chapter two

Women among the Professors of History

THE STORY OF A PROCESS OF TRANSFORMATION

When I entered graduate studies in 1963, women represented a tiny fraction of professional historians. Women entering the profession in middle age were considered "freaks" and were viewed with suspicion. Most of us never saw a woman or a nonwhite professor during our doctoral studies. Isolation, alienation, and a sense of being there on sufferance, always offered with the expectation that we would not measure up and were likely to fail, defined our environment.

*I had entered graduate study after several decades of involvement in grassroots organizing and political activism. Thus it seemed natural to me to address these problems organizationally, especially since they were also reflected in the attitudes and environment of the annual conferences of historical societies. Shortly after earning my Ph.D. in 1966 I became active in the Organization of American Historians and later took a leadership role in the formation of the caucus of women historians at the 1969 convention of the American Historical Association. The following essay describes what we did and how we managed to transform the professional societies and with them the career choices for both women and men in our profession.**

As I look back to the beginnings of feminist organization among historians in the late 1960s, I am aware of the fact that I entered the field with an unusual background. I came to academic life as a mature woman, having been a committed political activist since age fifteen. A refugee from Hitler, I had experienced fascism, racism, imprisonment, and persecution. As an immigrant in the United States I worked in typical unskilled women's jobs, from domestic work to file clerk, and it took me years to work my way up to becoming a medical technician. I had long worked with women

*Based on two previously published essays: Gerda Lerner, "Women among the Professors of History: The Story of a Process of Transformation," in Eileen Boris and Nupur Chaudhuri (eds.), *Voices of Women Historians: The Personal, the Political, the Professional*, 1–10 (Indiana University Press: Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1999; Gerda Lerner, "A View from the Women's Side," *Journal of American History* 76, no. 2 (Sept. 1989): 446–56.

in their community organizations, and I knew in my bones that women build communities. But as I entered academic life as a student, I encountered a world of "significant knowledge" in which women seemed not to exist. I never could accept that patriarchal mental construct and resisted it all through my training. My commitment to women's history came out of my life, not out of my head.

I first attended a convention of the Organization of American Historians (OAH) in 1963, the year I entered graduate school at Columbia. It was a discouraging experience: I knew no one there, and there seemed to be no way of getting to know anyone. The group was overwhelmingly male; there were so few women and so very few female graduate students that one noticed each woman in the room. Yet no one seemed to want to be the first one to speak to a stranger. The social highlights of the convention were something called "smokers," organized by various prominent schools. The Columbia smoker, true to its name, took place in a smoky room without chairs, in which men, each carrying the obligatory over-priced drink, milled around trying to connect with others they knew. The few women present usually turned out to be wives. The famous professors were surrounded by a few nervous and eager young men, whom they had chosen from among their graduate students to be introduced to other important professors who might further their careers.

At that time there were no accepted ground rules for hiring and interviews. Most jobs were never advertised, but were announced informally through the old boys' network. When a job opened, a professor from that department would call his friends and contacts in other schools and elicit the names of their favorite and preferred students. The job search then took place privately, at the convention or on campuses, as a sort of competition between the pre-screened chosen few. Less favored students or those whose professors were not well connected in the network simply lost out. Women and minorities tended to be among the losers. At the smokers one could stand in a corner and watch the ballet of eminent professors introducing their favorites to other eminent professors or one could try to stand on the outer rim of a group and catch the professor's eye in hopes of being included. It was a dismal form of social interaction.

I also remember taking a number of lonely meals at these conventions and feeling miserable, until I finally decided to make my own contacts. At first, I just walked up to one or more of the nuns present and asked if I could have lunch or dinner with them. The nuns were always friendly and

cheerful, and I made some splendid contacts and lifelong friendships. From this I branched out to introducing myself to other women, but many of them were busy socializing with men they knew and hanging around the important professors. It took several years before I had built up enough contacts so that I would not pass the convention in lonely misery.

