

**Annual Report of the Editor of *Central European History* (CEH)
Andrew I. Port
Professor, Department of History
Wayne State University
Saturday, January 5, 2019**

**Central European History Society (CEHS)
132st Annual Meeting of the
American Historical Society
Chicago, IL January 3-6, 2019**

The Annual Report provides a Summary of the Operations of the journal for the calendar year 2018. It consists of five main sections dealing with the following themes:

- I. production flow and relations with Cambridge University Press (CUP);**
- II. comments and highlights;**
- III. *CEH* and gender representation;**
- IV. statistical tables: manuscript submissions and published articles;**
- 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 our new CUP liaison, Executive Publisher Mark Zadrozny (mzadrozny@cambridge.org).

Summary of Operations

I. Production flow and relations with Cambridge University Press

Contract: Calendar year 2018, Volume 51, was the second year of the third (belatedly drawn-up and signed) five-year contract governing the publishing relationship between the Central European History Society (CEHS) and CUP to produce *CEH*.

Publication Schedule and Flow: The first three issues of Vol. 51 **all appeared on schedule** in March, June, and September 2018: Vol. 51, no. 1 (March; live online March 28), no. 2 (June; live online June 28), and no. 3 (September; live online Sept. 19). I received and returned (within an hour of receipt) the final issue proof on December 26, but CUP did not manage to get it online by the end of the month, no doubt because of the holidays. It should appear any day now.

Publishing Editor: On September 17, **Mark Zadrozny** informed *CEH* and the officers of the CEHS Board that **Hal Moore** would no longer be working at CUP as of September 28. Mark is temporarily filling the position, and, to the best of my knowledge, CUP plans to hire a replacement. This is good news, but it will be the fourth person in the position of publishing editor over the past four years.

Book reviews: Associate Editor **Julia Torrie** continues to experience difficulties securing reviews – in large part the result of authors not submitting their reviews on time or at all. In response to this, we decided last year to publish fewer reviews each issue (fifteen instead of twenty), but to increase the maximum length of each review to 1,200 words (previously 750-1,000 words). The results have been spotty. There were two featured reviews (one by James Brophy, one by Marjorie Lamberti) and only eighteen regular reviews – but this is because there were two special issues in March and September, whose length precluded the inclusion of reviews.

Submissions: There was a noticeable drop in the number of article submissions this year, after an all-time high last year. Last year's record number no doubt played a role. Another reason for this is that I was less "aggressive" about soliciting manuscripts this past year – largely because we have had an embarrassment of riches of late. *CEH* now has enough articles to fill almost all the issues that will appear during the first year of the new Editor, Monica Black. Because of this current backlog, as well as because of my belief that my successor should have a greater say in what she publishes, I decided to hold back from soliciting manuscripts as forcefully as I had in the past.

II. Comments and Highlights:

CEH* published **fourteen articles, **two** forums, **two** featured reviews, **four** memorials, and **eighteen** book reviews in Vol. 51 (Table 1).

CEH*'s **impact factor (IF) jumped to 0.485 in 2017, its highest ever. This is based on citations of articles that appeared in 2015 and 2016, my first two full years as Editor. Please consult the publisher's report for an explanation of the IF. Of eighty-nine journals on the History list, *CEH* placed thirty-third, and had 209 cites.

*Two of our authors received **major awards** for articles published in our journal:

--**Marcus Colla** (University of Cambridge) received the **Alexander Prize of the Royal Historical Society** for his 2017 article, "Prussian Palimpsests: Architecture and Urban Spaces in East Germany, 1945-1961" (*CEH* 50, no. 2 [2017]). According to the RHS's website: "The prize is awarded for an essay or article based on original historical research, by a doctoral candidate or those recently awarded their doctorate, published in a journal or an edited collection of essays." The award was established in 1897, and this is, to the best of my knowledge, the **first time that an article published in a non-British journal has won the award.**

--**James Retallack** (University of Toronto) received the biennial **Hans Rosenberg Article Prize** of the Central European History Society for 2015-16, for his 2016 article, "Mapping the Red Threat: The Politics of Exclusion in Leipzig before 1914" (*CEH* 49, no. 3-4 [2016]). The prize "recognizes the best English-language article or essay on Central European history written by a permanent resident of North America."

