publishing scholarship on women’s and gender history in all parts of the Americas and between the Americas and other nations across all centuries. A Special Issue entitled ‘Women as Wives and Workers: Marking Fifty Years of The Feminine Mystique’, based on our 2013

annual conference, is currently under preparation. Individual submissions are welcome at any time.

New Affiliate Member: History Associates www.historyassociates.com

History Associates is an organization comprised of historians, archivists and records managers. Collectively, our staff brings decades of practical experience and academic training to a broad array of research services and history projects. In addition to historical research, archival services, exhibit planning and records management, we are often a valuable resource for writers and researchers requiring assistance locating historical data or information.

CCWH Member, Tamika Richeson has been awarded one of ten Woodrow Wilson Women's Studies Dissertation Fellowship for 2014. The Woodrow Wilson Women's Studies program, the only national fellowship for doctoral work on issues of women and gender, supports the final year of dissertation writing for Ph.D. candidates in the humanities and social sciences doing interdisciplinary and original work on these issues. Ms. Richeson is a doctoral candidate in history at the University of Virginia. Her research examines nineteenth-century law and culture to explore the racial and gendered context in which American criminal law took shape. Congratulations Tamika!

CCWH member, Courtney Campbell successfully defended her dissertation at Vanderbilt University. Courtney has recently become the new membership coordinator for the CCWH. Congratulations Courtney!

CCWH Ida B. Wells Graduate Student Fellowship Bylaws

(revised March 2014)

1. The Ida B. Wells Graduate Student Fellowship is an annual award given to a graduate student working on a historical dissertation that interrogates race and gender, not necessarily in a history department. Funds from this fellowship may be used for purposes directly or indirectly related to the dissertation, including but not limited to expenses for research, attendance of scholarly conferences, and the preparation of the dissertation.
2. Applicants to the Ida B. Wells Graduate Student Fellowship must be current members of the CCWH when they submit their application. Current CCWH Executive Board members or prize committee members are not eligible to apply. Applicants for the fellowship may apply more than once but may win only once.
3. All applicants should have advanced to candidacy in a U.S. institution of higher education and be researching or writing the dissertation. The dissertation should be historical in nature, although the degree may be in related fields. Applicants should expect the Ph.D. no earlier than December of the calendar year in which the award is made.
4. Applicants may only apply for one CCWH award, prize, or fellowship each year.

5. Applicants for the Ida B. Wells Dissertation Fellowship must submit their completed application materials to Wellsaward@theccwh.org as ONE e-mail attachment with the name of the award and the name of the applicant in the subject line:
 - A. A scanned completed application form (with abstract inside the provided space on the application form) and the signature (on the application form) of a representative of the applicant's department verifying that qualifying exams have been passed or that A.B.D. status has been achieved in some other way. If this is not possible, both letters of recommendation should state clearly that the applicant has achieved A.B.D. status.
 - B. A copy of a current curriculum vitae
 - C. A copy of a summary of the dissertation project, an explanation of how the dissertation project will advance our understanding of the issue(s) under study, a survey of the major primary sources, a discussion of the historiography, a summary of research already accomplished, and an indication of plans for completion of the dissertation in no more than five double-spaced pages using 12 font Times New Roman, with one Inch margins.
 - D. Two letters of recommendation from members of the dissertation committee should be sent separately in e-mail attachments with the name of the award and the name of the applicant in the subject line.
 - E. Applicants who do not meet the deadline for submission or include all the required materials will not be considered.

6. The Fellowship Committee members shall:
 - A. Be appointed by the co-presidents, with the approval of the Executive Board, for a three-year term. In case of an incomplete term of service, an appointment shall be made by the Co-Presidents to complete the term of service. All committee members should be current members of the CCWH.
 - B. Ideally, have terms that are staggered in a three-year cycle. Each year a new committee member shall be appointed.
 - C. Ideally, the committee members should represent different geographical and temporal areas of expertise.
 - D. In the event that there are communication (problems) or other issues (arising) within and among the committee members, the Executive Director, with the assistance of the Co-presidents will intervene to mediate and if necessary, choose the award winner.

7. The Fellowship Committee chair shall:
 - A. Be confirmed by the co-presidents at the start of each award cycle.
 - B. Usually be the senior-most member of the committee, but ideally have at least one year of experience on the particular committee prior to taking over the position of chair.
 - C. Be responsible for overseeing the work of the committee, including checking to see if applicants are current CCWH members; contacting each committee member with the password for the award

e-mail account; for the timely determination of award recipient and for the notification of the decision to all applicants, selected or not, as well as the Executive Director.

- D. The award chair is responsible for e-mailing each applicant to let them know their application is complete and that their letters of recommendation have been received.
 - E. Present or appoint someone to present the fellowship to the winner at the CCWH award luncheon at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association.
 - F. Make a summary report to the Executive Board at the annual meeting that includes the names and dissertation titles of all applicants and the rationale for choosing the award winner and honorable mention (as applicable).
8. Each committee member shall review and rate each application for the Ida B. Wells Graduate Student Fellowship. Committee members will rank each application using a 5-point scale with 5 as excellent; 4 very good; 3 good; 2 satisfactory; 1 unsatisfactory (in other words the highest possible total will be 25) giving equal weight to each of the following criteria:
- A. Scholarly potential of the graduate student.
 - B. Significance of the dissertation project for historical research.
 - C. Originality and clarity of argument.
 - D. Progress already made toward completing research for the dissertation.
 - E. Timeliness of the topic.
9. The fellowship will be determined by the Ida B. Wells Graduate Student Fellowship Committee subject to funding availability and the applicant pool.
10. Should questions of eligibility arise during the evaluation and application period, the chair, in consultation with the co-presidents, shall make a decision on the applicant's eligibility.
11. The Ida B. Wells Graduate Student Fellowship recipient shall be announced at the CCWH awards luncheon at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association.

