

**Annual Report of the Editor of *Central European History* (CEH)
Andrew I. Port
Professor, Department of History
Wayne State University
Saturday, January 6, 2018**

**Central European History Society (CEHS)
131st Annual Meeting of the
American Historical Society
Washington, DC, January 4-7, 2018**

The Annual Report provides a Summary of the Operations of the journal for the calendar year 2017. It consists of four main sections dealing with the following themes:

- I. production flow and relations with Cambridge University Press (CUP);**
- II. relations between *CEH* and the CEHS board;**
- III. statistical tables: manuscript submissions and published articles;**
- IV. Vol. 50: comments and highlights, future issues;**
- V. concluding remarks.**

Members of CEHS with any questions about circulation, sales, marketing, online access, etc. should consult the Publisher's Report supplied by CUP, and feel free to contact me or CUP liaison Hal Moore (hmoore@cambridge.org).

Summary of Operations

I. Production flow and relations with Cambridge University Press

Contract: Calendar year 2017, Volume 50, was the first year of the third (belatedly drawn-up and signed) five-year contract governing the publishing relationship between the Central European History Society and Cambridge University Press to produce *Central European History*.

Publication Schedule and Flow: ALL four issues of Vol. 49 appeared **on schedule** in March, June, September, and December 2017.

Book reviews: **Julia Torrie** continues to do a superb job as Book Review Editor. She nevertheless continues to experience difficulties created by reviewers who do not submit their reviews on time – or at all. As previously reported to the Board, we jointly decided last year to reduce the number of reviews per issue, but now allow reviewers to submit lengthier reviews of 1000-1250 words (the previous limit was 750-1000 words). It should be emphasized that under Julia's tenure, there has been a significant increase in the number of review essays and featured reviews; she also organized two major review fora for Vol. 50 (see Part IV of this report). In the March 2018 issue commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of *CEH* (also see Part IV), Julia will publish an overview that looks at the development of book reviews, including the challenges they sometimes pose, since

first introduced by *CEH* in 1991.

As the members of the Board know, production issues related above all to **copy editing** have been a consistent challenge and major bone of contention since I took over as Editor of *CEH* in 2014. Poor communication and inadequate customer service on the part of CUP have remained serious problems as well, but ones with a long history that predates my tenure as Editor.

In addition, as Jim Brophy rightly noted in an email from May 1, 2017, there have been “various forms of recriminations” among some members of the CEHS Board. Because some members of the current Board have only recently joined and thus were not privy to earlier developments, because the minutes of CEHS meetings tend to be bare bones, and because some members have chosen to make accusations and insinuations behind proverbial closed doors, often in emails sent only to certain members or “zwischen Tür und Angel” at various conferences (a subject to which I return), I think it makes sense to provide a systematic overview of what has transpired over the past three years.*

In this report, I begin by once again addressing the issue of copy editing, something I have done on numerous occasions in writing and at our meetings. I also address in detail some of the misleading claims that Hal Moore, our contact at CUP, made in an email sent to two Board members in late April 2017. Finally, I describe continuing problems related to subscriptions, poor communication, and other “customer-care” issues at CUP, while setting forth a number of the more divisive topics that have caused acrimony on the CEHS Board.

Providing a sense of what has transpired over the past three years is important for a number of reasons: to help clear up and prevent further difficulties related to copy editing and other production issues, especially as CEHS embarks on the search for a new Editor; and to allow CEHS to assess its present and future publishing relationship with CUP, as well as with present and future Editors of *CEH*.

These issues and claims deserve to be put down on paper for posterity, I believe – not least in the hope that such disputes can be dealt with in a less disingenuous manner in the future. This is important, I think, if CEHS wishes to attract strong candidates for the position of Editor and, just as important, promote greater collegiality.

a) copy editing

i) background

When I was recruited four years ago to serve as Editor, I made my acceptance of the position dependent on several conditions. Besides support for a course release from my university, as well as travel money to conferences that I am required to attend in my capacity as Editor, I insisted above all on assurances that CUP would provide me with a copy editor who would not only enforce house style and Chicago of Manual Style, but also make edits or editorial suggestions with regard to writing style and organization (e.g., clear transitions between sentences and paragraphs, the editing of “clunky” writing, etc.).

* I first presented the following comments in a report distributed to the CEHS Board prior to at a special meeting that it held at the annual meeting of the German Studies Association in Atlanta in the fall of 2017. I have made only slight modifications. The only feedback that I received about the report at that meeting came from Atina Grossmann, who pointed out that her name had been misspelled; that has been corrected.

I made it very clear that I could not, in good conscience, put my name as Editor on a journal that published articles that were poorly written and hence unclear. My main concern as Editor was and remains strength of content *and* clarity of exposition. Helmut Smith, the head of the committee charged with finding a new editor, as well as the CUP representatives with whom I met in New York in the spring of 2014, all assured me that that would not be a problem and that a competent copy editor would be assigned to *CEH*.

It is worth noting in this context the arrangement that my predecessor, Ken Ledford, had through CUP and his university. In addition to providing him with an annual course release, Case Western Reserve paid an annual salary of \$26,000 to an Assistant Editor in charge of copy editing, whose other duty appears to have been “internal financial accounting.” As I understand it, Ken received other financial support from his university as well, including \$6,000 annually for traveling and other *CEH*-related expenses (e.g., supplies, computer, etc.), in addition to an annual stipend from CUP of approximately \$2,500.

By contrast, I receive an annual course release (for which CEHS pays 20 percent; my university covers the rest); CEHS pays for my annual travel and lodging to two conferences (the GSA and AHA; my university pays for my meals); and CUP currently pays me an annual stipend of \$4,000 for “developmental editing.” In the absence of an Assistant Editor, CUP has also agreed to pay up to \$8,500 annually for copy editing.

ii) turnover of copy editors

Since taking over as Editor, I have worked with five copy editors. That is a clearly a significant turnover, especially in such a relatively short amount of time, so it deserves some explanation:

The **first copy editor** assigned by CUP did an extremely poor job, failing to correct even the most basic grammatical errors (such as noun-verb agreement). When I pointed out these basic errors to Pat McGinty, *CEH*'s new contact at CUP at the time (i.e., Mark Zadrozny's successor), he agreed that this person needed to be replaced immediately. We further agreed that CUP would advertise the position and that candidates would be given sample excerpts to copy edit. It was upon this basis that we chose a new copy editor.

