

Narrating the History of Women's History

Enrica Asquer, Anna Bellavitis, Giulia Calvi, Isabelle Chabot, Cristina La Rocca, and Manuela Martini, eds. *Vingt-cinq ans après. Les femmes au rendez-vous de l'histoire*. [Twenty-five years after. Women at the rendezvous with history] Rome: École française de Rome, 2019. 498 pp. ISBN 9782728313785 (pb).

Teresa Bertilotti, ed. *Women's History at the Cutting Edge: An Italian Perspective*. Rome: Viella, 2020. 120 pp. ISBN 9788833131412 (pb); 9788833136196 (PDF); 9788833139074 (ePub).

Julie E. Gallagher and Barbara Winslow, eds. *Reshaping Women's History: Voices of Nontraditional Women Historians*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2018. 292 pp.; ISBN 9780252042003 (cl); 9780252083693 (pb); 9780252050749 (e-book).

Elizabeth Jacoway, ed. *No Straight Path: Becoming Women Historians*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2019. 264 pp.; ISBN 9780807170434 (cl); 9780807172124 (ebook).

Karen Offen and Chen Yan, eds. *Women's History at the Cutting Edge*. London: Routledge, 2019. 130 pp. ISBN 9780367029074 (cl); 9780367663520 (pb); 9780429001093 (ebook).

Hilda L. Smith and Melinda S. Zook, eds. *Generations of Women Historians Within and Beyond the Academy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2018. 336 pp.; ISBN 9783319775678 (cl); 9783030084820 (pb); 9783319775685 (ebook).

Monica Pacini

It has been over a year since the Covid-19 pandemic considerably transformed women's lives and work. The closure of libraries, archives, and laboratories has distanced people from one another, reduced physical mobility, and entrusted contacts and projects to webs of words and virtual images. Remote working within domestic spaces has compelled people to seek out a new balance between family and personal needs, between production and caretaking, and it has revealed the deep fractures of society, the preexisting disparities, and the unequal impacts of the crisis in terms of gender.¹ In this suspended time of mourning and emergency, as the work of women historians is changing, that work has become an even more important object of reflection. The matter of women's historical work intertwines with debates over policy and the strategies to adopt for maintaining countries social and democratic fabrics, and with the challenges that feminist activism is facing.² Representation, health, forms of

control, work protections, access to income and credit, taxation, life-work balance, protests, consumption, and public and social spending all appear under a different light considering the events of the past few months, the shock that struck the markets and the world, and the catastrophe of millions of human lives lost.

Between 2018 and 2020, right before the pandemic unfolded, numerous collected volumes were published on the relationship between the past, present, and future of women's and gender history; on the forms of access for women to research and write; and on the historian's profession between the nineteenth and twenty-first centuries. Adopting different critical tools, these studies have contributed to the revival of the discussion of the interconnection between the personal, political, and professional dimensions of women's history work, twenty years after the release of the collection edited by Eileen Boris and Nupur Chaudhuri.³ Since its inception, women's and gender history has stood out for its distinct tendency to reflect on itself: from the seminal questions of the 1970s on the possibility of "making" women's history to the debates that have followed about the state of the profession, the historiographical trajectories followed in various countries, the ability to transform mainstream historiographic practices, and how to educate new generations and how to have an impact on a wide audience (Asquer, et al., 25–34; Bertilotti, 45–53). Not infrequently, this intense work of introspection and synthesis has sprung up from a desire to measure women's history against History, which is understood as an exclusive, professional academic prerogative of a male white elite. Even in the early 1990s, Hilda L. Smith and Bonnie G. Smith asked provocative questions and brought attention to the contemporary representations of the "noble dream" of historical research that had omitted women's intellectual contributions and women's history.⁴ Recently, Bonnie Smith has recalled that one of her articles on the contribution of women historians to modern French and Anglo-Saxon historiography did not resonate with members of the American Historical Association when it was published. Only years later, when the resulting monograph included male historians, did her work inspire more widespread interest (although the majority of commentators focused on the men).⁵

