

**Annual Report of the Editor of *Central European History*
Andrew I. Port
Department of History
Wayne State University
Saturday, January 9, 2016**

**Central European History Society
130th Annual Meeting of the
American Historical Society
Atlanta, GA January 7-10, 2016**

The Annual Report provides a Summary of the Operations of the journal for the calendar year 2015. It consists of five main sections dealing with the following themes:

- a) production flow and relations with Cambridge University Press;
- b) vol. 48: general comments and highlights;
- c) statistical tables: manuscript submissions and published articles;
- d) new members of the Editorial Board;
- e) concluding remarks.

Summary of Operations

a) Production flow and relations with Cambridge University Press

Contract: Calendar year 2015, Volume 48, was the fifth year of the second five-year contract governing the publishing relationship between the Central European History Society (CEHS) and Cambridge University Press (CUP) to produce *Central European History* (CEH), and the first full year of the term of the current Editor. Per contract, CEH had to let CUP know twelve months in advance (i.e., by Dec. 31, 2014) if it planned on cancelling the contract. In June 2014, the members of the CEHS Board unanimously supported a formal recommendation not to cancel the contract. A new one should be arriving shortly.

Publication Schedule: As of December 31, 2015, all four issues of Volume 48 have appeared **on schedule**. According to Pat McGinty, our (outgoing) principal editorial contact at CUP, this is the “first time in recent memory” that this has been the case.

Book Reviews: Associate Editor **Julia Torrie** continues to do a superb job as Book Review Editor. Breaking with past practice, she edits the reviews herself, and they have continued to appear in a timely manner. Julia warmly welcomes suggestions from the members of the Board for books to review, as well as ideas for review essays. She can be contacted at ceh@stu.ca.

Copy Editing: The timely publication of CEH was especially fortuitous, given some of the production difficulties that CEH experienced this past year with respect to copy editing. One very

competent copy editor quit over a pay dispute with CUP, and her successor was let go because of his uneven work and poor bedside manner. I received complaints from at least four or five authors about the “tone” of his editorial comments; in addition, I had to go over his copy edits to ensure that basic items such as house style were properly enforced. I am happy to say that we have found a **new copy editor**, who has decades of experience at other prominent journals and who came highly recommended by *CEH* Board member **Sue Marchand**. Because of existing commitments, she will begin working in the late winter on Vol. 49 no. 2.

A few words about the **copy editing process**: Because of the uneven quality of the copy editing, I felt compelled to review all of the manuscripts myself (also, in some instances, to try to catch and tone down occasionally brusque comments by the last two copy editors). As a result, there were two sets of edits for each article, and it may thus not have always been clear who – I or the copy editor – had made certain comments or changes. Authors respond in different ways to editorial suggestions and changes: some are extremely happy for the feedback. In fact, the authors of six of the twenty-one articles that appeared in Vol. 48 specifically thanked the editor and/or the editorial staff by name in their published acknowledgements. There were also authors who were less enthusiastic about the feedback they received; this largely had to do with questions of style and syntax, sometimes with respect to argument and content. I consider making such suggestions to be one of my most important duties as editor and will continue to do so in the most constructive manner possible, as I have in the past. In every case, however, the authors had the final say in such matters at the copy editing and proof stages, and it was always made clear that suggestions for improvement were just that: suggestions.

Plagiarism: The scourge of plagiarism is a concern for the profession as a whole, as well as for *CEH*. One anonymous reader wrote to me just this past year, in fact, that a revised manuscript by an author based in the United Kingdom included large segments taken verbatim – and without any acknowledgment whatsoever – from her report. CUP just enrolled *CEH* in the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), a UK-based organization aimed at ensuring the highest ethical standards in academic publishing. According to a welcoming email, “Membership in COPE sends a signal to authors and reviewers that your journal upholds the highest ethical standards.” Membership benefits include the “ability to bring cases to the quarterly COPE Forum for advice” and “obtain confidential advice on sensitive ethical issues...”