The **second copy editor** did a very good job, but quit *of her own volition* after several months. She wrote CUP on several occasions, asking for a pay raise given the amount of time and effort she was putting into the copy-editing process (for *CEH* and another CUP journal), but confided to me that she had received no response to her emails. At that point, she sent a letter to CUP on April 8, 2015, in which she stated the following: “I’m writing to inform you that I am unable to continue working on these projects. Constraints on both my finances and my time have made it impossible for me to accept additional assignments on either title going forward. Please know that I am grateful to have had the opportunity to work with CUP’s talented staff and dedicated editors-in-chief.”

CUP advertised the position again and hired a **third copy editor**, who submitted a very strong sample of his copy-editing skills. Soon after being hired, however, he informed me via email that he could not put as much effort into *actual* copy editing for the journal – unless CUP raised his salary, which, at the time, was \$5 per page. He requested \$8 and I was able to persuade CUP to pay him \$6.50 per 250 words. This copy editor did an adequate job, but had extremely poor “people skills”: a recent PhD in History, many of his editorial comments were rather brusque, bordering on impolite, which understandably angered a number of our authors (see below) – eventually forcing me to edit

his edits before I could send them out. This was an unnecessary drain on my time and energy, so I decided, after consulting with Pat McGinty, to let him go.

At this point I decided to take over the copy-editing duties myself. But, on October 6, 2015, Geoff Eley, the acting president of CEHS, sent an email on behalf of the Board in which I was strongly encouraged to work with CUP to find another copy editor – and I wholeheartedly agreed. Sue Marchand suggested one of her friends for the position: someone with whom she had worked in the past, and who was, in her opinion, an extremely talented and experienced copy editor. I contacted this person, who agreed (reluctantly) if CUP and CEHS were willing to pay her an hourly wage of \$60. After some negotiation, CUP (reluctantly) agreed to do so, while expressing its concern about the amount she requested.

The **fourth copy editor** was indeed extremely talented – but also extremely tardy, not easy to work with (based on my own experience, as well as on feedback from authors), and extremely expensive (CUP's predictions on this score turned out to be entirely correct). Up to this point, *CEH* had once again been publishing on time (in the past, *CEH* has been up to two years behind schedule), but for the first time under my Editorship, it was unable to publish in the calendar month as a result of the new copy editor's work habits. She received the manuscripts for the September 2016 on schedule in June – but did not complete them until November (sic)! As a result, I decided, after consulting with CEHS and CUP, to publish a double issue that December. Again, because of the new copy editor's tardiness, it did not appear until January. To make matters worse, she charged almost \$16,000 for this issue – almost double the entire *annual* budget for copy editing. One important reason for the exorbitant bill was her practice of charging us at the hourly rate of \$60 for time spent responding to emails.

Secretary Treasurer Ben Marschke, then CEHS president David Luebke, and Hal Moore, who had replaced Pat McGinty at CUP several months earlier (Pat left for another publishing house), met with me during the AHA annual conference in January 2017. For the reasons I outline above, we jointly decided that we had to part ways with this copy editor and find another, and the CEHS Board agreed with that assessment at the annual meeting later that day.

At the breakfast meeting with Ben, David, and Hal, I said that, in the future, I would carefully pre-edit the manuscripts for style and content so that the new copy editor would only have to enforce house rules and Chicago Manual of Style. In short, I had come to realize that I needed to scale back my expectations about what a copy editor supplied by CUP could or would do, *despite* the assurances given to me when I agreed to become Editor. But because such pre-editing would involve a great deal of my time, I requested that I be fairly compensated for my efforts. Hal promised to speak with his superiors about this and get back to us.

CUP subsequently assigned *CEH* a **fifth copy editor**, who was supposedly highly qualified and experienced. Given the agreement reached at the breakfast in January, I carefully pre-edited in good faith – i.e., without charge and without knowing how much of an annual increase I could expect for this additional work – the manuscripts for content, as well as for style and clarity. This meant that the new copy editor merely had to enforce house style. There were few problems with the copy editing this time as a result – there was little for the copy editor to do, after all – and the March 2017 issue consequently appeared on schedule.

iii) request for remuneration for “pre-editing”

In the meantime, after repeated prods from Ben Marschke, Hal finally wrote on February 13, 2017, that CUP would increase my annual payment from \$3,000 to \$4,000 in the new contract – which, it is worth noting, *CEH* received more than a year after it had initially been promised (in fact, by the time we received the new contract, the old one had already long expired). Three days later, Hal wrote to us that Julia Chang, *CEH*'s superb production editor, would be leaving for another publishing house – just as Pat McGinty had done the year before. At this point, I wrote to Hal and Ben expressing my anger and disappointment about the paltry increase – it is worth bearing in mind that Ken Ledford's assistant received \$26,000 annually, essentially for copy editing and other editorial tasks that I perform alone – as well as about the departure of Julia Chang, the only person at CUP who, besides Pat McGinty, had been, in my experience, consistently professional and supportive of the journal. I made it clear that I would do all I could to persuade CEHS not to renew *CEH*'s contract with CUP after the new one expired. This was related as well to other recurring difficulties with CUP, to which I will return below.

In a March 7 email, Hal rejected Ben's counter-suggestion that I be paid \$6,000, offering the following explanation: “Frankly, I had a tricky enough time convincing my bosses that we should increase the editorial payment at all given Andrew's part in the problems with volume 49 3 and 4 (which ended up as a rather thin double issue, by Andrew's own admission, and late).[†] They were also not happy to hear that we have needed to appoint yet another new copyeditor for this year's volume. As you saw, on 19 February, three minutes after you wrote to me saying you hoped to have our business wrapped up within a week, Andrew wrote to me, apparently so insulted by a 33% increase in his stipend that he has vowed to oppose Cambridge as a publishing partner during the next renewal, in whatever capacity. So I don't really think \$6,000 is going to cut it. I am chiefly concerned with our relationship – we'd like to put that extra \$2,000 toward a reception celebrating our partnership, the journal, and society membership at the GSA this year.”

Hal and his colleagues apparently believe that a reception “celebrating our partnership” is more important than remunerating me adequately for my work on the journal – but suggested that CEHS make up the difference, if it wanted to do so. Ben Marschke wrote to me that he did not think the current president would go along with that suggestion so the idea was quietly dropped.

It was at this point that I decided to cease all pre-editing (apart from questions of content and substance) and pass along to the copy editor (via our new production editor) the final manuscripts I had received from the authors for the next issue (June 2017), as CUP and some members of CEHS had strongly encouraged me to do. The copy editor did an extremely poor job this time: apart from failing to edit unclear language and style, she even failed to enforce consistently house and CMS style in the footnotes. As a result, I was required to spend hours and hours carefully copy editing all the manuscripts again.