CEH* published **two special issues and **two forums**:

--*CEH* 51, no. 1 **commemorated the fiftieth anniversary** of the journal. It contained three main sections – "Recollections and Reminiscences," "Reflections, Reckonings, and Revelations," "Reveries and Reverberations" – and included more than two dozen essays by the following scholars, who provided expert overviews of the history of the journal, as well as the field of Central European history: Celia Applegate, Shelley Baranowski, Doris

Bergen, Chad Bryant, John Deak, Matthew Fitzpatrick, Michael Geyer, Kees Gispén, Will Gray, Karen Hagemann, Donna Harsch, 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.

The issue also included a **full-color frontispiece** reproducing all eight covers of CEH since 1968; and two **appendices** listing the officers of CEHS and its predecessor (1959-2018), as well as the recipients of the Hans Rosenberg Prize (1988-2016). To mark this milestone, Cambridge UP kindly made access to the fifty most-cited *CEH* articles temporarily available free of charge.

--*CEH* 51, no. 3 was a **special issue**, guest edited by *CEH* Board member **Thomas Kühne**, with eight articles on "Masculinity in the Third Reich" by scholars based in the USA and France: Jason Crouthamel, Christopher Dillon, Patrick Farges, Michael Gehran, Thomas Kühne, Elissa Mailänder, and Edward Westermann. Special thanks to the two external reviewers!

--*CEH* 51/2 included a **forum**: "In Memory of the 'Two Helmut's': The Lives, Legacies, and Historical Impact of Helmut Schmidt and Helmut Kohl," with contributions by five historians and one political scientist based in the USA, Britain, and the Netherlands: Clayton Clemens, Ronald Granieri, Mathias Haeussler, Mary Elise Sarotte, Kristina Spohr, and Christian Wicke.

--*CEH* 51/4 included a **forum**: "The Vanishing Nineteenth Century in European History?" with contributions by fourteen scholars based in the USA, Germany, and Italy. These include several members of the *CEH* and CEHS boards, as well as scholars working outside the field of Central European history: Birgit Aschmann, David Blackbourn, James Brophy, Alex Chase-Levenson, Roger Chickering, Sebastian Conrad, Karen Hagemann, Pieter Judson, Lloyd Kramer, Simone Lässig, Suzanne Marchand, Alexander Martin, Jürgen Osterhammel, and Andrew Zimmerman. I am grateful to *CEH* Board member **Karen Hagemann** and CEHS Board member **Simone Lässig** for organizing and guest editing the forum.

***Memorials** appeared marking the deaths of

--**Douglas A. Unfug** (51/1, by James Van Horn Melton)

--**Hans Mommsen** (51/2, by Larry Eugene Jones)

--**Georg G. Iggers** (51/3, by Andreas Daum)

--**Eberhard Jäckel** (51/4, by Peter Hayes)

Stefanie Schüler-Springorum has kindly agreed to write a memorial for **Reinhard Rürup**.

CEH* adopted a **new cover for Vol. 51, another painting that Berlin-based artist Edward Gordon has allowed us to use at no charge.

***Forthcoming:**

--*CEH* 52, no. 1 (March 2019) will be another special issue: "New Narratives for the History of the Federal Republic," comprised of seven articles guest edited by *CEH* Board member Astrid Eckert and by Frank Biess.

--Karen Hagemann, Tobias Hof, and Konrad Jarausch are preparing a special issue, "Burdens and Beginnings: Rebuilding East and West Germany after Nazism." The revised articles are undergoing a second review by the original readers and, if accepted, will likely appear next fall.

III. *CEH* and Gender Representation:

On April 3, 2018, **Dolores Augustine** (St. John's University) sent the following email to the members of the CEHS Board and the *CEH* Board of Editors:

The members of the German Women's History Group, a longstanding group of feminist scholars working in Central European History, note with dismay and consternation that the "Special Commemorative Issue: Central European History at Fifty (1968–2018)"... is severely gender-challenged. Of 26 contributions, six are by women. While 20 of the male scholars are sole author, four women (of a total eight) are included in two co-authored pieces. Two of the female authors are included *ex officio*, as book review editor and the current president of the CEHS. Women have been given space to speak on the topics of culture and gender, but not on many other major themes of German history. It would seem from this anniversary issue that women scholars have not come very far in the history of the field's flagship journal. This issue does not accurately reflect the changes in our field nor even the actual content of the journal over the past fifty years. We certainly hope that it does not reflect the future direction of *CEH*.

