



clio

AMONG THE MEDIA

Newsletter of the History Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication



notes from the head

‘We have a lot to do’ in 2004-05

By Pat McNeely
Head
South Carolina

When I was growing up, I loved to listen to my mother and grandmother talk about their memories of the past, and I loved to sit in the pecan tree in front of our house and read from a faded red history book that had been passed down in our family.

Even though I turned to a life of writing and teaching, history—in all its forms—has also been one of my passions and an integral part of my life. Not a day passes that I don’t relive in my mind some of those precious moments. Not a day passes that I don’t find some new, interesting historical nugget. And not a day passes that I don’t teach history in some way in my classes—even when it’s not a history class.

See Notes, page 2

Research papers and the purpose of history

By Dane S. Claussen
Vice Head/Research Chair
Point Park

It may seem an odd question for me to be asking, given my emphatic rejection of the anti-intellectual waves sweeping over U.S. higher education during the last 20 years and never too far off-shore before that, to wit: that college education must be practical and prepare students for jobs; that applied research is the best research, even in the sciences where fresh basic research now can lead to much applied research later, etc.

But there it was: what is the purpose of papers on mass communication history delivered at academic conferences and conventions? But my question was not anti-intellectual, since I was not questioning the value of history itself. It was more along the lines of: how can we waste less time, energy, and money on mass communication history research that is unproductive for our subdiscipline (of both history generally and of mass communication generally) and get on with more original research?

It also was peculiar that I was “picking on” history, since media historians do not suffer from anywhere near the number of methodological problems that crop up in, say, the Magazine Division (in which I also have been active) or deal with questions that may never

be resolved in any more than a hypothetical kind of way (think certain research in the Law Division).

But it seems to be time to revisit the reasons why a historian researches one topic rather than another, and why he or she reads one article or book rather than all of the others. (For instance, one could spend the rest of his or her life reading about nothing but the Civil War or World War II and never read the same sentence twice—unless of course one is reading Stephen Ambrose and earlier literature.....)

Over the past 10 years, at regional and national conferences, I have listened to mass communication history papers justified many ways: that the paper reported new findings from original sources; the paper reinterpreted the conclusions of others’ readings of original sources; the paper was correcting flat-out errors in previous historians’ work; the paper was introducing into the discipline of mass communication some historical knowledge of interest to mass communication that hitherto was known or understood only in other disciplines; the paper was bringing together knowledge and understanding from history or mass communication, plus some other discipline, in a fresh interdisciplinary way; the paper was

See Research papers, page 2

Research papers, from page 1

intended to inspire others through a great example; the paper was drawing parallels between a historical event and something going on in the present; the paper was showing how past events were the result of conscious choices and that the present can be changed in part because the past could have happened differently; the paper was in essence reminding the subdiscipline of mass communication history about some figure or periodical or event or trend or issue that it has basically forgotten or at least underemphasized, and so on. Especially with historical writing free from the constraint of developing formal hypotheses and/or research questions, then there are those papers that don't even imply a purpose for themselves, other than the author found the subject interesting.

Since mass communication historians produce relatively fewer papers that are truly dreadful (I can think of one presented at AEJMC/AJHA Northeast in New York City a couple of years ago that exhibited appalling ignorance about both the Great Depression and the history of one of America's largest cities), again it may seem like my hectoring would be of more value elsewhere. But of course sometimes papers seem to say the obvious or even the inaccurate because a poor "literature review" (I'll use the social scientific term

here even though history is not a social science) failed to make obvious that what is being considered for presentation already has been said—perhaps many times. While a poor literature review is not terribly uncommon and also not excusable, the bigger problem is when a journalism historian knows

Startt and Sloan's 'criteria of "good" history' would go a long way toward prompting media historians to identify the purpose of any paper, article, or book.

that he is covering well-trod ground, and not saying anything new or different, and decides to present it anyway. (Some will say that the present article does that, to which I confess; however, this article has not been refereed by busy colleagues.)

James D. Startt and Wm. David Sloan, in their 2003 revised edition

of *Historical Methods in Mass Communication*, provide us with an exhaustive list of results that history may accomplish: "explain particular things of the past with fullness and truth"; "capture and relate the thought and feeling of a time past"; "comprehend ["things"] in their fullness of meaning"; be "informative about human behavior, about how people have related to one another, and about how they have interacted with the conditions of their time"; provide "information important for identity and background"; offer "knowledge of what others have done before helps one to understand what it is possible to do," and so on. (Startt and Sloan also sometimes tell us what history is not for: "neither to justify an action of the past nor to offer facile judgments about the past nor to suggest careless analogies between the past and present.") Strangely, however, they do not directly address many of the purposes publicly claimed by mass communication historians who are presenting papers.