[†] Hal's comment is extremely disingenuous. He neglects to explain *why* the issue was “late” (see the previous page) or why it was “thin”: as he was well aware – because he was consulted on this via email – one author did not submit her finished article despite repeated requests, and we could not run another planned article because serious errors in the author's statistical tables had been discovered (late in the game) by the copy editor – errors the outside readers had not caught. As a result, we could only publish four of the six planned articles. What “part,” then, did I play in the “problems” to which he alludes?

iv) Hal Moore's Email of April 27

At this point, I decided that I would again take over all copy-editing duties, and informed CEHS and CUP of my decision. On April 27, Hal wrote to me and Ben Marschke, explaining that they were “conducting a review” of that issue and would “be in touch with more detail shortly.” I never heard back from him on this. Instead, he sent the following email later that day to Ben and Atina Grossmann, the current president of CEHS:

“Copyediting has been a problem since Andrew took over as editor, and I’m sure you’re not surprised to be hearing about this again now, as Andrew told us he informed the board on Monday that he would once again be taking over the copyediting of the journal himself. I believe Sue Marchand spoke not only for herself when she wrote to Andrew (copying also David Luebke and Julia Chang, the former Production Editor) on 27 January: “*I remain concerned that you take too much on yourself, and are trying to serve as both developmental editor and copy editor, but I am hoping that you will adopt the new process put in place and work smoothly with the new copyeditor CUP is going to assign to CEH.*” Clearly, Sue’s hope was in vain, and we at Cambridge remain seriously concerned.”

Sue Marchand, a member of the *CEH* Board of Editors at the time, did indeed express her concerns to me, but it is important to put Sue’s email in context. As I noted earlier, it was Sue who had kindly recommended our fourth copy editor. When I wrote that copy editor to let her know that I and CEHS had decided to part ways with her, making it clear (to avoid any hard feelings) that she was simply too expensive for us – I did not mention her many delays – she did not acknowledge my email but instead wrote directly to Sue to complain. Based solely on what she had heard from her old acquaintance, and making it clear that she was not interested in hearing my version of events, Sue expressed her concerns to me – and to CEHS and CUP – about my “interference” in the copy-editing process.

Hal’s letter continues: “We did assign a very experienced copyeditor, Kim Shigo, with whom our Production department has an excellent relationship. When Julia left Cambridge at the end of February, her manager Kelly Loftus filled in, and the production of 50(1) was by all accounts relatively smooth, Andrew having only minor quibbles with Kim’s copyediting. Yet now he has effectively fired her in the middle of the production of 50(2), and she becomes the *fifth* copyeditor to have come and gone since he began his term as editor (and he is now on his second stint as copyeditor himself). I’m sure he has told you (as he repeatedly tells me and my colleagues) that this is evidence of our inadequacy as a publisher. What I say to you plainly is: no, this is evidence of his inability to strictly perform his responsibilities as editor.”

I have already explained why I decided to part ways with this copy editor in the middle of 50/2, so allow me to add the following: Hal notes, correctly, that Kim was our fifth copy editor. But he does not mention the reasons – and, to this day, has never asked me to explain, as I do above – *why* we have had so many. Since he stresses the word *fifth*, it should be noted that, since I’ve taken over as Editor, we have had *four* production editors, *three* publishers (Pat McGinty, Mark Zadrozny, and Hal Moore), *three* marketing editors, and *two* ScholarOne contacts.

With regard to my “responsibilities as Editor,” Hal continues: “Chief among these (per the CEHS’ last call for an editor, in 2012) are: ‘soliciting manuscripts in all fields of the history of German-speaking Central Europe, shepherding submitted manuscripts through the peer review and editorial processes, [and] working with the journal’s print and electronic publisher, Cambridge University Press.’ Our review of 50(2) raises fresh doubts about all three.

Production has been surprised by the quality of manuscripts received recently – they require far more work than a standard copyedit, so in one way, I do understand Andrew's frustration when he spends many hours on a manuscript and doesn't feel compensated for that work. (Now that he has declared himself copyeditor again, he will be paid a standard rate of \$6.50/page, separately from his \$4,000 annual payment for developmental editing). But the crucial point is: a lot of this work should be done by the author, possibly in conjunction with their university's writing center (if English is not their first language), but certainly before (or as a precondition for) acceptance."

Hal does not offer any evidence for his assertions about "the quality of manuscripts received recently" (I am not sure how he could judge that), or for his claim that they "require far more work than a standard copyedit." As Editor, I can say with great confidence that the quality of the manuscripts has remained at the same level – some are strong, some are less strong. The only thing that changed for *CEH 50/2* was my decision to pass along the manuscripts *without stylistic pre-editing*. The fact that Hal and his team noticed a change in the "quality" of the manuscripts should give some sense of the work I put into the manuscripts *before* they reach the copy editor.

He writes further that "a lot of this work should be done by the author" and suggests, incredulously, that non-native speakers should take their work to "university writing centers." Given the fact that we publish many articles by scholars based in foreign countries where English is not the spoken language does he seriously believe that a "university writing center" (!) could be of much help? He continues:

"Instead, we currently have a complete breakdown of the editorial process, wherein Andrew is rewriting large portions of text after copyediting, and making substantial corrections right up until the issue prints, which is causing considerable strain on my Production colleagues and the workflow they've attempted to establish. By extension, we are concerned about the general quality of submissions that are coming in, and what level of screening they are receiving once they do, if these papers are being accepted in such a state, without first requiring a lot more work from the authors. Also, copyeditors are specifically trained *not* to rewrite, but to help authors find their own voices. A journal editor should provide vision without insisting on controlling voice as well."

All of this was news to me: of the three production editors with whom I have worked, not one has complained to me about "considerable strain" caused by my corrections. Hal repeats his earlier, unsubstantiated point about the supposed decline in the "general quality of submissions" and the "level of screening," and then offers guidelines for what, in his opinion, a copy editor is supposed to do. When I visited the CUP office in the spring of 2014, I was presented with a copy of Sally Morris et al.'s *The Handbook of Journal Publishing*, which CUP publishes, and I suggest that Hal carefully read the following sections on pp. 94-96:

"Some publishers no longer have journal articles edited in detail to improve the clarity of the authors' expression... However, there has been a marked increase in the number of papers coming from countries where English is not the first language...; for these, language editing is increasingly necessary and can be very time-consuming. Indeed, some publishers offer this as a service for which authors or their institutions pay. This type of editing is often carried out by freelance editors.... It requires a degree of subject expertise as well as an excellent grasp of clear English.