I may have been particularly inept socially or, as I then believed, I was enough of a misfit among the Columbia students (too old, a married mother of teenagers, and interested in Women's History) to account for my isolation. In the '60s very few women over forty pursued graduate training. Those who did faced discrimination not only in admission to graduate programs, but especially in access to the informal networks which sustain professional development.

The ways for graduate students to become professionally known, by participating in conference sessions, offering papers or commentary, and getting articles published, were deep mysteries that students found accessible only through their mentors. If one leafs through the programs of the conventions of the major historical professional organizations in the '50s and early '60s, if one looks through their journals, the absence of women as participants and contributors is glaringly obvious. Women were not on the boards and offices of the professional organizations. The same was true for members of minority groups, only their exclusion was closer to total.

All of this changed with the organization of the Coordinating Committee on Women in the Historical Profession (CCWHP) at the 1969 convention of the American Historical Association (AHA). Although only seventeen people attended the first meeting, which Berenice Carroll had organized, a public meeting held later during the convention drew a large crowd and generated a list of over one hundred who wished to participate in the new organization. We drew up a statement of purpose, a set of immediate demands, and elected officers: Berenice Carroll and Gerda Lerner, co-chairs; Hilda Smith, treasurer; and a steering committee of five members. An indication of the politics of the group was the sharp debate over what to call the organization. The more radical members wanted it to be called Women's Caucus, while the moderates, among whom I was then counted, wanted to avoid the term because of its radical connotations. I'm afraid I have to admit that I was an advocate of the somewhat klutzy name that resulted and with which we were saddled for decades. In fact, we were a women's caucus and acted as such. In organizing our group we were influenced and encouraged by the formation of women's caucuses

in other learned societies, such as the Modern Language Association, the American Sociological Association, and the American Studies Association. In the early 1970s the movements for equity for women in the professional societies and the growth of Women's Studies erupted throughout the academic world; they would lead eventually to a transformation of academic disciplines and to the curtailment of the unchecked male dominance in the structures of higher education. Our efforts in the field of history were a fairly typical case study of how this transformation was accomplished.

The program of CCWHP was threefold: 1) to encourage the recruitment of women into the profession and advance the status of women at all levels; 2) to oppose discrimination against women; and 3) to encourage and develop research and instruction in the field of Women's History. Other specific demands were quickly formulated: the formation of special "women's committees" to investigate the status of women in the profession; the provision of child care at the conventions; changes in hiring practices, and the appointment of a special assistant to oversee the transition to open hiring practices; the establishment of a roster of women historians to facilitate the hiring of women; equal access of women to all committee appointments of the professional organizations; and equal participation in the formation of convention programs. In one form or another all of these demands were implemented over the next five years.

I functioned as a liaison with the Berkshire Conference group during our 1969 meeting and the next year and tried to convince its leadership that the formation of CCWHP was in the common interest and that we should closely collaborate. The "Berks" had formed in the 1920s, largely in order to help female historians overcome the sense of marginality and isolation they experienced at professional conventions. The group met once a year in the Berkshires for a weekend retreat to discuss papers, and served as a support group for its members. As it later turned out the activities of CCWHP and the spectacular growth of the Women's History movement infused new life into the group. After the notable Berkshire Conference on Women's History held in 1974, the successive Berks conferences became major social and professional events, attracting over 2,000 participants and rivaling the AHA for attendance.

CCWHP from the beginning and throughout its existence tried to engage in serious and pragmatic organizing and to avoid factionalism. Many women in CCWHP were active members of the radical caucus, others were strongly committed to feminism, and still others were more traditionalist

in their politics. We certainly had our disagreements, which have heightened as the field of Women's History has become more respectable. Whenever any disagreements among us were publicly expressed, those who all along disparaged our efforts used these to prophesy the downfall of our enterprise. But I think, seen in historical perspective and compared to other radical movements, ours has been characterized by the avoidance of factionalism and by an acceptance of differences that still allow for alliances. We have benefited from the support of male radical historians and they from ours on specific issues, in which we shared a common interest, such as the broadening of the base of our professional organizations, opposition to the Vietnam War, the advancement of the status and opportunities of minority scholars, and support for the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA).