Finances: Essential information about financial matters related to the journal, including subscription levels, is included in the **Publisher's Report** supplied by CUP in late December. There is one issue in particular worth addressing: **subscription levels**. The first table on p. 2 of the report suggests that subscription levels declined in 2015. Pat McGinty explained in an email that that is not the case: “Subscriptions are going up, but the data in the report is not accurate. In the first part, 2014 had a lot of duplicate traditional subscriptions to account for the closing and bankruptcy of SWETS, so the numbers are inflated - we had to duplicate all the SWETS subscriptions in order to fill them ourselves. In the second part, 2015's figures are truly preliminary. Because so many subscriptions hinge on consortia negotiations they are often deferred, and we don't recognize the subs nor the revenue until we close our books in April of the following year. Overall, subscriptions (and therefore revenue) have been increasing annually.”

Marketing: The TOC of each new issue, along with all abstracts in English and German, are distributed every quarter via H-German and H-Soz-Kult. CUP also sends out so-called “content alerts” and occasional “press releases” as soon as a new issue appears (see the samples on pp. 6-8 in the Publisher's Report). It is my strong impression (based on feedback from *CEH* Board members, as well as from other subscribers) that these emails are not reaching as broad an audience as possible – or even all subscribers. It has also been brought to my attention that not all subscribers have been

receiving reminders to renew their subscriptions. "I think we have relied too much on automated systems to send membership reminders and they don't always function well," Pat McGinty recently wrote me, "This is why in the new contract I propose that Cambridge undertake membership campaigns and at least one printed mail reminder annually." It is imperative that we and CUP follow up on this.

Online access: At the last *CEH* Board meeting that took place in early October at the GSA, Pat McGinty enthusiastically pointed out that *CEH* was poised in 2015 to have the most online downloads ever – surpassing even the inflated high of 2011 (inflated, he explained, because free access had been given for a six-week period that year to all CUP journals as a promotional measure; see the table on p. 2 of the preliminary publisher's report from Oct. 2016). The table on the lower half of p. 14 of the final Publisher's Report seems to tell a different story, and in response to a question asking him to clarify this, Pat sent me the following explanation: "The data in this new report includes a couple of additional sources, so comparing the last report to this report is like comparing apples to [apples AND oranges AND pears]. If you look at the bottom chart on p. 14 you'll see that those numbers aren't only Cambridge downloads; we also include EBSCO and ProQuest downloads. So for sake of comparison you'll want to look mainly at the blue bars: those are the ones that we can control. The blue bar is up from last year, and if you strike the anomalous spikes from 2011-2013 we're up above every year. Those red and green bars - EBSCO and ProQuest - we can't do anything about, because those are third parties and they only host older content."

If the members of CEHS have any questions about circulation, sales, marketing, etc. not addressed in the Publisher's Report, they should feel free to contact me or **Mark Zadrozny**, our new principal contact at CUP (mzadrozny@cambridge.org).

b) Statistical tables: manuscript submissions and published articles

As the following tables make clear, the submission of manuscripts remains strong; so, too, does the general quality of submissions. (N.B. The figures for 2010-2014 are taken from previous reports by Ken Ledford.)

Table 1

Volume and Number	Articles	Review Articles	Book Reviews	Other	Pages
48/1-4 (2015)	17	4	72	3	ca. 650
47/1-4 (2014)	27	0	79	2	900
46/1-4 (2013)	20	1	92	1	952
45/1-4 (2012)	21	0	85	0	817
44/1-4 (2011)	21	0	85	2	783
43/1-4 (2010)	17	1	88	4	758

Table 2: Editorial Summary

	2015	2014	2013	2012	2011	2010
Articles Submitted --sent out for peer review	58 --18 (31%)	61 --31	56	54	69	50
Articles Accepted --submitted in 2015 --submitted before 2015	17 --4 --13	11	11	21	21	20
Articles to be Revised/Resubmitted	3	7	11	6	12	9
Articles at Referees	6	6	6	14	25	16
Articles Rejected --by Editor --after peer review	44 (76%)* --40 --4	31	46	46	36	28
Acceptance rate	8%*	26%	19%	31%	37%	41%

*as % of articles submitted *and* accepted/rejected in 2015 (i.e., this figure does not include articles that are either being revised/resubmitted or still out with readers)