The bottom line, Startt and Sloan write, is that history is researched for "many reasons," among which are "seeking] to close gaps in some important segment of the existing historical record. Others aspire to advance a new idea." They obviously could be quoted at much greater length here, but suffice

see Research papers, page 3

Notes, from page 1

I know that all of you have similar stories to tell about someone or something that sparked your interest in history, which makes history one of the elements of AEJMC that crosses all of our lives, as well as all divisions, interest groups and commissions. Those are all good reasons for us to want to bring more members into our Division.

Right now, we have 484 members in the History Division, which puts us in fourth place behind three other divi-

sions: newspaper with 740; mass communications and society with 653; and public relations with 549. Since there are 17 divisions, 10 interest groups and two commissions, that makes us one of the most significant parts of AEJMC. Preserving our past is an important job and an incredible hobby, and we need all the help we can get, which is another one of those good reasons for us to reach out for more members—to read, research and write history. I just

checked with the AEJMC office and found that anyone who is already a member can join the history division at any time just by sending our \$7.50 annual history dues to Rich Burke, AEJMC, 234 Outlet Pointe Blvd., Suite A, Columbia, SC 29210-5667.

We don't have to wait for annual dues to be due. So I'll make a deal with you.

I'll personally recruit five new

see Notes, page 3

Research papers, from page 2

it to say that their book does not suggest putting energy into introducing into the discipline of mass communication some historical knowledge of interest to mass communication that hitherto was known or understood only in other disciplines; or reminding the subdiscipline of mass communication history about some figure or periodical or event or trend or issue that it has forgotten or at least underemphasized. They assume and state that historical research often is, even must be, interdisciplinary, and imply that information about, and interpretations of, mass communication history found in other disciplines can be, must be, found by mass communication historians and that doing so hardly constitutes a fresh discovery.

Startt and Sloan's "criteria of 'good history'" would go a long way toward prompting media historians to force themselves to specify the purpose behind any paper, article, or book. Their first criterion is "topic definition," which includes being "clearly defined and significant"; note that merely being interesting to the historian is not mentioned and therefore is not enough. The second criterion is "bibliographic soundness," the accomplishment of which prevents one from unknowingly stating what others already know. The third is "research"

that "rests upon primary sources with secondary sources employed only with discretion"; it is no accident that almost all conference papers of dubious value rely more heavily on secondary sources than the high quality, truly intriguing ones. The fourth is "accuracy." The fifth is "explanation," which most of the poorer papers either do not really attempt at all, or they attempt too freely given the lack of primary sources. The sixth is "historical understanding," and no paper should be delivered before the author/scholar is sure that he/she has achieved that. (The seventh criterion is, of course, "writing"—good writing.)

Much later in their book, Startt and Sloan address the purpose issue a second time, and more explicitly. About David Dary's book, *Red Blood & Black Ink*, they ask, before answering it, "For what purpose" [was the book written]? About Stephen Koss's biography of A.G. Gardiner, they again rhetorically ask, "Why should Gardiner's biography be written?" They then discuss, in turn, the purposes of presenting interpretation, causation and/or theory in historical writing. Historical research has a purpose if it advances a new interpretation, or provides new evidence for an existing interpretation, especially one that is controversial. And interpretation is easy to, as Startt and Sloan put it, "mismanage."

Explaining causation in history also is "complex," as Startt and Sloan put it, and has been "subjected to much abuse." As for theory, Startt and Sloan admit that it is problematic, but that a historian at least can have, probably should have, a theory in the form of a hypothesis about interpretation and/or causation—"an explanation to be adapted, developed, or rejected." However, as we see in too many mass communication history papers, no interpretation, causation, or even theory in the form of an identifiable (if not formally stated) hypothesis can be located—the paper is simply a collection of facts, no matter how well written.

As Startt and Sloan point out even later, "It is easier to have a paper accepted for presentation at a conference than to have an article accepted for publication. Consequently, historians sometimes let their research and writing quality slip when preparing a submission for a paper competition. Such a practice should be avoided."

Amen.



Dane S. Claussen is associate professor and graduate program director, Department of Journalism and Mass Communication, Point Park University, Pittsburgh, Pa. His latest book, covering 1944 through 1996, is Anti-intellectualism in American Media: Magazines and Higher Education (Lang, 2004).