Even when detailed language editing is no longer carried out, however, most publishers still have articles copy-edited (again, often by freelancers) to ensure consistency with house style... Although authors are increasingly expected to prepare the electronic script which will be used for composition, it is unlikely that they will have read the publisher's 'Instructions for Contributors'/'Instructions to Authors,' however carefully drafted! ...

Every author has his or her own distinctive style of writing, and the aim should never be to remove this and reduce every article to an identical, bland style. Clarity and comprehensibility are the aims, rather than literary elegance. The Copy-Editor needs to consider the article from the point of view of the reader: will the reader... understand immediately and unambiguously what the author is trying to convey? Words may need to be substituted, or sentences (or even whole paragraphs or sections) reordered, to ensure understanding..."

Hal continues in his email: "With regard to the most problematic paper for 50(2), Coché (attached with Kim's suggestions, author responses, and Andrew's edits), Kayla instructed Kim to be relatively heavy-handed with her edit, but when Kim attempted this, the author refused most of her suggestions. Andrew then largely rewrote the introduction, and I'm sure the author *was* grateful, because she received valuable services, for free, from an expert in the field (Andrew has frequently defended himself by making reference to authors' gratitude), but the fact remains that a journal cannot operate this way. Andrew also raises a variety of questions that require specialist knowledge of the field, which no standard copyeditor could be expected to have, and, again, perhaps these author answers should have been required as part of the developmental edit before acceptance."

This is at variance with Cambridge UP's own *Handbook of Journal Publishing*, which states: "Authors do not always get the facts right, and reviewers do not always spot all their mistakes; that is why a Copy-Editor needs knowledge of the journal's field. He or she needs to have a nose for facts that may be wrong, and to be familiar with the sources in which they can be checked" (96). In fact, I have never expected a copy editor to make suggestions of a substantive nature regarding content – that is something I do myself, and consider it to be part of my job, so I am not sure what Hal means here. But he does clearly suggest that I am wrong to offer "valuable services, for free, from an expert in the field" and that I have "frequently defended" myself by "making reference to authors' gratitude" – "but the fact remains that a journal cannot operate this way."

Why can a journal not operate in this way? Is it not an editor's duty to provide substantive feedback, as a specialist in the field? With regard to Hal's point about gratitude: yes, I am proud of the fact that the authors of more than half of all the articles that have appeared in *CEH* during my tenure as Editor have thanked me by name in their acknowledgements for my editorial feedback (see **Appendum**, which includes a statement by Stefanie Coché, who had just given birth). I would think that CUP would welcome editorial activities aimed at making their journals as strong as possible. That Hal seems to suggest otherwise is something I find highly surprising and problematic.

He continues: "Andrew has also complained several times about endnotes for 50(2) – this is largely the responsibility of the author, and ideally, a research assistant. A copyeditor checks that the references are there, that they're formatted according to journal style, and if any links are provided, makes sure they go to live webpages. But it is not part of their remit to research individual sources, or suggest alternate sources, or these other specific questions that Andrew knows to ask because he is so familiar with the scholarship. A copyeditor is there to clean things up – again, more should be required from the author."

Once again, it is unclear what Hal means here. No one has asked any copy editors to research or make suggestions regarding sources. The problem with *CEH* 50/2 was that the copy editor failed to "clean things up" because she failed to enforce CMS format consistently. That was the main reason why I decided to let her go: her failure to do the very minimum of enforcing house/CMS style.

"In the immediate term, this means that costs are once again on the rise, as we have already paid Kim for her work on 50(2), and will now have to pay Andrew for the same work." This is simply

untrue: even though I had to copy edit all of the articles *again*, I only asked for payment for the one by Coché because the copy editor's failures there were most egregious.

Hal then concludes his email by noting that I “will copyedit the reviews for 50(2), and presumably will continue as copyeditor for 50(3). If you want us to appoint another copyeditor, we'll require a representative from the society to participate in the review process and set expectations properly. But in the longer term, although of course it is your decision, we urge you to consider seeking a new editor for the term beginning 1 July 2019. Naturally, I am happy to discuss any aspect of the above with you both in greater detail, and Atina – as I live and work in Manhattan, I'd also be happy to sit down for coffee and discuss this in person, if that would be helpful.”

Instead of responding directly to Hal's brazen suggestion that CEHS not renew my term as Editor (I should note that I had already informed several members of the Board that I had no intention of seeking a second term, given the continuing difficulty of working with CUP and the steady loss of its best personnel), let me quote from an email that his predecessor, Pat McGinty, sent to CEHS on December 28, 2015, when he informed us that he was leaving CUP for another publishing house:

“The journal has performed remarkably this year. For the first time in recent memory it's publishing on time. This may seem like a minor point, but as a publisher I know how difficult it is not only to keep a journal on time, but to recover from 2+ months of delays. The new cover is beautiful and has been remarked upon favorably by many attendees at this year's GSA. The journal's copyediting has improved substantially, due in large part to Andrew's own proofing and QA, and I really believe that the overall quality is more consistent with an edited book than a journal. The new German abstracts have been a wonderfully inclusive feature... and I could go on, but if you hold up 2014 and 2015's volumes the differences are truly striking, from the format through to the writing. I am so proud to have worked on CEH this past year. I wish more journals could achieve anywhere close to the level of excellence set by CEH this year - but of course they can't, because Andrew doesn't work for them; he works for CEH. The aforementioned achievements owe entirely to him.”

The issue of copy editing has now been resolved, at least for the remainder of my tenure as Editor, but will no doubt arise for my successor. I will serve as copy editor through the June 2019 issue, and I will continue to make edits of a substantive and stylistic nature in accordance with house rules and CMS. I would like to stress a final point on the issue of copy editing: I have always made clear, and will continue to make clear, that the editorial suggestions I make are exactly that – suggestions that the authors are free to accept or reject (except for ones related to house/CMS style). After all, as I always tell authors, it is *their* name that appears on the article.

b) Relations with CUP: subscriptions, notifications, poor communication

I turn now to various other difficulties that I – and many members of CEHS, including Board members – have had with CUP:

*the difficulty of renewing subscriptions via the website;

*various problems with existing subscriptions (e.g., issues not arriving on time or at all, subscribers being charged in a different currency and thus at a higher rate);

*CUP's failure to send out notifications when a new issue of *CEH* appears;

*CUP's failure to send out notices to subscribers informing them that their subscription is about to expire or has expired;

*CUP's inconsistent marketing of the journal;

*CUP's failure to distribute payments for services rendered (e.g., copy editing, translation work) in a timely manner, resulting in repeated email inquiries about outstanding payments.