Table 3: Submissions and Published Articles by Geographic Location (according to author's institutional affiliation)

	United States	Germany	UK†	Elsewhere††	TOTAL
Submissions					
2015	22 (38%)	2 (3%)	6 (10%)	28* (48%)	58
2014	26	5	9	21	61
2013	28	4	4	20	56
2012	24	3	3	9	39
2011	42	9	4	14	69
2010	28	3	5	14	50
Articles					
2015 (Vol. 48)	12 (57%)	3 (14%)	4 (19%)	2** (10%)	21
2014 (47)	23	1	0	3	27
2013 (46)	15	1	2	3	20
2012 (45)	15	2	2	2	21
2011 (44)	13	2	0	6	21
2010 (43)	10	5	1	1	17

*Poland (4); Austria, Italy (3 each); Canada, Czech Republic, Iran, Spain (2 each); Australia, Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Hungary, India, Ireland, Malaysia, Norway, South Korea (1 each)

**Austria, Canada – 1 each

†The number of **submissions from the UK** remains modest at 10 percent, but there are encouraging signs. In raw numbers, submissions from the UK were higher over the past two years than they had been in the past. As Table 3 indicates, *CEH* had almost as many submissions from the UK in the last two years (fifteen in 2014-2015) as it had altogether in the four previous years (sixteen from 2010 to 2013).

††The articles submitted from “**Elsewhere**” tend to be of poor substantive quality or off-topic, i.e., not about German-speaking Central Europe. I encourage authors to resubmit poorly written ones after a native English speaker has had a chance to edit the manuscript. This is why they made up 48 percent of submissions in 2015, but only 10 percent of all published articles (the two authors of those pieces were from Anglophone countries). It is worth recalling, in this context, **Astrid Eckert's** useful idea about the possibility of publishing translations of seminal articles written in languages not accessible to the average English speaker. I still like this idea very much, despite some of the logistic issues related to the cost of translation and the vetting of such articles. But, as Astrid wrote, it would give “colleagues who most likely do not have easy access to English-language journals a venue for their work.” I again encourage members of the *CEH* and *CEHS* Boards to identify and nominate potential articles.

Table 4: Submissions and Articles Published by Time Period

	up to 1750	1751-1870	1871-1918	1919-33	1933-45	1945-pres.
Submissions						
2015*	3 (6%)	6 (12%)	13 (24%)	1 (2%)	16 (33%)	17 (35%)
2014*	4 (8%)	3 (6%)	15 (29%)	8 (16%)	12 (24%)	9 (18%)
2013	7	4	11	8	9	17
2012	3	6	8	10	12	15
2011	2	6	18	17	16	20
2010	2	4	14	13	2	15
Articles						
2015 (Vol. 48)	1 (5%)	2 (10%)	4 (20%)	2 (10%)	5 (26%)	5 (26%)
2014 (Vol. 47)	9	3	3	1	2	9
2013 (Vol. 46)	1	3	8	1	6	1
2012 (Vol. 45)	0	2	2	4	3	9
2011 (Vol. 44)	0	2	1	4	3	7
2010 (Vol. 43)	1	2	1	6	1	7

*off-topic submissions are not included (9 in 2015, 10 in 2014)

Table 5: Submissions + Articles published according to Geographic Location of Topic

	"Germany"	Elsewhere*
Submissions		
2015	40	18 --8 on Austria/Habsburg lands/Switzerland
2014	48	13
2013	39	17
2012	39	15
2011	52	17
2010	33	17
Articles published		
2015 (Vol. 48)	16	2
2014 (Vol. 47)	27	0
2013 (Vol. 46)	15	5
2012 (Vol. 45)	17	4
2011 (Vol. 44)	15	6
2010 (Vol. 43)	17	0

***By way of explanation, allow me to quote Ken Ledford's Final Report for 2013:** "The question of 'geographic region' addresses primarily the question of post-1848 "*Kleindeutschland*" and "*Grossdeutschland*" (or even beyond to other places in eastern and central Europe). The bulk of manuscripts from Elsewhere which are not accepted deal largely with internal and foreign policy topics in Czech or Hungarian history, or matters exclusive to Balkan states (Croatia, Serbia, Bulgaria, Romania, the Ottoman Empire), and I thus consider them outside the subject matter sweep of Central European History, defined as '**German-speaking central Europe.**'"

c) Vol. 48: general comments and highlights

CEH* published **seventeen articles and **four review essays** in Vol. 48, down from an inflated high of twenty-seven articles in Vol. 47 (see Table 1). The goal is to publish, on average, four articles and one review essay per issue.