It was signed by the following persons: **Bonnie Anderson, Dolores Augustine, Rebecca Boehling, Renate Bridenthal, Belinda Davis, Atina Grossmann, Amy Hackett, Maria Hoehn, Marion Kaplan, Jan Lambertz, Molly Nolan, Krista O'Donnell, Kathy Pence.**

A couple of hours earlier, **Atina Grossmann**, who had just served as president of CEHS and was (and is) a current member of the CEHS Board, had sent the following message – apparently by mistake – to the members of the CEHS Board:

These are the CEHS Board d (sic) members. They will say that's (sic) they do not control editorial content which is true. But *CEH* is the journal of CEHS. The statement (Renate's version) should also go to the members if (sic) the *CEH* editorial board. Which can be found online. I had sent the list of who offered to post where yesterday.

In response to queries from several perplexed Board members, Grossmann sent this explanation: "Multitasking. Embarrassing iPhone error. My apologies. I should not try to send emails during class breaks."

On April 4, **Shelley Baranowski**, the president of CEHS, sent the following response to the German Women's History Group:

On behalf of the Central European History Society Editorial Board, I thank you for your message regarding the Special Commemorative Issue of *Central European History*. In response, I raise what we believe is a crucial point. As anyone who has produced a volume with multiple contributors can testify, commissioning essays is a formidable undertaking. Contributors to the final product are those who answered the call, not the many scholars who were solicited. Given the practicalities involved in producing the current issue of *CEH*, we urge you not to read gender bias into it. The Central European History Society and *Central European History* are indeed committed to inclusivity now and in the future, be it in methodologies, viewpoints, historical periods, and especially the diversity of contributors.

To the best of my knowledge, there was no immediate response to or acknowledgment of Baranowski's email. Instead, on May 10, Augustine sent a second email on behalf of the German Women's History Group:

We, the German Women's History Group of New York, remain concerned about CEH's lack of attention to gender equity. Data released to us (see the attached document) show that the AHR has achieved gender parity, setting the bar for other journals. We hope that CEH will similarly release gender data on authors of articles published over the past few years.

This time, it was sent in the name of only ten of the original thirteen individuals: **Bonnie Anderson, Dolores Augustine, Rebecca Boehling, Renate Bridenthal, Belinda Davis, Atina Grossmann, Amy Hackett, Marion Kaplan, Mary Nolan, Krista O'Donnell.**

This prompted an immediate response from **Karen Hagemann**, a member of CEH's Board of Editors:

You all might want to read the attached article "Gendering Central European History: Changing Representations of Women and Gender in Comparison, 1968–2017" written by Donna Harsch and me. It came out in *Central European History* 51 (2018), 114–127, the issue for the 50th anniversary. This article looks at two main developments in the journal *Central European History*: the representation of female authors and the representation of articles on the subject of women's and gender history. It compares the development in *Central European History*, with the journals *German History* and *American Historical Review* over the last fifty years. The article seems to be a timely contribution to the debate the members of the German Women's History Group of New York want to initiate. It shows improvement since the 1990s, but concludes too that we need to aspire to do better in both, the increase of the number of female authors and the integration of articles that include a gender perspective, especially compared with AHR.

Shelley Baranowski then sent this email on May 15:

Thank you and the German Women's History Group for your most recent email. I hope you all received Karen Hagemann's response of late last week. If you haven't already done so, you should follow up on her suggestion that you read the article that she and Donna Harsch contributed to the *Central European History* commemorative issue. It provides the data that you seek, and it gives the CEHS the basis for productive discussion that will in turn lead to effective solutions. In the meantime, if you or other members of the group (and know of others outside the group as well) who have articles in the pipeline, we would welcome your submitting them to *Central European History*.

To the best of my knowledge, there were no responses to either message. On September 29, I received a personal email from one of the co-signers, who had approached me during the GSA annual conference in Pittsburgh. This is an excerpt:

I also need to apologize for any aspect of the letter that seemed like an ad hominem attack against you. At the time my intention and that of the great majority of signers was to complain about structural issues, not to criticize you. I want nothing to do with any personal animus or quarrel that anyone has with you. I'm also sorry if the letter struck too aggressive a tone.