The women editors of the six volumes under review are responding to different issues in the profession, but as a whole they illuminate individual and collective paths, national and transnational contexts, socio-political dynamics, and internal mechanisms of the academic world and bring those multiple pieces together. Hilda L. Smith and Melinda S. Zook, in *Generations of Women Historians*, use the category of generation to place in stark relief the different educational and professional contexts within which American and European women—in particular British and French—have had access to history; the editors understand history to include research, publication, teaching, and holding office in professional associations. The volume has four thematic parts, each of which contains three biographical essays of women historians born between the 1700s and the 1900s. However, the generations to which the title refers are predominantly those of the pioneers born between the 1860s and the period between the World Wars. The growing wave of women who attained a bachelor's or doctoral degree

after the Second World War remains outside the frame, in particular those from the period between the late 1950s and the mid-1970s. These women had the opportunity to insert themselves in a more dynamic job market, sometimes with the support of public policies (1–21). Elizabeth Jacoway dedicates her edited collection to these later life stories, which I will return to in the final pages of this review.

The select group of pioneers from the early 1900s, placed under the magnifying glass in the essays of *Generations of Women Historians*, lived in a world marked by separate and hierarchical gender roles, racism, and misogyny; often, this group of women dealt with history by way of literature as well as other recently formed disciplines that were open to field research, such as sociology and anthropology. Even when they came from elite social and cultural environments like those of their male contemporaries, the “first” women who wrote economic and social history, like Ellen Annette McArthur and Alice Clark, or who taught at universities and published historical biographies, like Isabel de Madariaga, lived an insular existence; they held no leadership roles in the field, remained outside the canon, and, at best, had a posthumous rediscovery of their works. In many cases, they were busy writing in order to make a living. The success with the general public enjoyed by women historical fiction writers like Cicely Veronica Wedgwood or Nancy Mitford did not correspond to legitimacy in academia. Even the few who were a part of the university system—like Caroline Robbins—or who influenced the research of following generations—like Ellen Annette McArthur and Julia Cherry Spruill—have never been recognized as leaders of the “profession.” As a consequence, they have never been treated as such by the media, governmental organizations, or the boards of directors of banks and businesses. The very absence of (auto)biographies of the “pioneers,” who were deprived of the networks necessary to secure and perpetuate their fame, highlights the important work of memory; it is a way to bring the ideas, theories, and practices of women historians to public attention, to give value to the generational transmission of knowledge.⁶ By reconstructing the intellectual lives and reputations of prominent women historians of past generations, these essays reveal the close link between historical research, politics, and citizenship (the combination of activities characteristic of irregular and tortuous paths) and the usefulness of a collective analysis—on a group level and not solely an individual one—of the careers of women historians both inside and outside academia.⁷ The volume contains many starting points for future research. Scholars could delve deeper into a number of issues: the history of associations created for women in the profession, like the New England organization that in 1929 gave life to the Berkshire Conference of Women Historians; the intellectual relationships and the epistolary exchanges among active female researchers in the social and political fields; and the history of journals, databases of (published and unpublished) doctoral theses, and collected works like historical and biographical dictionaries. A few of these paths have been traversed for some time, but there is much more to do, especially in Asia, Eastern Europe and post-Soviet Russia.⁸

The 2019 edited volume titled *Vingt-cinq ans après* is the product of a multi-voice discussion about two notable milestones: the twenty-fifth anniversary of the release

of *Histoire des femmes en Occident* (*A History of Women in the West*), edited by Georges Duby and Michelle Perrot, and the twentieth anniversary of the publication of *Storia delle donne in Italia* (*A History of Women in Italy*).⁹ Thirty-four men and women researchers from Europe and the United States and of different generations contributed essays with the two-pronged goal to analyze the context of production, the reception, and the impacts of these pioneering works of synthesis and research and, at the same time, to consider the developments of the following decades (1–24).