THE APPROACH OF women historians has been to work from within and with the professional organizations and to use a broad spectrum of forces to promote change. At its October 1969 council meeting, the AHA received a petition from twenty-two historians, some of whom would subsequently be among the vanguard of CCWHP, urging that the AHA appoint a committee to undertake a formal investigation of the status of women historians. After the December membership meeting the council named Professor Willie Lee Rose of the University of Virginia as chair of an ad hoc Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession. It took another year before this committee became a standing committee of the organization. Its report, issued in December 1970, provided the factual basis for setting the agenda for a massive effort to improve the status of women historians. Soon after, the OAH established its first Committee on the Status of Women in the Historical Profession. The two committees were unusual in that they had a lively constituency that prodded them along and supported their recommendations. Each of the women's committees' future demands—such as the appointment of a paid executive secretary to deal with women's problems in the profession and the publication of a roster of women historians—was at first resisted by the administration and the council, and it took repeated efforts and membership pressure to get them passed. Still, persistence paid off, and women historians, introducing innumerable resolutions at AHA and OAH conventions, returning after they were beaten and presenting them again, succeeded in initiating a series of dramatic institutional changes within the professional organizations.

In these early years Committees on the Status of Women were organized also in the regional and affiliated branches of the historical societies. They added initiative and pressure for change to the efforts started by CCWHP and helped focus attention on the need to democratize the structure of the historical societies.

Some of the most important changes were initiated quite informally by women historians and their allies and were later formally introduced as resolutions at the OAH and AHA conferences. They concerned the conditions under which historians obtained their jobs. We supported all efforts to make the hiring process open, equitable and accessible to all, and with some support from government affirmative action rules, we succeeded. We also lobbied for the appointment of women to the advisory boards of the AHA and OAH journals and as members of program committees.

We set out also to systematically demystify the process of becoming a professional historian. A few of us found out how the professional organizations worked, how program committees formed their programs, how one got to suggest a panel proposal, how one got appointed to a committee. Whatever we found out, we immediately shared with everyone. We organized graduate student workshops, issued survival manuals, organized and proposed our own panels and fought to get them accepted by program committees. The AHA Committee on Women Historians issued a "Survival Manual" that included chapters such as "Survival at Interviews," "How to Apply to Graduate School," "How to Get on a Program at a Meeting of Professional Associations," and "How to Apply for Grants and Fellowships." The manual quickly became popular with male and female historians. Panels and workshops on these subjects, sponsored by the women's committees or CCWHP, began to be featured at succeeding conventions. They provided contacts for networking and forums for airing grievances and planning future actions, and they became models for open democratic process. The CCWHP cocktail hour, which we started in 1973, quickly became an institution and soon it was *the* social event of the conventions, a good antidote to the old boys' smokers. For women, for graduate students, and for many men, we transformed the social climate during conventions, simply by modeling other possibilities. For me, from 1970 on, the two professional conventions and, of course, the revitalized Berks, have become warm social occasions, not only for learning what's new and current in scholarship, but also for meeting an ever-widening circle of close friends and co-workers.

At the time, changing the social climate of the conventions was not high on our priority list, but it proved to be an important side effect of the work of CCWHP and the women's committees. Creating an alternative to the hierarchical model of the old boys' network not only made the conventions more pleasant and more inclusive, but it helped to involve a broader group of people in the work of the organizations.