Up to this point, I have not responded publicly to the letters sent by the German Women's History Group, but I would like to do so now, not least because Shelley Baranowki has informed me that the important issue of gender representation will be discussed at the CEHS Board Meeting. Shelley also discussed this at the annual Board of Editors meeting at the GSA in Pittsburgh in September, after kindly asking if she could attend.

With that in mind, allow me to make the following points:

*The original email of April 3 about the commemorative issue contained several errors and misleading statements:

a) "Of 26 contributions, six are by women."

In fact, there were twenty-two original contributions, plus a memorial. (Two of the essays were reprints of pieces that had appeared years earlier in *CEH*.) The correct statistics are as follows: Eight of the twenty-four authors who wrote new pieces for the issue were women; six of the twenty-two articles were by women, i.e., between a third and a quarter. I address the reasons for the underrepresentation of women authors below.

b) "Two of the female authors are included *ex officio*..."

This is not the reason why Julia Torrie and Shelley Baranowski were included. I extended an invitation to *all* members of the Board of Editors, and Julia was the only woman, besides Karen Hagemann and Donna Harsch, to accept the invitation; she chose her own topic. Shelley was invited to participate because of her position as a leading senior scholar who has published widely in the field.

c) "While 20 of the male scholars are sole author, four women (of a total eight) are included in two co-authored pieces... Women have been given space to speak on the topics of culture and gender..."

In fact, the women in question a) requested that their articles be coauthored, and b) suggested the topics themselves; they were not "assigned." I have indeed heard from several of the female authors that they were themselves offended by these unfounded insinuations.

As one of them wrote to me: "... I was forwarded the petition protesting the gender balance of contributors to the last issue, and I just wanted to let you know that as one of the purportedly underrepresented, I do not in any way share their views and am even somewhat insulted by the implication that cultural history is somehow a less serious, 'girlie' area of inquiry. But maybe I'm just 'gender-challenged' myself. Let me instead congratulate you on an truly outstanding job pulling together a very impressive multigenerational and multidisciplinary roster of respected scholars in the field, of which I am very honored to be a part!"

d) "This issue does not accurately reflect the changes in our field nor even the actual content of the journal over the past fifty years."

Unfortunately, this claim is not fleshed out, which makes it difficult to evaluate its accuracy. Still, as the author of a 2015 article on precisely this issue, "*Central European History* since

1989: Historiographical Trends and Post-Wende ‘Turns’” (*CEH* 48/2), I find the statement both erroneous and perplexing.

*Shelley Baranowki's response of April 4 is, by contrast, entirely accurate: "Contributors to the final product are those who answered the call, not the many scholars who were solicited." In fact, I wrote to at least a dozen additional women scholars asking for contributions. I received either polite refusals – or no response at all. In addition, two women who agreed to write essays did not do so in the end: one never submitted hers, and the other decided to contribute to a forthcoming special issue of *CEH* instead.

*It is worth noting, in this context, that at least three of the co-signers of the original email from the German Women's History Group had received past requests from me to vet manuscript submissions – on women's and gender issues, incidentally – but refused to do so because of "overcommitment" or "health issues." It is also worth noting that not a single one of the co-signers of the two emails has, in response to Shelley's invitation of May 15, submitted a manuscript to *CEH* for consideration, or sent to the journal a single suggestion for how to improve the alleged gender imbalance that they decry.

*The second email from the German Women's History Group only confirms the impression that the co-signers had not carefully read the commemorative issue. If they had, as Karen Hagemann suggested in her response, they would not have asked for information and data *included in that very issue*.

*Along similar lines, I wonder if any of the co-signers read the Letter from the Editor that I wrote for the commemorative issue, in which I directly address the issue of gender and *CEH*. Allow me to cite that part of the letter in full:

Unfug's immediate successor, Kenneth Barkin, took over the reins in 1991 and would go on to edit the journal for more than a dozen years, ably assisted the entire time by his former graduate student, Ursula Marcum—who, like Glee Unfug, was another unsung *female* hero of *CEH*. Kenneth Ledford received similar support during his ten years as editor from Gayle Godek. It is worth mentioning, in this context, an appendix that I have included in this commemorative issue: a list of all the major officers of the Conference Group of Central European History and of its successor, the Central European History Society—the official institutional sponsors of the journal—as well as a list of all the members of the journal's editorial staffs since 1968. What is striking to me about these lists are the largely "subordinate" roles played by women. For one, only ten of the Group/Society's sixty-one presidents have been female, and the first of these, Annelise Thimm—about whom Doris Bergen writes with great admiration and affection in her contribution to this issue—only became president in 1984, i.e., a quarter-century after the founding of the society in 1959. There has only been one female secretary-treasurer, and women have also tended to play a subsidiary, if indispensable role in the running of the journal itself, serving primarily as book review editors, or as editorial assistants in charge of copy editing, financial matters, and various administrative tasks. This only underscores what Karen Hagemann and Donna Harsch write in their contribution to this issue on the representation of female authors in *CEH* and on the percentage of articles in the journal dealing explicitly with women's or gender history: both have increased significantly since the 1990s, a result of larger developments in the field and the profession as a whole. Yet, as they rightly contend, a good deal of progress can still be made on this score. After a long run of four male editors, the recent choice of Monica Black as my successor beginning in 2019 is clearly an encouraging

development, one that will no doubt mark a new era in the history of the journal. In which specific ways remains to be seen, of course.

I would also draw attention to the following footnote that appeared in the Letter: "I tried to solicit a contribution by Ursula Marcum and several others, but was unable to establish contact, despite repeated attempts."

*I would like to request that the CEHS Board ask Atina Grossmann to clarify several issues for us. Her email of April 3 suggests that she took a leading role in this initiative ("The statement [Renate's version] *should also go* to the members if (sic) the CEH editorial board"; emphasis added). If that is true, it is not very surprising, in light of what I wrote in last year's report about Grossmann's past intrigues. In any event, it would be good to know why she did not, as a member of the Board, first approach me as Editor, or the other members of the Board, both to express her concerns and ask for an explanation of the gender breakdown. Also, she writes that she had "sent the list of who offered to post where yesterday." It is important for the Society to know where else this letter, or any other, subsequently appeared.

In conclusion, let me say that the concerns about *any* sort of imbalance in *CEH* are worth pursuing – regardless of whether one or more of the co-signers intended to make an "ad hominem attack," whether the letter "struck too aggressive a tone," or whether the motivation of one or more co-signers had to do with "any personal animus or quarrel" (I am quoting here from the personal email I subsequently received from one of the co-signers in September). The forum on the nineteenth century that just appeared in *CEH* 51/4 suggests that gender imbalance *should* indeed be a concern, but one that clearly has more to do with impersonal, structural forces than any explicit editorial efforts to exclude women. After all, only four of the fourteen contributors to that forum are women, i.e., less than a third, and two of those are the organizers themselves – including Karen Hagemann, who wrote eloquently in the pages of the commemorative issue about the need to address gender imbalance ("The aim should be that the percentage of female authors reflects at least the percentage of female full-time faculty in history departments"). That alone, I think, speaks volumes.

IV. Statistical Tables:

Table 1: Publication Overview

Volume and Number	Articles	Review Articles/ Forums	Book Reviews	Other*	Pages
51/1-4 (2018)	14	2	18	29	733
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

*essays in commemorative issue (51/1), featured reviews, memorials, etc.

Table 2: Editorial Summary

	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014
Articles Submitted --sent out for peer review	44 --30 (68%)	63 --44 (70%)	52 --30 (58%)	58 --18 (31%)	61 31
Articles Accepted	3	6	13	17	11
Articles to be Revised/Resubmitted	14	7	10	3	7
Articles at Referees	13	19	8	6	6
Articles Rejected --by Editor --after peer review	12 --11 --1	24 --18 --6	27 (52%) --19 (70%) --8 (30%)	44 --40 (91%) --4 (9%)	31
Acceptance rate*	20%*	20%	21%	28%	26%

*as % of articles submitted *and* accepted/rejected in 2018 (i.e., this figure does not include articles that are either being revised/resubmitted or are still out with readers)

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

	United States	Germany/ Austria/ Switzerland*	UK/ Canada/ Australia/ New Zealand*	Elsewhere	TOTAL
Submissions					
2018	24 (55%)	3 (7%)	7 (16%)	10 (23%)**	44
2017	31 (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 (43%)	5 (8%)	9 (15%)	21 (34%)	61
Articles					
2018 (Vol. 51)	10 (71%)	0 (0%)	2 (14%)	2 (14%)	14***
2017 (50)	2 (17%)	2 (17%)	8 (67%)	0 (0%)	12
2016 (49)	8 (57%)	2 (14%)	4 (29%)	0 (0%)	14
2015 (48)	12 (57%)	3 (14%)	4 (19%)	2 (10%)	21
2014 (47)	23 (85%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	3 (11%)	27