These scholars interrogate the lines of continuity, overlaid by the innovations represented by the opening of women's and gender history to global and transnational history. This change is connected to the intention to "provincialize Europe"; to develop alternative categories to read the relations between colonies and empires, metropolises and suburbs; to recover the voices and the bodies of "others."¹⁰ In the first section, "Vingt-cinq ans après, Vent'anni dopo" (Twenty-five years later, Twenty years after), Pauline Schmitt Pantel, Françoise Thébaud, and Gabriella Zarri—some of the female editors of *Histoire des femmes en Occident* and of *Storia delle donne in Italia* (*The History of Women in Italy*)—recall the planning stages of those early enterprises, recognizing the limitations (Eurocentricity, only white women, the absence of Jewish and Muslim communities) and innovative qualities (long-term duration, comparative, interdisciplinary) in their choice of themes, historical periods, and methodologies (39–46, 51–56, 57–68).

If in the 1970s research was driven by the push to recover a forgotten past, to rethink chronologies, caesurae, and themes of western history from the experiences of women, from the 1990s–2000s it has been the transnationalization of gender history guiding a "second battle for integration."¹¹ The essays from part 2 of the volume *Vingt-cinq ans après* follow this trend as they seek to overcome the small scale and national borders through the perspective of a history attentive to the exchange and transnational circulation of peoples, cultures, religions, practices, and knowledge.¹²

A roundtable inspired the 2018 volume, *Women's History at the Cutting Edge*. In 2015, Karen Offen and Chen Yan structured their position paper for the roundtable "Women's History at the Cutting Edge" around the following questions: in what measure and with what results is women's and gender history able to transform itself and to transform historiographic practices, breaking out of the borders of specialization and dialoguing with critical histories of colonialism and empire, studies of masculinity, and the innovative approaches of the "spatial turn" and cultural geography? The International Federation for Research in Women's History (IFRWH) organized the roundtable in Jinan as part of the XXII International Congress for the Historical Sciences, hosted for the first time in Asia.¹³ In this discussion between American, European, and Asian female researchers on the promises, acquisitions, and expectations for the future of women's and gender history, participants emphasized the significant differences between national contexts.¹⁴ In some contexts (Romania, Russia, China), the production of historical knowledge continues to be strongly directed by state politics and mechanisms of self-censorship prevalent in society. In others (the United States),

the reduction of opportunities and recruitment in the field of women's and gender history is bound up with the more general state of weakness of the humanities and the lack of historical awareness about the civic and cultural development of the country (5–9, 44–47). The linguistic factor tends to trap the non-English-speaking world in their respective historiographies within national borders, and it makes the processes of transnationalization more challenging, especially in conjunction with economic recessions that curtail research funding.

Offen and Chen's volume outlines a complex and often problematic picture for many of the world's women historians. In France, academics have started to overcome the frame of the nation-state partly thanks to the publication of bilingual journals (in French and English) and interdisciplinary e-journals such as *Femmes, Genre, Histoire* (Women, Gender, History) and *Genre, sexualité & société* (Gender, sexuality & society) (38–43). In Japan, there has been some positive change as well, through the birth of the Gender History Association, the Science Council initiatives taken during the 2000s in support of gender equality, and increased integration of gender in high school history textbooks. These changes have not come without backlash, as witnessed by the controversial (and still ongoing) affair of the insertion of “comfort women” in the narrative of Japanese imperialism (59–62). In the Japanese context, archives for the collection and conservation of primary sources of women's history are still scarce, as are local historical associations and libraries willing to collect objects from the ordinary people. This is in contrast to what has happened in western societies such as Canada, where there is a longer tradition of women's and gender history and women's grass-roots activism. Catherine Carstairs and Nancy Janovicek's essay in Offen and Chen's volume discusses the problems and hopes of Canadians since the 1990s. There were significant cuts to the budgets of federal institutions such as museums and archives between 2006 and 2015. Additionally, there was increased emphasis on the British cultural heritage of Canada, rather than on a diverse Canadian nation that includes women, Indigenous peoples, and other marginalized communities. Finally, the authors examine the persistent underrepresentation of minorities within the Canadian university system. One hopes for some reversal of these trends under Justin Trudeau's Liberal government (27–37).¹⁵