The two women's committees quantified the glaringly unequal representation of women in articles published in journals and in reviewing assignments. We monitored the articles submitted and the rejection letters; we set up meetings with editors of the journals to discuss these issues. I remember participating in several very unpleasant meetings of this kind with editors and various gatekeepers in which our efforts to gain access for women scholars and Women's History scholarship were rebuffed. The usual first response was denial; nobody ever had rejected articles by women or treated them in any way differently than articles written by men. The second response was more maddening: it was a sad "fact" that no good articles by women were being submitted to journals. If such quality articles were to be submitted, they would undoubtedly be accepted. CCWHP proposed that the OAH and AHA might try publishing separate journal issues focusing on scholarship by women. Such proposals were rejected with disdain by editors of historical journals. Were we afraid of fair and open competition? Did we wish to lower standards?

It may be difficult for younger historians to imagine the extent to which male historians' resistance to our efforts took the form of disparagement. It is, of course, an ancient tactic by those resisting change to accuse those advocating change of lowering standards. The same response greeted educational reformers in the 1840s and again at the turn of the century, who wished to include the study of American history and literature in college curricula. They, too, were accused of wanting to lower standards and dilute the value of higher education. The same accusations are, of course, made today against those advocating affirmative action and multicultural curricula. The assumption of the gatekeepers was and is that education is a zero-sum game. If new groups were to be included, it must mean that old groups would be slighted. The other, and more galling assumption, was that by definition scholarship by women was and would be inferior to scholarship by men. These objections vanished in the face of the solid scholarly work of the women and minority scholars who finally succeeded

in gaining representation on the advisory boards of the journals and as members of program and executive committees.

Petitions, lobbying, and the introduction of resolutions by and about women at each of the conventions became staples of our organizing work. It was a slogging, slow, and often utterly frustrating process. We met resistance each step of the way, but in the end we prevailed. For example, the practice of CCWHP interviewing candidates for election to OAH and AHA offices regarding their views on a number of organization issues was considered divisive, unprofessional, and terribly threatening when we first started it. By now, it has become an accepted feature of OAH and AHA elections and has certainly contributed to making candidates for office more accountable to the voters. I think that our shattering of the old boys' network and transforming the hierarchical, mystified way of running the professional organizations was one of the best and most useful things CCWHP did for everyone in the profession, not just for women and minorities.

In 1969 the status of women in the profession was marginal and hedged about by discriminatory practices and an androcentric tradition. The employment situation of women historians over a twenty-two-year span was surveyed in 1986 by Patricia Albjerg Graham, then the chair of the Committee on Women Historians (CWH), in a report to the AHA. In 1950–59 women had represented 10.4 percent of the Ph.D.s in history, while in 1980–84 they represented 32.6 percent.[1]

The situation is somewhat improved. In 1998 women faculty were 29.9 percent of those employed, while in 2003 they were 30.4 percent. This must be measured against the fact that women earned 40 percent of all Ph.D.s in history in 2003. Thus, considering the available cohort of qualified faculty, women were still discriminated against in access to employment.[2]

The greatest and most positive changes have occurred in the two major professional organizations. In 1969 there were no women officers in either organization. The presidency of both the OAH and AHA had been filled by males throughout the entire period of their existence, with the exception in each case of one woman president in the 1930s. By 1982 women constituted 34 percent of the elected officers of the AHA and 36 percent of the members of standing committees. My election to the presidency of the OAH in 1982 was followed by that of Anne Firor Scott in 1984 and that of Natalie Zemon Davis to the presidency of the AHA in 1987. Since then,

women have been fairly represented in the elections of both organizations. Whereas women at the 1969 AHA convention had represented 4 percent of all program participants, they numbered 25 percent in 1982 and 46 percent in 1998. In both organizations the participation of women in the annual conferences has vastly increased and with it their access to professional exposure and scholarly exchange.