*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 "other"

**2 from Czech Republic, 1 each from Denmark, Italy, Luxembourg, Romania, Russian Federation, Singapore, Slovenia, Sweden

***does not include:

a) the essays in the commemorative issue (51/1), which had 24 participants from the following countries: USA (18), Canada (2), Australia (1), France (1), Germany (1), United Kingdom (1)

b) the international forums published in 51/2 and 51/4, which had 20 participants from the following countries: USA (13), Germany (3), UK (2), Italy (1), Netherlands (1)

**Table 4:
Submissions and Articles Published by Time Period***

	up to 1750	1751-1870	1871-1918	1919-33	1933-45	1945-pres.
Submissions						
2018	4 (10%)	3 (8%)	6 (15%)	5 (13%)	3 (8%)	19 (48%)
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 (8%)	3 (6%)	15 (29%)	8 (16%)	12 (24%)	9 (18%)
Articles						
2018 (Vol. 51)**	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	2 (14%)	1 (7%)	9 (64%)	2 (14%)
2017 (50)	1 (8%)	1 (7%)	4 (29%)	2 (15%)	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 (33%)	3 (11%)	3 (11%)	1 (4%)	2 (8%)	9 (33%)

*off-topic submissions are not included (4 in 2018, 4 in 2017, 3 in 2016, 9 in 2015, 10 in 2014)

**does not include essays in commemorative issue (51/1) or forums on post-1945 period (51/2) and 19th century (51/4)

**Table 5:
Submissions and Articles published by Geographic Location***

	“Germany”	Elsewhere
Submissions		
2018	35	9 --5 on Austria/Habsburg
2017	50	13 --6 on Austria/Habsburg/ Switzerland
2016	47	8 --5 on Austria/Habsburg/ Switzerland
2015	40	18 --8 on Austria/Habsburg
2014	48	13
Articles published		
2018 (Vol. 51)	13**	1 --1 on Austria/Habsburg
2017 (50)	12	2
2016 (49)	15	2
2015 (48)	16	2
2014 (47)	27	0

*By way of explanation, I refer to 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.'"

**Three of these articles also focused on Austria, Palestine/Israel, UK/USA

Table 6: Impact Factor

Year	Impact Factor	5-year Impact Factor
2017	0.485	0.471
2016	0.196	0.324
2015	0.271	0.243
2014	0.326	0.394
2013	0.116	0.240

V. Concluding Remarks:

*This will be my **final report** to the *CEHS*. I am stepping down at the conclusion of my term as Editor of the journal on June 30, 2019. My successor will be **Monica Black** (University of Tennessee, Knoxville). Given the current rate of submissions and acceptances, the new editor will have enough articles to fill all issues during her entire first year as editor. This is not a “luxury” that I enjoyed, and it should make the editorial transition that much easier. I wish Monica great success!

*A word of thanks to the members of the *CEH* Board of Editors, past and present, most of whom have been very supportive over the past five years. I owe special thanks to **Astrid Eckert**, **Thomas Kühne**, and **Karen Hagemann** for having gone above and beyond the call of duty, with their many suggestions for issues and articles and forums, and for always being willing to vet submissions. I am also grateful to **Julia Torrie** for her superb work as Associate Editor; to **Sylvia Taschka**, for her wonderful translations of the abstracts (and for reading over my Letters before they went to press); and to Wayne State University for its support, which included an annual course release. Four individuals with whom I have worked closely at Cambridge UP over the past five years deserve sincere thanks as well: **Julia Chang** and **Pat McGinty**, who are no longer at the press, and, more recently, **Kayla Riddleberger** and **Mark Zadrozny**. Finally, I would like to thank two of the presidents of CEHS for their undinting support during my time as Editor: **Celia Applegate** and **Shelley Baranowski**. There is a quote from Bilbo Baggins that comes to mind when I think of the dozens of others whose paths I have had the pleasure of crossing as Editor over the past five years, but it is perhaps sounder at this point to slip on the proverbial ring and instead silently slip away.

Vorwärts!