Although funding for research projects in the North American states remains considerable, many female authors express concern about the reduced number both of PhD students in history and of tenure-track positions as well as about the stalemate in the percentage of women full professors. This comes precisely at a historic global moment in which more women than men are enrolling in universities and graduating in the humanities (45). These authors underline, moreover, the imbalance between terminations and beginnings of careers, which renders the passing of the baton between generations overly complex (89–90). This is especially true in countries where the process of institutionalization of women's and gender history in the curricula started later and has been more controversial.

Italy is one such case. Teresa Bertilotti compares the Italian example to those raised in Offen and Chen's volume in her similarly named work, *Women's History at the Cutting Edge: An Italian Perspective*. Essays by Maria Pia Casalena and Simona Feci show that, on the Italian peninsula, the establishment of women's and gender history has not led to the creation of departments of women's and gender studies nor to the introduction of specific courses in the existing curricula, at least not up until the end of the 1990s. It has led, however, to the intertwining of cultural work, political activities, research disseminated in journals, centers of study, seminars, conferences, summer schools, published monograph series, and prizes. The Società Italiana delle Storiche (Italian Society of Women Historians), founded in 1989 outside of academia, is more akin to an association of women dedicated to historical research and education than to a group of women researchers with a particular expertise (29–43, 45–53). This lateral approach—open to the concerns of civil society, indebted to feminist perspectives, and capable of channeling the commitment and political passions of women from across the generations—has not resulted in an integration of women's and gender history in textbooks, mainstream historiography, or discussions in the media (TV programs, history festivals).¹⁶ The restrictions imposed by the pandemic appear to have stimulated women's historians to reach out to a wider audience through YouTube channels and the organization of live events made accessible on social media platforms.¹⁷

How can we overcome the limited diffusion of women's history's rich conceptual and analytical components into the wider domain of historical practice, mainstream historiography, and public perception? How can we identify and reinforce strategies to surmount the resistance to rethinking priorities, visions of the past, and prospects for the future in terms of gender? The proposals of the women authors in *Women's History on the Cutting Edge* branch out in many directions. Chen Yan wonders if incentivizing the history of sexuality and masculinity could favor a "gendering" of Chinese history. Maria Bucur invites us to refocus mainstream history on transnational questions such as the economic contribution of women and the pacifist movements that have developed around the globe outside mechanisms of masculinist power.¹⁸ Joanna De Groot examines intersectionality, which originates in African American feminist thought, as a useful analytical tool to seize upon the connections and tensions between the different relationships of power and subordination, without reducing them to restrictive hierarchies of oppression and exploitation. Intersectionality also modifies western ethnocentric assumptions about the primacy of gender and class. The synthesis of published research in English-speaking countries in the last decade shows how one of the most intriguing strengths of women's and gender history resides in its ability to intertwine the dynamics of intimacy and biography with the global and transnational. The field encourages studying the present of the global within domestic space, the familiar within the imperial, and the personal in the context of small and large-scale politics (107–109).