In 1970 the status of Women's History was nonexistent. At a time when political and institutional history was the measure of significance and social history had only recently been elevated to legitimacy, the subject "women" was defined as doubly marginal. Women's History was not recognized as a legitimate field and to admit that one worked in it was considered the kiss of death professionally. In 1970, there were only five scholars in U.S. History who defined themselves primarily as historians of Women's History: Janet James, Anne Firor Scott, Elizabeth Taylor, Eleanor Flexner (a nonacademic historian), and myself. Carl Degler, Clarke Chambers, and Christopher Lasch had done significant work in Women's History, and Degler and Chambers were instrumental in furthering the establishment of the field. Christopher Lasch told me, probably in 1971, when I asked him what his next project in Women's History would be, that he had "taken the field about as far as it would go" and was now working on other subjects. A younger generation of graduate students was, of course, already working on Women's History topics and would shortly emerge as a self-conscious force, but there was a vast gap between them and the generation of Mary Beard, Elizabeth Schlesinger, Eugenia Leonard, and Elizabeth Massey who had, mostly outside the academy, worked to establish Women's History in the 1920s and '30s.

I was very much aware of the lack of support for Women's History during the founding period of CCWHP. A questionnaire answered by seventy-two CCWHP members in 1970 regarding what should be the focus of the organization's work revealed that 45 percent wanted it to focus primarily on the professional status of women and only 25 percent wanted to focus on Women's History.[3] My commitment was then already clear: for me the promotion of Women's History as a field had primary importance. Accordingly, I concentrated in 1970 on getting several panels sponsored by CCWHP into the programs of both the AHA and OAH. After lengthy negotiations I succeeded in organizing a panel, "Feminism—Past, Present, and Future" for the 1970 AHA convention (Chair, Anne Firor Scott; papers by Alice Rossi, Jo Freeman, and myself, with William O'Neill as commen-

tator). During the same convention the innovative chairman of the Program Committee, Professor Raymond Grew, accepted a panel discussion, "Women's Experience in History: A Teaching Problem," organized by the AHA Committee on the Status of Women. What a triumph—out of a hundred sessions, two concerned women. These path-breaking sessions were lively and well attended. As a mark of progress, the 1971 AHA convention featured five Women's History panels. The 1971 OAH convention featured a panel on Mary Beard and two panels on professional concerns of women historians. I served as the single woman member of the 1972 OAH program committee and wrote more than fifty letters trying to get several panels on women organized, but succeeded only in getting two on the program (or perhaps three, if one wants to consider a paper on the "marriage market" as representing Women's History). One of these sessions, "The Case of the Missing Ladies," which dealt with a study of the leading college textbooks and the near-total absence of references to women in them, proved to be quite sensational, with an overflow audience and reporters present. It was written up in the *New York Times* the next day. So it went, step by step, six steps backward for every two steps gained. Yet, since 1972, at each convention, there have been panels and workshops pertaining to the professional interests of women and to Women's History.

In the summer of 1970 CCWHP reported that, nationwide, twenty-two members were offering at least one course on Women's History and that four Women's Studies programs were then being developed. That was only thirty-eight years ago. In 1972, when, with the help of a Rockefeller Foundation grant, I launched the M.A. program in Women's History at Sarah Lawrence College, ours was the first graduate program of its kind in the United States and, to my knowledge, in the world (see Chapter 3). Today students can earn an M.A. or Ph.D. with a Women's History specialization at over seventy colleges and universities.[4]

The process of gaining acceptance for this new field of scholarship was slower and even more labor-intensive than that of promoting the status of women historians. We had to advance on four fronts all at once: we had to show that there were adequate and interesting sources available in Women's History; we had to produce first-rate work based on these sources; we had to train teachers and develop bibliographies and syllabi; and we had to convince administrators and our colleagues that there was student demand for these courses.