Over the past three years, I have received or read emails from some longtime readers of *CEH* expressing frustration about these recurring difficulties; these include ones from Charles Maier, Jonathan Sperber (repeatedly), Nancy Wingfield, Ken Ledford, Geoff Eley, and many others who have told me that they have thrown their hands up in desperation because of the difficulty of navigating the website, subscribing to the journal, and dealing with CUP representatives. Ken Ledford and Jim Brophy inform me that these are long-standing problems that predate my tenure as Editor.

A frequent complaint I hear as well is that CUP representatives do not respond to email inquiries about subscription-related difficulties; as I note earlier, the failure of CUP to respond to emails in a timely fashion – or at all – is one reason our second copy editor resigned in 2015.

Two years ago, I sent a series of emails asking for help with these issues to Mark Zadrozny (*CEH*'s contact person at CUP under Ken Ledford and our interim contact person once again following Pat McGinty's resignation), to Marianne Headrick, who is in charge of customer affairs, and to several other people at CUP. My emails were largely ignored, and, more important, the problems continued unabated. I thought that there would be a change when I received the following email on May 4, 2016, from Hal Moore: "Although I only began work at CUP on Monday, on behalf of my colleagues, I must sincerely apologize for the poor & delayed communications of the past few weeks. I want to give you my personal assurance that I do not accept such standards with regard to my journals. Please let me know if I can be of assistance."

Since then, Hal has become increasingly slow to respond in a timely fashion – if at all – to emails from me and also from Ben Marschke. The same is true of the various marketing people we've been assigned. This, along with the lackadaisical approach to individual subscriptions, makes one wonder just how dedicated CUP is to the success of the journal.

To cite just the latest example: I asked CUP to publicize an important forum on the *Historikerstreit* and the Goldhagen debate that just appeared in *CEH* 50/3. Our newest contact in their marketing division, Marcus Hinds, kindly requested that I send him a blog about the forum for the Cambridge Core website, and that he be notified when the forum appears; I was also assured that there would be free online access to the forum for a limited time. Hinds received the blog from me on Sept. 7, 2017, and he received notice from his colleagues at CUP that the issue went live on Sept. 28. That same day, Hinds wrote to me and his colleagues that he would "get cracking on the publicity of *CEH* 50/3 as pointed out previously via the activities" (including announcements on social media); in another email later that day, he wrote, "Awesome! Will act on this momentarily." Six days have gone by and the blog has not appeared, there have been no announcements on social media, and there is still no free online access to the forum.

Previous difficulties had prompted me a month before to write directly to Mandy Hill, CUP's Managing Director of Academic Publishing. She was in New York at the time, met with Mark Zadrozny and Hal Moore that week to discuss some of the issues I'd raised in my email, and sent me the following message on August 11: "I appreciate that there have been a number of issues that have

led you to the point of contacting me and these have been discussed thoroughly internally. The latest issue that you contacted the team over on Sunday was regarding the email alerts. Whilst they had not yet responded to you they are actively working with colleagues on the issues, which I am sorry to say are outside their control, and were trying to get some answers for you. I know that it was the lack of reply that in this instance frustrated you, but that was not an indication of a lack of action. I know that they will be in touch shortly with an update, which I am pleased to say should provide some more promising news." I have still not received the promised "update" with "some more promising news."

In short, I strongly urge CEHS to consider these many problems with CUP, and the extent to which they have been addressed and resolved, when deciding whether to renew the contract when the current one expires.

Update: I sent a copy of the preceding comments to Mandy Hill in early October 2017. Since then, there have been some notable improvements: new issues of *CEH* are now announced by email in a timely manner, and Hal Moore has been more responsive to various email requests. That said, and based on messages that I continue to receive, subscribers and potential subscribers are still having difficulty negotiating the website, above all when it comes to subscribing to the journal. I have also heard that they do not always receive reminders about the need to renew memberships.

II. Relations between *CEH* and the CEHS Board

As I note earlier, CEHS has been plagued over the past three years by various forms of "recrimination" – largely repeated, unsubstantiated, and inflammatory claims that one former and one current CEHS president (Geoff Eley and Atina Grossmann) have made about my work as Editor.

Although the roots of these tensions lie further back than any contact through *CEH* and CEHS, the frictions themselves erupted in a series of email exchanges over issues related to the way in which officers of CEHS are elected and, more seriously, during a heated dispute over Eley's decision to invite a scholar repeatedly accused of plagiarism (by reputable publishing houses and colleagues) to the so-called president's panel at the AHA.

While it is impossible to establish a clear causal connection, Eley made false claims shortly thereafter at the annual conference of the GSA, telling a number of people that I had fired Tara Zahra, one of his former graduate students, from the *CEH* Board of Editors – without once asking me directly if that had been the case. (In fact, it had not, and there was absolutely no basis to this claim, as Zahra subsequently confirmed to me in an email.) I also heard that Eley and Grossmann had told a number of colleagues at the conference that I was "out of control" and that "something had to be done" about my "behavior" and "comportment" as Editor. There was an irregular meeting of the Board at that GSA conference that I missed because of illness, where they seem to have made these and similar criticisms about my work as Editor, claiming, in addition, that I was not open to work on "theory," the "new cultural history," or "gender."

Not once had either Eley or Grossmann raised these issues with me, via email or in any other fashion – though Eley would later claim that he had been hearing such "complaints" for over a year. Instead, he sent emails following the GSA meeting to the members of the *CEH* Board of Editors, as well as to the *CEH* Review Editor – again, I was not copied on any of these – soliciting feedback about my "comportment" as Editor and "any thoughts you might have about the copy editing or for that matter about the journal more broadly." Eley then sent a lengthy email to several members of the CEHS Board on December 15, in which he claimed that "for more than a year I've been the recipient of approaches of various kinds concerning the journal, sometimes in my capacity as President, in other

cases because of my strong links to German historians in the UK. While I've been at a loss to know how on earth to deal with it, there is surely a problem..." Clearly asking me directly about these claims had not occurred to him the entire year.

Eley later writes in the email: "... unfortunately we do have a problem. Andrew's treatment of contributors has not always been appropriate and respectful... it concerns a lack of basic professionalism and the kind of rudeness that can quickly bring damage to the journal's reputation. There seems to be a pattern of gendered disrespect too." He then quotes a statement from an unnamed "full professor, a highly respected senior scholar, whose work we are lucky to be publishing in the journal" who "experienced that kind of treatment and would like us to discuss it..." She allegedly wrote the following to Eley: "I would not, in fact, publish again in the journal as long as he's editing it. The issue was the extraordinarily intrusive and extensive double copy-editing. Although some of the interventions were helpful, the tone was not, and I think that my prose, overall, became muddier as a result. The most serious problem, however, was that Andrew (and the official copy-editor whose name I'm lapsing on) both seem to be theory-hostile and have a tin ear for cultural history. They both wanted explicit textual evidence for every point -- had I followed their suggestions the essay would have been not only muddier, but much thinner and less interesting."