The interconnections between the personal and the political, between subjects and contexts, and between biography and historical identity are at the center of *Reshaping*

Women's History—edited by Julie E. Gallagher and Barbara Winslow and examining the “non-traditional” paths of the recipients of the Catherine Prelinger Award—and *No Straight Path*, a volume of auto-biographical writings collected by Elizabeth Jacoway. *No Straight Path* includes nine autobiographical essays written by the first cohort of women, born between the 1940s and the 1950s, who began to teach at the university level and who made careers in the history departments of the southern United States. They created professional associations of women (Southern Association for Women Historians); eventually, a younger woman historian (Elizabeth Anne Payne) joined them and the writing project through the Delta Women Writers Group.¹⁹ Both volumes chose autobiography as their form, leaving authors free to express themselves in a variety of ways, such as the useful exercise in collective reflection on the relationship between experience and life, social-political changes (laws, job market, the school and university systems), and the development of studies on women’s and gender history. They ask: What makes us who we are? If and how do we become women historians? How important is it to pursue “a life of the mind” in situations of economic hardship or war? Can we (or must we) think of a different kind of university outside the tortuous paths experienced by the majority of women who recount their stories in these books?

A common trait among the authors’ many life stories is the difficulty of keeping together the pieces (relationship and family life, political activism, research, teaching, managerial tasks), and succeeding, at the same time, to distinguish work requirements from those of the family, to not privilege one over the other. To be an “independent scholar,” in fact, can mean depending on the resources and the mobility of one’s partner, and this can translate into a solid and successful family strategy or into a painful knot to unravel (*Reshaping Women's History*, 14–27; *No Straight Path*, 55–76). Generally, the awareness of core parts of academic life and the basic mechanisms of universities appears scarce or inadequate across various age cohorts (*No Straight Path*, 103–121). Sheila Skemp explains in *No Straight Path*, “And so, totally clueless, I proceeded. . . . I was flying blind” (32). The construction of a gendered vocabulary to help understand and challenge discrimination is slow. Beverly Greene Bond remembers that in 1963 the State University of Memphis was not a “very welcoming place for a young black woman.” One of the first Black women to become a teacher instead of a janitor in the white high schools, she emphasizes that “while some may assume that gender can be a natural mortar cementing relations between black and white women, this is seldom the case, especially when history (not the discipline but the reality) comes into play” (*No Straight Path*, 88, 94). Sylvia Frey, who grew up in Louisiana in a family with French and German ancestry, affirms that her “understanding of equality was developed from and was still limited to race”; later, her “awareness of the need to take gender as seriously as other forms of discrimination developed in tandem with the women’s movement” (*No Straight Path*, 191).

Until recent years, being a professional historian was not considered a career for women to build, which particularly exposed many women’s journeys to the winds of fortune, or to the opportunities of family and national background (*No Straight*

Path, 166–181). For the women born in the immediate postwar period, continuing their studies after college, transferring to another state, or committing themselves to politics and as volunteers during the civil rights movements in the 1960s did not mean “choosing” a profession, but meant escaping family problems, the “small world” of the community, or other issues. Only later would they rediscover their families or communities as women “historian[s]” (*No Straight Path*, 55–76, 122–140, 182–225). “Becoming Women Historians” can therefore be expressed in various ways: not only by access to an academic career, but also in the story of how one comes to do research and publish an essay or a book through long trajectories that go by way of teaching and other jobs, such as office work. Educated in women’s colleges or with only white male professors, a part of this generation arrived at women’s and gender history through the political history of Roosevelt’s America and the New Deal, through the attention to republicanism and to slavery during the Revolutionary War, through the struggle for desegregation, through the “self-approach,” and, above all, through programs on oral history.²⁰ A comparison between the historiographic phases of European countries between the 1970s and the 2000s would be intriguing. How does women’s and gender history change in the period of early grassroots history, then with the “cultural turn,” and then in the most recent “post-colonial turn”?