Just as we had often been told by traditional historians that women's

history was insignificant, so we were constantly met with the unproven but widespread belief that there was a lack of sources for this field. This was disproved once and for all in a project I helped to conceive, organize, and finance. In April 1971, a small group of scholars got together at the OAH convention to discuss what might be done to make sources on women more readily accessible to scholars. All of us who participated in this meeting—Anne Firor Scott, Carl Degler, Janet James, Clarke Chambers, and myself—had done primary source research on women in the archives. Janet James, with her husband Ed James and Paul Boyer, was then still editing the three-volume *Notable American Women*, the first modern reference work on the subject. We all knew that one of the difficulties for researchers on women was the fact that archives and libraries did not catalogue their material on women in a coherent way. Women's diaries, letters, and writings were lost in family correspondences catalogued under male family members' names. The records of women's organizations were not systematically collected or identified. The work and activities of women were often hidden in organizational records, government files, and church records. As long as there were no finders' guides or indices indicating that these records pertained to women, researchers could only find them by serendipity. It was a common experience to go into an archive, ask the archivist what they had on women, and be handed one or two items, when in fact the archive contained hundreds of items by or about women. The five of us decided that we needed to do a survey of archives and of their holdings about women. What was needed was a reference work, a sort of union catalogue. Clarke Chambers offered his state, Minnesota, as a testing ground and recommended that we bring in Andrea Hinding, curator of the Social Welfare History Archives, to take on the project. With the help of Dorothy Ross, who at that time chaired the AHA women's committee, we secured the cooperation of both the AHA and OAH in drafting a grant proposal for such a project. We also organized a workshop for historians and archivists at the 1972 OAH meeting, which enthusiastically supported the project.

Meanwhile, in the fall of 1971 I had been invited by historian Peter Wood, then an officer of the Rockefeller Foundation, to consult with him about how to advance work in Women's History and Women's Studies. I recommended the convening of a small planning conference to designate priorities in the development of Women's History. As a direct result of this conference at the Rockefeller Foundation, held April 8, 1972, we

were able to secure grant support for the test run of the Women's History Sources Survey, which afterward was funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities and the University of Minnesota. The final project, which took four years to complete and surveyed all the states, resulted in a work of two volumes: Andrea Hinding (ed.), *Women's History Sources: A Guide to Archives and Manuscript Collections in the United States* (New York: R. R. Bowker, 1979).

Of all the projects I have ever been involved in, this, I think, was the most effective and important. Not only did we show that there were vast, and mostly unused, primary sources available virtually in every major community in the United States, but we made these sources easily accessible. The informal networks of Women's History scholars, which were then being established, helped greatly to spread the effect of this work to the broader community. Further, in the process of conducting the survey, most archives and libraries decided to reclassify their items on women in such a way that they could be easily identified. The National Archives led the way by creating a finders' guide to its Women's History materials, and other major collections soon followed. Thus, the Women's History Sources Survey project transformed the way archives were cataloguing their holdings on women and greatly aided scholarship on this subject.

The production of monographs, essays, collections, documents, and books in women's history was greatly aided by this archival project. In 1960, one could find thirteen books in print in Women's History. In 1978 I published a *Bibliography in the History of American Women*, which listed 291 titles.[5] There were then hundreds of dissertations in the field still in progress. By the year 2000 scholarship in Women's History had grown large enough to be listed separately in the annual bibliographical survey of the *Journal of American History*. In the three years 1998–2000 the survey listed 720 items of scholarship on the subject. These consisted of 150 books, 280 dissertations, and 290 articles.[6] The growth trend has continued since. Its quality is attested by the ever-increasing numbers of books on women winning top literary and historical awards.

The professional organizations of women historians contributed to this development from 1970 on. We began by publishing lists of "Research in Progress in Women's History," and we systematically distributed course syllabi and bibliographies in Women's History to all interested. Beginning in 1972 the women's committees and CCWHP agitated for the commissioning of a pamphlet on Women's History, to be sponsored by the AHA in

its series of teaching pamphlets. Typically, the editor of the series refused us, with the information that such a pamphlet was not high on the AHA's priority list. When we persisted, he changed his mind. I was asked to write this pamphlet, which, when it was finally printed, turned out to be the best-selling pamphlet in the series for many years. The fact that women's history questions now appear on SAT tests in many states is the result of organizational effort by women and pressure by educators. Textbooks at all levels have begun to reflect the growth and impact of this intellectual transformation, which is at last bringing the history of the majority into the mainstream.