*The total number of **book reviews** decreased to seventy-two, largely a result of the editorial transition (see Table 1). We plan to return to an average of twenty per issue.

*The number of **total pages** for Vol. 48 decreased significantly to approximately 600 (see Table 1). This reflects two things: a) the fact that *CEH* published fewer articles and reviews, and b) the larger physical format of the new publication. In consultation with the *CEH* Board and CUP, Vol. 49 will have more generous margins, as well as a slightly larger font.

The vast **majority of submissions** were once again heavily concentrated in the twentieth century: 35 percent from the period after 1945, 33 percent from the Weimar Republic and the Third Reich (with an especially heavy focus on the latter) (see Table 4). Once again, I urge Board members who work on earlier periods – and on Switzerland, Austria, and the Habsburg lands – to encourage colleagues and students to submit articles for consideration in these neglected areas, time periods, and regions. I have committed myself to doing all I can to encourage submission by authors working on pre-1918, especially the medieval and early modern periods, as well as on the “Elsewhere” geographic regions. That is why I brought onto the Board two experts on the Habsburg lands (**Mo Healy** and **Larry Wolff**), as well as a healthy number of early modernists (**Joel Harrington**, **David Luebke**, and **Helmut Puff**). On a more positive note, the four articles that will appear in the **first issue of Vol. 49** (March 2016) cover the period from the Middle Ages to the late *Kaiserreich*. For an overview of the types of articles and themes that *CEH* has covered over the past fifty years, with an emphasis on trends since the so-called *Wende* of 1989-1990, please see my review article in 48/2, available for free download on the CUP website.

CEH* has adopted a **new cover, a painting that Berlin-based artist Edward Gordon has allowed us to use at no charge. The Letter from the Editor that appeared in 48/1 includes a discussion of the cover and an explanation for its choice. The reactions to the cover have been extremely positive and even enthusiastic. According to Pat McGinty, “The new cover is beautiful and has been remarked upon favorably by many attendees at this year's GSA.” Julia Chang, the production editor, added this: “It's been a handsome volume, and I get a lot of comments on how striking the cover looks on my shelves!”

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

*Each issue includes **English and German abstracts** for each article. My hope is that this will encourage greater attention to *CEH* by German-speaking scholars and lay audiences. To that end, the TOC, along with the abstracts in English and German, are included online at the CUP/*CEH* website at no charge and distributed quarterly on H-German and H-Soz-Kult.

*Benjamin Carter Hett's article, “‘This Story Is about Something Fundamental’: Nazi Criminals, History, Memory, and the Reichstag Fire,” appeared in 48/2. I approached Hett two years ago at the GSA encouraging him to write this piece, and am happy to say that it was the article that was **most frequently downloaded** in 2015 (643 times); it was also the topic of a lively and well-attended roundtable discussion sponsored by CEHS at the 2015 AHA. An abridged version appeared in translation as a five-page special section of *Die Welt am Sonntag* on May 24, 2015, for which *CEH* was given due credit.

*Four **review essays** and one **feature review** have appeared in Vol. 48: **Geoff Eley**, “The German Right from Weimar to Hitler: Fragmentation and Coalescence” (48/1); **Katherine B. Aaslestad**, “Serious Work for a New Europe: The Congress of Vienna after Two Hundred Years” (48/2); **Andrew I. Port**, “*Central European History* since 1989: Historiographical Trends and Post-*Wende* ‘Turns’” (48/2); **Annika Mombauer**, “Guilt or Responsibility? The Hundred-Year Debate on the Origins of World War I” (48/4); **Konrad Jarausch** on Ulrich Herbert, *Geschichte Deutschlands im 20. Jahrhundert* (48/2)

*The September issue (48/3) was a **Special Issue on Photography and Twentieth-Century German History**. It contains an Introduction by guest editors **Elizabeth Harvey** and **Maiken Umbach** (University of Nottingham, UK), and five articles by scholars from the US, the UK, and Germany covering the entire span of the twentieth century.