In *Reshaping Women’s History: Voices of Nontraditional Women Historians*, eighteen scholars who have been awarded the Prelinger award between 1998 and 2016 describe the singularity and the irregularity of their training paths in different times and places in the US and the (tangible and intangible) support represented by scholarships. In the process, they demonstrate how, and how much, research has transformed their lives. The money made available to them not only allowed them to complete research, create archives, and publish doctoral theses—often later in life, with more extended timelines in comparison to when they completed their first drafts—but helped to provide meaning and value to their work. The prize and money attached to it helped some of the recipients to, in the words of Pamela Stewart, “create a new life out of one no longer working.” A mother of five, Stewart lived a wretched and unhappy existence in a Mormon community with an abusive and dishonest husband, but she found the strength to go back to school at the University of North Texas, to divorce, and to love women. The 2001 prize that supported her research on the women revolutionaries at the Paris Commune allowed her to “stay on that new path” and to acquire the necessary degrees to teach history at Arizona State University. In various passages, Stewart returns to the importance of studying and teaching the history of the lives of women, especially for those who will never be women historians with an academic career. “History grants me community, often with women who endured significantly more challenges than I did, allowing me to see possibilities,” she writes (55, 44). Stewart’s experience shows that history can be a stepping stone towards becoming aware of the silences and consequences (individual and familiar) and of their political implications; it can unveil class privileges and racial prejudices that obligate one to overcome the apparent natural order of things (1–13). Rickie Solinger, in her essay, lingers on the silences of

her own family and of the Jewish community in Cincinnati about the Holocaust, as well as on the discrimination suffered by African Americans migrating from Alabama to Ohio. “Coming to terms with the content and consequences of those pointed adult silences was a process that turned me toward becoming a historian,” she explains (29).

Some authors in *Reshaping Women's History* discuss the absence of African American and Hispanic women in higher education for much of the twentieth century and how that has created a gap, long difficult to bridge, between the “living” history told in families, specifically by women who carried out an essential function in the transmission of genealogies and practices, the stories of pain and migrations, in religious education, and that of the history taught in schools. There, history was a sequence of dates and the events of the military and political history of men (207–221, 141–165). Annette Rodriguez, a woman of Mexican heritage, writes about her time in New Mexico's schools: “I had little historical background to link me to a historical tradition” (238).

The relationship between feminist activism and research has changed and reformed itself over time; the activism has shifted from protests against the war in Vietnam to environmental and reproductive issues, from domestic violence to human rights (56–70, 153–180). However, no matter the movement, a pattern emerges of individuals aspiring to connect research to human actions and choices, to bring to the political debate the voices and points of view of women from the subaltern classes with an approach of “crossover history”—to use Darlene Clark Hine's phrase—that goes beyond ethnic affiliations (166–180, 113–126).²¹ This research ultimately unveils relationships of power. As women historians, we continue to ask ourselves, how can historical knowledge favor the empowerment of women against the resurgence of racism and sexism? And what is the role that women historians can have in connecting schools, universities, and communities in the project of promoting change and greater social and gender justice? Actively involved outside of academia, specifically after the disasters of Hurricane Katrina, Sylvia Frey in *No Straight Path* writes: “to act as an education activist . . . erases the sharp line drawn between academic and public history. It recognizes that the living have voices and that change, if it is to endure, must be led by the community itself, which in practice means the right to speak for themselves. . . . Never before, perhaps, has there been such a public need for history as there is today” (198–199).

Notes

¹Mary Njeri Kinyanjui, Roopal Thaker, and Kathryn Toure, eds., *Covid Stories from East Africa and Beyond: Lived Experiences and Forward-Looking Reflections* (Bamenda, Cameroon: Langaa RPCIG, 2020).

²Helen Kara, Su-ming Khoo, *Researching in the Age of COVID-19*, 3 vols. (Bristol, UK: Policy Press, 2020); Constanza Tabbush and Elisabeth Jay Friedman, “Feminist Activism Confronts COVID-19,” *Feminist Studies* 46, no. 3 (2020): 629–638.

³Eileen Boris and Nupur Chaudhuri, eds., *Voices of Women Historians: The Personal, the Political, the Professional* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999).