CCWH/ Berkshire Conference of Women Historians Dissertation Fellowship Bylaws

(revised March 2014)

1. The CCWH/Berkshire Conference of Women Historians Dissertation Fellowship is awarded annually to a Ph. D. candidate in the discipline of history who may specialize in any historical area. Funds from these this Awards fellowship may be used for purposes directly or indirectly related to the dissertation, such

as including but not limited to expenses for research, attendance of scholarly conferences, and the preparation of the dissertation.

2. Applicants to the CCWH/Berks Graduate Student Fellowship must be current members of the CCWH when they submit their application. Current CCWH Executive Board members or prize committee members are not eligible to apply. Applicants for the fellowship may apply more than once but may win only once.
3. All applicants should have advanced to candidacy in a U.S. institution of higher education and be researching or writing the dissertation. Applicants should expect the Ph.D. no earlier than December of the calendar year in which the award is made.
4. Applicants may only apply for one CCWH award, prize, or fellowship each year.
5. Applicants for the CCWH/ Berkshire Conference of Women Historians Dissertation Fellowship must submit application their completed application materials to CCWHBerksaward@theccwh.org as ONE e-mail attachment with the name of the award and the name of the applicant in the subject line:
 - A. A scanned completed application form (with abstract inside the provided space on the application form) and the signature (on the application form) of a representative of the applicant's department verifying that qualifying exams have been passed or that A.B.D. status has been achieved in some other way. If this is not possible, both letters of recommendation should state that the applicant has achieved A.B.D. status.
 - B. A copy of a current curriculum vitae
 - C. A copy of a summary of the dissertation project, an explanation of how the dissertation project will advance our understanding of the issue(s) under study, a survey of the major primary sources, a discussion of the historiography, a summary of research already accomplished, and an indication of plans for completion of the dissertation in no more than five double-spaced pages using 12 font Times New Roman, with one inch margins.
 - D. Two letters of recommendation from members of the dissertation committee in separate e-mail attachments with the name of the award and the name of the applicant in the subject line.
 - E. Applicants who do not meet the deadline for submission or include all the required materials will not be considered.
6. The Fellowship Committee members shall:
 - A. Be appointed by the co-presidents, with the approval of the Executive Board, for a three-year term. In case of an incomplete term of service, an appointment shall be made by the Co-Presidents to complete the term of service. All committee members should be current members of the CCWH.
 - B. Ideally, have terms that are staggered in a three-year cycle. Each year a new committee member shall be appointed.
 - C. Ideally, the committee members should represent different geographical and temporal areas of expertise.
 - D. In the event that there are communication problems or other issues arising within and among the committee members, the Executive Director, with the assistance of the Co-presidents will intervene to mediate and, if necessary, choose the award winner.

7. The Fellowship Committee chair shall:
 - A. Be confirmed by the co-presidents at the start of each award cycle.
 - B. Usually be the senior-most member of the committee, but ideally have at least one year of experience on the particular committee prior to taking over the position of chair.
 - C. Be responsible for overseeing the work of the committee, including checking to see if applicants are current CCWH members; contacting each committee member with the password for the award e-mail account; for the timely determination of the award recipient and for the notification of the decision to all applicants, selected or not, as well as the Executive Director.
 - D. The award chair is responsible for e-mailing each applicant to let them know their application is complete and that their letters of recommendation have been received.
 - E. Present or appoint someone to present the fellowship to the winner at the CCWH award luncheon at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association.
 - F. Make a summary report to the Executive Board at the annual meeting that includes the names and dissertation titles of all applicants and the rationale for choosing the award winner and honorable mention (as applicable).
8. Each committee member shall review and rate each application for the CCWH/Berks Graduate Student Fellowship. Committee members will rank each application using a 5-point scale with 5 as excellent; 4 very good; 3 good; 2 satisfactory; 1 unsatisfactory (in other words the highest possible total will be 25) giving equal weight to each of the following criteria:
 - A. Scholarly potential of the graduate student.
 - B. Significance of the dissertation project for historical research.
 - C. Originality and clarity of argument.
 - D. Progress already made toward completing research for the dissertation.
 - E. Timeliness of the topic.
9. The fellowship will be determined by the CCWH/Berks Graduate Student Fellowship Committee subject to funding availability and the applicant pool.
10. Should questions of eligibility arise during the evaluation and application period, the chair, in consultation with the co-presidents, shall make a decision on the applicant's eligibility.
11. The CCWH/Berks Graduate Student Fellowship recipient shall be announced at the CCWH awards luncheon at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association.

Comments or Questions?

Please contact the Executive Director at execdir@theccwh.org with any comments or questions about the changes to the by-laws of either award.

CCWH
607 Emanuel Lane
Sycamore, IL 60178

PLACE
STAMP
HERE