Eley then continues himself: "In other instances, Andrew has made changes to the prose of an author's article without permission, has added citations, and has changed the meaning of sentences into a direction he prefers. I will say that I experienced this myself directly when publishing a piece in the journal last year, in a way that just seemed odd. But in my own case this wasn't egregious so much as gratuitously time-consuming and annoying." Once again, no names are named, no actual evidence is provided, except for his own subjective experience – and here he fails to specify exactly what he allegedly "experienced."

"There's an even more delicate situation arising from some negative reactions against how Andrew has been handling himself in the profession at large. Without going into detail, this has made some of our colleagues in Britain so angry that they will no longer send or solicit material for the journal so long as Andrew remains the Editor. They include some of the UK's most senior Germanists who are centrally placed in the training of graduate students, and that, surely, is a problem." It is worth noting, once again, the absence of any names or actual evidence – though my suspicion is that this has to do with cases of plagiarism involving British colleagues, including the one I allude to earlier in this report. In any event, it is worth noting that *CEH* has, under my tenure, received a record number of submissions from scholars based in the UK. I have also brought on to the Board of Editors scholars from the UK, as well as from Germany, Switzerland, and Australia.

Eley, as well as Grossmann, raised some of these issues again, this time in my presence, at the meeting of the CEHS Board at the AHA conference in early 2016 – and *then again* at the Board meeting a year later in 2017. I responded to these baseless claims on both occasions, yet, they continue to arise – most recently, in an email message that Grossmann sent on February 16, 2017, in which she expressed her "dismay" about the "conspicuous absence/low representation of articles by women in the latest issue of *CEH*" – followed by a comment that she could "only assume from the final product that you had even greater difficulty in attracting high quality submissions from women." It is worth noting Grossmann's highly selective use of "evidence": three of the four articles in the previous issue had been by female authors, and eleven of the twenty-one authors in Volume 48 were female – a point I had already made at the 2016 Board meeting in response to a query about the gender breakdown of article authorship.

In short, there is little evidence that *CEH* has a poor track record on this score – or of a "gendered pattern of disrespect," to use Eley's innuendo – and I am astonished that any careful reader of *CEH*

would have a different impression.[‡] As someone whose own scholarly work has been greatly enriched by the insights of the “new cultural history,” as well as by the work of historians who use gender as a category of analysis, I am puzzled and concerned that such an impression may exist – regardless of whether or not it is well founded. I wish that Eley, Grossmann, or anyone else who had such concerns had contacted me directly.

Following the last Board meeting, I ran into CUP's Hal Moore in the publishers' exhibition hall, where he expressed his surprise about the claims that Grossmann and Eley had made – and explicitly referred to *CEH*'s official Editorial Policy: “All topics and approaches to history are welcome, whether cultural, social, political, diplomatic, intellectual, economic, and military history, as well as historiography and methodology. Contributions that treat new fields, such as post-1945 and post-1989 history, *maturing fields such as gender history*, and less-represented fields such as medieval history and the history of the Habsburg lands are especially desired.” Hal did not say anything to that effect at the meeting; I hope he broached the issue with Grossmann later on – perhaps at the meeting he suggested (in his April 27 email cited earlier) they have over coffee in New York to discuss the “copy editing situation.”

Let me be clear: *CEH* is not only open to but also explicitly encourages *all* approaches and methods and topics related to the history of German-speaking Central Europe. The sole criterion for publication is and will remain *quality*, which is why submissions undergo a rigorous peer-review process.

There is nothing wrong with *constructive* criticism; in fact, I gladly welcome it in the interest of making the journal as strong as possible! Unfortunately, Eley's and Grossmann's criticisms have been petty and personal – and lacking in any evidence. What I find equally disheartening is that, to the best of my knowledge, no one on the CEHS Board has responded in a public manner to these repeated accusations – for example, by calling them to account for spreading the demonstrably false rumor that I had “fired” Tara Zahra from the Board.

Asinus asellum culpat: In this context, and in a desire for greater collegiality all around, it is perhaps worth quoting Eley's characterization of our recently deceased colleague Hans-Ulrich Wehler; this is from his review of a book by Wehler's student, Paul Nolte, which appeared in *CEH* 50/3 (p. 439):

“His approach to debate more generally was calculatedly confrontational, a matter of friend/foe and either/or, meant to drive opponents flatly from the field. This could sometimes be welcome: when defending societal history against the aggressively dogmatic attacks of conventional diplomatic and political historians in the mid-1970s, for instance, or in much of the book-length commentary on the *Historikerstreit* in 1988. But more often the polemics were ugly and destructive: his savaging of Helmut Böhme in 1969, for example, or his disparaging of *Alltagsgeschichte* and the new forms of cultural history in the 1980s. In debate, Wehler was gratuitously abrasive; despite his closeness to Jürgen Habermas, he was no model of communicative reason. Rather than speaking constructively across differences, he preferred their sharp iteration. His main presence among German historians was ultimately divisive in that regard.”

[‡] Karen Hagemann and Donna Harsch will publish a lengthy piece on gender in the March 2018 issue (the commemorative issue marking *CEH*'s fiftieth anniversary), in which they look at gender issues in *CEH* with respect to both article authorship and thematic content.

Addendum: Feedback from *CEH* authors and contributors

I have given a good deal of space above to the baseless claims that Eley, Grossmann, and Moore have made about my work as Editor over the past two to three years. In closing, I would like to take the liberty of offering a sample of the feedback that I have received from actual authors who have published in *CEH* during my tenure as Editor. These are all drawn from their “acknowledgments”:

Stefanie Coché: “Last but not least I would warmly like to thank Andrew I. Port for his immense patience and superb assistance, which helped put the finishing touches on the final version of this article” (*CEH* 50/2, p. 218).

Edward Ross Dickinson: “I would also like to thank the anonymous readers for *CEH*, and particularly the editor Andrew Port for his diligence and acuity in offering constructive criticisms and suggestions regarding both style and content” (*CEH* 49/1, p. 93).

Luminita Gatejel: “A special word of thanks goes to the editor, Andrew I. Port, for guiding me through the publication process” (*CEH* 49/2, p. 162).