⁴Hilda L. Smith, "A Prize-Winning Book Revisited. Women Historians and Women's History: A Conflation of Absence," *The Journal of Women's History* 4, no. 1 (Spring 1992): 133–141; Bonnie G. Smith, "Whose Truth, Whose History?" *Journal of the History of Ideas* 56, no. 4 (1995): 661–668.

⁵Bonnie G. Smith, "The Contribution of Women to Modern Historiography in Great Britain, France, and the United States, 1750–1940," *The American Historical Review* 89, no. 3 (June 1984): 709–732; Bonnie G. Smith, *The Gender of History: Men, Women, and Historical Practice* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998); Bonnie G. Smith, "Conclusion: Understanding Women Historians' Lives and Scholarly Reputations Both Within and Outside the Academy," in *Generations of Women Historians*, 306.

⁶Elizabeth Anne Payne, *Writing Women's History: A Tribute to Anne Fior Scott* (Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2011).

⁷See in particular part 2: *Politics and Citizenship in Early Modern Britain* and part 3: *Women and Modern Politics*.

⁸See, for instance, Nupur Chaudhuri and Elizabeth Perry, "Achievements and Battles: Twenty-Five Years of CCWHP," *Journal of Women's History* 6, no. 3 (Fall 1994): 97–105.

⁹*Histoire des femmes en Occident* [A history of women in the West], 5 vols. (Paris: Plon, 1991); *Storia delle donne in Italia* [The history of women in Italy], 4 vols. (Rome-Bari: Laterza, 1994–1997).

¹⁰Tracey Rizzo and Steven Gerontakis, *Intimate Empires: Body, Race, and Gender in the Modern World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017); Bonnie G. Smith, *Modern Empires: A Reader* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).

¹¹Mary Louise Roberts, "The Transnationalization of Gender History," *History and Theory* 44, no. 3 (2005): 456–468, quote on 461. See also Françoise Thébaud, *Écrire l'Histoire des Femmes et du Genre* [Writing the history of women and gender] (Lyon: ENS Éditions, 2007).

¹²For a recent example of this approach in the European context, see Martin Baumeister, Philipp Lenhard, and Ruth Nattermann, eds., *Rethinking the Age of Emancipation: Comparative and Transnational Perspectives on Gender, Family, and Religion in Italy and Germany, 1800–1918* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2020).

¹³The seven contributions collected in the volume *Women's History at the Cutting Edge* were originally published in a special issue of *Women's History Review* 27, no. 1 (2018).

¹⁴Contributions from India, Africa, and from the Middle East are not present, even though some of the female historians involved in the discussion are experts in these areas, and neither from Southern Europe.

¹⁵See the federal government's plans for the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the founding of Canada. Since 2015, strategies to "Indigenize" universities have begun in response to the work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

¹⁶Marco Rovinello, "Esserci per non essere. Donne, LGBTIQ+ e genere nei manuali per le superiori" [Being there for not being. Women, LGBTIQ+, and gender in high school textbooks], *Genesis* 19, no. 1 (2020): 93–119.

¹⁷In October 2020, the Italian Society of Women Historians opened a channel on YouTube where they uploaded online events that took place during the pandemic.

¹⁸See also Maria Bucur, *The Century of Women: How Women Have Transformed the World Since 1900* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2018).

¹⁹Active for over ten years, the group comprises about twenty women historians between the ages of 20 and 70 who live in the Mississippi delta (from Memphis to New Orleans) and who get together twice a year in Jackson to discuss their work, ranging from American history to global history. Martha Swain was one of the early cohort born before the 1940s.

²⁰In particular, see the Southern Oral History Program founded in 1973 at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill by Jacquelyn Dowd Hall. For her recent monograph, see Jacquelyn Dowd Hall, *Sisters and Rebels: A Struggle for the Soul of America* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2019).

²¹Darlene Clark Hine, “Black Women’s History, White Women’s History: The Juncture of Race and Class,” *Journal of Women’s History* 4, no. 2, (Fall 1992): 125–133.