Networking and the sharing of work in progress was another way in which we helped to build the field. In the fall of 1969, Patricia Graham (Columbia University,) Annette Baxter (Barnard College), and I organized New York Metropolitan Area Women Historians, which soon affiliated with the national CCWHP. By December 1970 the national organization had three affiliates: the New York City group, the West Coast Association of Women Historians, and the Committee on the Status of Women of the Southern Historical Association. Today, with seventeen CCWHP affiliates, it is probably hard to realize how triumphant we felt then at our swift growth. The New York City group quickly organized a campaign, securing 600 signatures on a petition in support of the demands made by CCWHP on the professional organizations: 1) support for the office of a special assistant on the rights of women in the AHA; 2) urging history departments to increase the number of women graduate students; and 3) affirmative action in the hiring of women faculty and the setting up of timetables to effect equal ratios of men and women in departments.

It took several years longer before we could persuade Columbia University to make room among its 232 faculty seminars, which were organized by fields of historical scholarship, for *one* seminar dealing with women. Pat Graham, Marcia Wright, Annette Baxter, and I cooperated on this project. When, at last, the seminar "Women and Society" was established, it quickly became one of the most popular and best-attended seminars of all. Similar work was, of course, being done all over the country by women historians trying to promote the new field.

When I graduated from Columbia in 1966 my specialty, Women's History, did not really exist. I was advised to hide my interest in this "exotic subject" and to market myself as a good social historian. I did not take

that well-meant advice, but I was aware of the fact that my special interest was a professional liability. We have come a long way since then. We have disproven the skeptics, persisting in the face of disparagement, ridicule, and tenacious resistance to change. CCWHP and the women's committees staffed in succeeding years by new and enthusiastic advocates of women and Women's History deserve a large part of the credit for the advances the field has made.

As for myself, looking back on sixty years of organizational work, mostly for lost causes, the past thirty years tell a story of spectacular, and often unexpected, success. The quest for restoring the interpreted past of half of the world's population has been richly rewarding, exhilarating, and energizing. We have proven, over and over again, that women make history and have always made history. In so doing, we have had to challenge the exclusionary and outdated patriarchal structures of academic institutions. Life and thought have merged; transforming knowledge has led us to transform institutions.

Notes

1. Patricia Albjerg Graham, "Revisiting the Rose Report," presented at the Women's Committee Breakfast Meeting, December 29, 1986, reprinted in *CCWHP Newsletter* 18, no. 1 (February 1987): 7–10.

2. Robert B. Townsend, "Federal Faculty Survey Shows Gains of History Employment but Lagging Salaries," in *Perspectives, News Magazine of the American Historical Association* 44, no. 3 (March 2006): 8.

3. *CCWHP Newsletter* 1 (Summer 1970): 6.

4. Accurate accounts of graduate training in Women's History are elusive. The figure mentioned was derived from a hand count of programs listed in Karen Kidd and Ande Spencer (eds.), *Guide to Graduate Work in Women's Studies*, 2nd ed. (College Park, Md.: National Women's Studies Association, 1994). It is likely the figure somewhat understates the number of such institutions.

5. Gerda Lerner, *Bibliography in the History of American Women* (A Sarah Lawrence College Women's Studies Publication, 3rd revised printing, 1978). In a fourth revised printing, there were 1,358 items listed. Gerda Lerner, with the assistance of Marie Laberge, *Woman Are History: A Bibliography in the History of American Women* (A Publication of the Graduate Program in Women's History, Department of History, University of Wisconsin–Madison, 1986).

6. Gerda Lerner, "U.S. Women's History: Past, Present, and Future," *Journal of Women's History* 16, no. 4 (2004): 10–27.