Ann Goldberg: “My thanks for the thoughtful comments by... the editor, Andrew Port, who devoted great care in shepherding the manuscript” (*CEH* 48/4, p. 480).

Julia Roos: “My thanks also to the editor, Andrew Port, for his careful and efficient handling of the manuscript” (*CEH* 49/2, p. 240).

Sagi Schaefer: “I thank... Andrew Port for working above and beyond his role as editor to improve this article” (*CEH* 50/4, p. 493).

Martina Steer: “... special thanks is also due to CEH editor-in-chief Andrew I. Port, who turned my manuscript into a more coherent piece of scholarly work. I deeply appreciate his critical insight, stylistic sense, and kindness” (*CEH* 48/2, p. 328).

Heidi Tworek: “I am grateful to the editor of *CEH*, Andrew Port, for his meticulous editing...” (*CEH* 50/3, p. 176).

Here is a sample of anonymized emails that I have received from authors:

“I want to thank you very much for your attentive and gentle editing. Your suggestions are very astute indeed and I have adopted most of them with gratitude... Again, I want to thank you for all your help and even more for the opportunity to write these pages. It has been very gratifying to me” (Feb 15, 2016).

“I would like to thank you again for your wonderful editorial work. I consider myself very lucky to have someone who devoted so much time to the manuscript and to such good effect. I have learned a tremendous amount from my close review of your comments. I have no doubt that your comments have forced me to improve the manuscript. Needless to say, I think that I have adopted the overwhelming majority of your suggestions” (Oct. 26, 2016)

“It occurs to me you may soon be packing your bags to attend the AHA. And so I wonder whether a note of appreciation from me would be useful at all to you when you report on *CEH* to the annual meeting of the CEHS. If so I would be glad to send my thanks for your hard work on my article...”

you should know -- and could document the fact -- that your contributors appreciate your efforts on our behalf (and, of course, on behalf of the society and the guild)" (Jan. 2, 2017).

"I accepted the vast majority of your suggestions, and answered your questions... Thanks again for your thorough and extremely useful editing. I think it looks much better now" (Feb 15, 2017)

"I've just received CEH's latest volume. It looks terrific (as usual), and I'm also very pleased with my article in its final form. Thanks again for everything" (April 7, 2017).

"I'd like to take the opportunity to - once again - thank you for your help. I know this went way beyond anything an editor is supposed to do. Without your help, as a non-native speaker with a little baby by my side, this text would never have come anywhere near a printable form. So, thank you!" (April 24, 2017).

".... the stimulating experience of having the good luck to have had you as an editor" (Aug. 7, 2017).

"Firstly, thank you very much for your extremely meticulous editing of my article which, I know, is a little messy in places. Incidentally, I guess this kind of first-class quality control is one of the main reasons for the journal's reputation." (Oct. 17, 2017).

Finally, an excerpt from a response to Eley's email to the *CEH* Board of Editors:

"New on the journal's board, but not so new as reader of the journal, I also think he is doing a truly amazing job, much more than could have been expected when he took over. As I have heard lately many times from colleagues and students, the overall impression is that the journal already has made huge, and seems to make even more, steps toward gaining the reputation it should have, as the leading one in our field. And this really is to Andrew's credit. I could further comment on praising Andrew's effectiveness as chief editor in dealing with the journal's advisory board, but what eventually counts is the increasing quality of the journal, of course. Not only the journal and the society, but also the entire field of German History in North America can be glad to have him in this role" (Oct. 12, 2015).

III. Statistical tables: manuscript submissions and published articles

Table 1: Publishing Overview

Volume and Number	Articles	Review Articles/ Fora	Book Reviews	Other	Pages
50/1-4 (2017)	14	3	49	8*	599
49/1-4 (2016)	12	2	68	3	534
48/1-4 (2015)	17	4	72	3	606
47/1-4 (2014)	27	0	79	2	900
46/1-4 (2013)	20	1	92	1	952

*featured reviews, memorials, etc.

Table 2: Editorial Summary

	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013
Articles Submitted	63	52	58	61	56
--sent out for peer review	--44 (70%)	--30 (58%)	--18 (31%)	--31	
Articles Accepted	6	13	17	11	11
Articles to be Revised/Resubmitted	7	10	3	7	11
Articles at Referees	19	8	6	6	6
Articles Rejected	24 (38%)	27 (52%)	44 (76%)	31	46
--by Editor	--18 (75%)	--19 (70%)	--40 (91%)		
--after peer review	--6 (25%)	--8 (30%)	--4 (9%)		
Acceptance rate*	20%	21%	28%	26%	19%

*as % of articles submitted *and* accepted/rejected in a given calendar year (i.e., this figure does not include articles that are either being revised/resubmitted or are still out with readers)

Table 3: Impact Factor
*****5-year Impact Factor: 0.243*****

Year	Impact Factor	5-year Impact Factor
2016	0.196	0.324
2015	0.271	0.243
2014	0.326	0.394
2013	0.116	0.240
2012	0.405	0.371

**Table 4: Submissions and Published Articles by Geographic Location
(according to author's institutional affiliation)**

	United States	Germany/ Austria/ Switzerland*	UK/ Canada/ Australia*	Elsewhere	TOTAL
Submissions					
2017	32 (51%)	11 (17%)	9 (14%)	11 (17%)**	63
2016	20 (38%)	6 (12%)	8 (15%)	18 (35%)	52
2015	22 (38%)	2 (3%)	6 (10%)	28 (48%)	58
2014	26	5	9	21	61
2013	28	4	4	20	56
Articles					
2017 (Vol. 50)	5 (36%)	1 (7%)	7 (50%)	1 (7%)	14***
2016 (49)	8 (57%)	2 (14%)	4 (29%)	--	14
2015 (48)	12 (57%)	3 (14%)	4 (19%)	2 (10%)	21
2014 (47)	23	1	0	3	27
2013 (46)	15	1	2	3	20

*beginning in 2016, the German-speaking and non-US English-speaking countries comprise two separate categories; for 2015 and earlier, Australia, Austria, Canada, and Switzerland were included in "elsewhere"

**3 each from France and Poland; 2 from the Czech Republic; 2 from Israel; 1 from South Africa

***does not include the three international fora published in 50/2, 3, and 4, which had 16 participants from the following countries: 8 from the USA, 5 from the UK, 2 from Germany, and 1 from Australia (see Part IV)