*Three **memorials** have been commissioned to mark the passing of Peter Gay, Gerhard A. Ritter, and Carl Schorske, written, respectively, by **George Williamson**, **James Sheehan**, and **John Boyer**. I have asked another scholar to write a memorial for Hans Mommsen, and am waiting for a response.

d) Members of the Editorial Board

It is with regret that I announce that **Tara Zahra** has decided to resign from the Board of Editors. She informed me in an email on September 30 that her other commitments were making it difficult for her to participate as actively on the Board as she would have liked. I mention Tara's email and reason for leaving because of a strange rumor that circulated at the October, 2015 annual meeting of the German Studies Association in Washington, DC, namely that I had fired Tara or somehow pressured her to step down. This is not only patently untrue but also, I think, extremely unkind to Tara. I wrote her in an attempt to get to the bottom of this, and she informed me in an email on October 8 that she had no idea what the source of the rumor could be. I hope that it has now been laid to rest.

On a happier note, we welcome three new members to the Board. All three extend *CEH*'s editorial “coverage” in different but important ways:

Will Gray (Purdue University): a former member of the H-German editorial board, Gray's expertise on post-1945 **East and West Germany** will come in handy because of the high number of submissions *CEH* receives in this broad area;

Nikolaus Wachsmann (Birkbeck, University of London): an expert on the Third Reich, Wachsmann teaches in the **United Kingdom**, and it is my hope that this will help us increase the number of submissions from overseas;

Larry Wolff (Director of the Center for European and Mediterranean Studies, New York University): Wolff's expertise on the **Habsburg lands** should help us increase *CEH*'s coverage of that important region.

e) Concluding remarks

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, and the rest of the Editorial Board any suggestions for fora or roundtables, thematic issues, review essays, or anything else.

Some ideas in the works for **future issues** include a forum to commemorate the thirtieth anniversary of the *Historikerstreit* and the twentieth anniversary of the Goldhagen affair in 2016 (this was **Nik Wachsmann's** useful suggestion), as well as special issue to mark the five hundredth anniversary of Luther's Ninety-five Theses in 2017 (I have been in contact with Joel Harrington, David Luebke, and Helmut Puff about this). **Jonathan Zatlín** has floated the fine idea of a forum on recent trends in German history, perhaps with a focus on a particular issue or subfield. I am enthusiastic about this, as well as about other suggestions made by other Board members in the past but not yet followed up on. These include issues or fora on the historical commissions investigating the role of various German ministries during the Third Reich; "transnationalism"; and the Habsburg lands.

A couple of important requests: If you have not yet done so, please **become a member of CEHS**, which includes an annual subscription to *CEH*, as well as other benefits, and also 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 the Cambridge site (especially when used in courses): this has a positive impact on our finances as well as on the journal's "**impact factor**," which – I am happy to report – **increased to 0.326** in 2014, up from 0.116 in 2013. *Vorwärts!*

In closing, a **word of gratitude** to the staff at Cambridge University Press: It is with great sadness that I recently learned that **Pat McGinty** is leaving CUP for a senior editorial position at Sage Publications. His tireless support and enthusiasm made the transition a smooth one, and I cannot say enough good things about how enjoyable it has been to work with him. The good news is that **Mark Zadrozny**, who previously served as the journal's main editorial contact at CUP, will be returning to that role. **Susan Soule**, who oversaw the design of the new cover as well as all marketing issues, has taken on a new role as an institutional marketer at CUP and will, as a result, no longer serve as marketing manager for *CEH*. We look forward to working with her successor, **Kerr Alexander**. I am happy to announce that there will be some continuity amid all this change: **Julia Chang**, our extremely talented production editor, will remain in that role. It is fair to say that if not for her professionalism, patience, and great attention to detail, the journal would not have remained on schedule or achieved the quality it has this past year.

All in all, the transition has gone smoothly, despite some initial production snags. 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 and Business meetings.