Table 5: Submissions and Articles Published by Time Period*

	up to 1750	1751-1870	1871-1918	1919-33	1933-45	1945-pres.
Submissions						
2017	0 (0%)	1 (2%)	13 (22%)	6 (10%)	14 (24%)	24 (41%)
2016	3 (5%)	7 (13%)	12 (22%)	6 (11%)	12 (22%)	15 (27%)
2015	3 (6%)	6 (12%)	13 (24%)	1 (2%)	16 (33%)	17 (35%)
2014	4	3	15	8	12	9
2013	7	4	11	8	9	17
Articles						
2017 (Vol. 50)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)	4 (29%)	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	6 (43%)
2016 (49)	1 (8%)	3 (23%)	3 (23%)	1 (8%)	3 (23%)	2 (15%)
2015 (48)	1 (5%)	2 (10%)	4 (20%)	2 (10%)	5 (26%)	5 (26%)
2014 (47)	9	3	3	1	2	9
2013 (46)	1	3	8	1	6	1

*Off-topic submissions are not included (5 in 2017, 3 in 2016, 9 in 2015, 10 in 2014)

Table 6: Submissions + Articles Published according to Geographic Location of Topic

	"Germany"	Elsewhere*
Submissions		
2017	50	13 --6 on Austria/Habsburg/ Switzerland
2016	47	8 --5 on Austria/Habsburg /Switzerland
2015	40	18 --8 on Austria/Habsburg /Switzerland
2014	48	13
2013	39	17
Articles published		
2017 (Vol. 50)	12	2
2016 (Vol. 49)	15	2
2015 (Vol. 48)	16	2
2014 (Vol. 47)	27	0
2013 (Vol. 46)	15	5

*By way of explanation, see the Editor's Report from 2013.

IV. Comments and Highlights:

CEH* published **fourteen articles, **three** fora, **five** featured reviews, **one** exhibition review, two **memorials**, and **forty-nine** book reviews in Vol. 50 (Table 1).

*In 2017, *CEH* received the **highest number of submissions** since 2011. The journal also has enough articles “in the pipeline” – including three special issues – to fill almost six issues.

*Special **highlights** of Vol. 50 include several “firsts”:

--a **discussion forum** in 50/3 marking the anniversaries of the *Historikerstreit* and Goldhagen “affair,” with contributions by Richard Evans, Mary Fulbrook, Timothy Snyder, Wendy Lower, A. Dirk Moses, Jeffrey Olick, and Gerrit Dworok (kindly suggested by *CEH* Board member Nik Wachsmann);

--a **review forum** in 50/2 on Pieter Judson’s *The Habsburg Empire: A New History*, with contributions by William Bowman, Gary Cohen, Pieter Judson, Michael Yonan, and Tara Zahra (kindly suggested by outgoing CEHS Board member Nancy Wingfield);

-- a **review forum** in 50/4 on Peter Wilson’s *Heart of Europe: A History of the Holy Roman Empire*, with contributions by Jason Coy, Len Scales, Barbara Stollberg-Rilinger, Tom Scott, and Peter Wilson;

--an **exhibition review** in 50/2 by Alexandra Bettag of “Europe in the Renaissance, 1400-1600” (kindly suggested by *CEH* Board member Helmut Puff);

--**color illustrations** accompanied *in print* Marcus Colla’s article on architecture and urban spaces in the GDR (50/2), as well as Adam Blackler’s article on the evolution of Germany’s imperial project in Southwest Africa.

*Each issue continues to include a two-to-three-page **Letter from the Editor**, which outlines the scholarly significance of the articles while placing them in their historiographical context.

*Each issue also includes **abstracts in English and German** for each article. The hope is that this will encourage greater attention to *CEH* by German-speaking scholars and lay audiences. To that end, an announcement about the publication of each new issue, along with the abstracts in both languages, appear on H-German and H-Soz-Kult.

CEH* adopted a **new cover for Vol. 50, another painting that Berlin-based artist Edward Gordon has allowed us to use at no charge.

***Memorials** marked the deaths of **Allan Mitchell** (50/1, by Lawrence Joseph) and **Ernst Nolte** (50/2, by Gerrit Dworok). Memorials have been commissioned for **Georg Iggers**, **Hans Mommsen**, and **Douglas Unfug**.

V. Concluding Remarks:

***Anniversary issue:** *CEH* will be commemorating its **fiftieth anniversary** in March 2018, and will mark the occasions in a number of ways. This includes a memorial for founding *CEH* editor Douglas Unfug, as well as a series of essays on the topic “**Reflections on the Past, Present, and Future of Central European History and Central European Studies: Taking Stock of the Journal and the Field.**” It will include contributions by Celia Applegate, Shelley Baranowski, Doris Bergen, Chad Bryant, Robert Citino, John Deak, Richard J. Evans, Matthew Fitzpatrick, Michael Geyer, Kees Gispens, Will Gray, Karen Hagemann, Donna Harsch, Christina von Hodenberg, Konrad H. Jarausch, Jürgen Kocka, Sandrine Kott, Kenneth Ledford, Charles S. Maier, Michael Meng, Pamela Potter, Helmut Puff, Mark Roseman, James Sheehan, Julia Torrie, Joachim Whaley, and George Williamson.

*Beginning with *CEH* 50/3, the following members of the Board rotated off: Joel Harrington, Mo Healy, Stefan-Ludwig Hoffmann, Sandrine Kott, Sue Marchand, and Jonathan Zatin. I am grateful for their support of the journal. We warmly welcomed four **new Board members:** John Deak (University of Notre Dame), Matthew Fitzpatrick (Flinders University), Karen Hagemann (UNC Chapel Hill), and Anna von der Goltz (Georgetown University).

*As noted in Part II, I have informed the Board of CEHS that I do not wish to continue on as Editor of *CEH* after my current term. CEHS has set up a **search committee** and will no doubt find a suitable successor by the time I edit my last issue in June 2019.

*If anything is unclear in this report, or if there are matters I have failed to address, please do not hesitate to contact me or raise them at the Board meeting. Also, please don't forget to **become a member of CEHS**, which includes an annual subscription to *CEH*, as well as other benefits, and to **encourage your colleagues and graduate students to join as well.**

*Also, please be sure to encourage your colleagues, as well as your students, to **download CEH articles directly from JStor or the CUP site** (especially when used in courses): this has a positive impact on our finances, as well as on the journal's “impact factor” (Table 3).

It is my fervent hope that *CEH* will continue to set the agenda and propose new and innovative directions for the study and historiography of German-speaking Central Europe – to an even greater degree than it already has for the past five decades. That is why all CEHS members are strongly encouraged to send along to me, Julia Torrie, or the other members of the Board of Editors any suggestions for fora or roundtables, thematic issues, review essays, or anything else.

Vorwärts!