Notes, from page 2

members for the History Division if each one of you will get just one. Even if I have to offer to pay their dues for them (\$7.50 per person), that would be a bargain. Let's try to do this by December when I plan to call Rich Burke and ask how many new members we have in our division. I'm hoping he won't say that he just has the five new members that I'll be sending over.

But even if we get a lot of new members, our job won't be done. We need to encourage them to submit a paper for the Southeast Colloquium, which will be held at the University of Georgia in Athens next year, as well as a paper for the San Antonio conference. We need to invite them to our members' meeting at the AEJMC convention, and we need to ask them to write for *Clio*, serve on committees

and help in other ways.

We have a lot to do this year.



Pat McNeely is the Eleanor M. and R. Frank Mundy Professor at the University of South Carolina School of Journalism and Mass Communications, where she chairs the print and electronic sequence and teaches writing, reporting, and history. McNeely is the author of three books. She is head of the AEJMC history division in 2004-05.

Excerpts from the Division's annual report

Research

The History Division's strongest "activity" in academic year 2003-2004 was research. Our tradition of excellence continued with competitive paper competitions at the annual and midyear conferences, which produced much significant scholarship.

At the AEJMC convention in August 2004 in Toronto, authors presented 33 refereed research papers, and the Division honored four faculty and four students with awards for research. The Division also continued the tradition of providing travel funding through the Edwin Emery Travel Fund, as well as complimentary conference registration, to the authors of top student papers. This practice helps young history scholars by encouraging them to submit and present research.

The Division presented its annual award for the best scholarly article on media history (the Catherine Covert Award), and this year celebrated the award's 20th anniversary with a panel featuring top history scholars. Karen List, the award coordinator, wrote an article about Covert's legacy for the Spring issue of the Division's newsletter,

Clio, and planned the anniversary event.

History scholars also presented research in competitive paper competitions at the Southeast Colloquium in Tampa, Florida, in March 2004, and the Northeast Regional Journalism History Conference (co-sponsored with the American Journalism Historians Association) in March 2004 in New York City. Three top paper awards (one faculty and two students) were given for research by the Division at the Southeast Colloquium, where 15 refereed papers were presented.

Although the Division typically presents an annual award for the best book in media history, the awards committee decided, after evaluating nominations, not to present an award this year. However, in the area of book publishing, the Division took the lead co-sponsoring a panel with the Public Relations Division on publishing scholarly research in book form.

History Division research featured a range of methodologies, informed by a variety of theoretical viewpoints. Repeating successful efforts in the past, the Division co-sponsored a research session in Toronto with the Magazine

Division to emphasize the examination of the history of long-form journalism, and we co-sponsored a research session with the Commission on the Status of Women as a way of spotlighting historical scholarship on gender issues. Competitive paper topics included: attempts to curb circulation of abolitionist newspapers in the 1830s, press coverage of Jackie Robinson and the Salvadorian Civil War, media history's pedagogy, diversity of editorial opinions in daily newspapers historically, the presence of myth in the coverage of the Persian Gulf War, the photographic portrayal of U.S. racial violence in the 1950s and 1960s, the Double V campaign in World War II, the "other" Hutchins Commission, and political cartoons of the 1884 presidential campaign, to name a few.

Thus the History Division continues in its mission to provide a multidisciplinary and intercultural forum for historical research in all types of mass communication, as well as themes that are relevant across different types of media. This breadth is the primary "contribution to the field" made by this

see Excerpts, page 5



clio AMONG THE MEDIA

Editor: *W. Joseph Campbell (American University)*

Layout and design: *Wesley Schauble (American University)*

Webmaster: *Kittrell Rushing (University of Tennessee-Chattanooga)*

Clio Among the Media is published quarterly by the History Division of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication.

Submissions to Clio are welcome. Please send them to: W. Joseph Campbell, School of Communication, American University, Washington, DC, 20016-8017. Electronic copy, either disk or e-mail, is preferred. For information, call Campbell at 202/885-2071, or e-mail him at: wjc@american.edu.

Excerpts, from page 4

year's Divisional body of research.

The Division continues its outreach to the other major organization of media historians, the American Journalism Historians Association. This year the Division co-sponsored a midyear conference with AJHA in New York City.

The Division continues to foster discussion of research topics and practice through *Clio*, one of AEJMC's finest newsletters, and its listserv. The newsletter regularly lists calls for papers, articles, and chapters; announcements of research competitions and conferences; and articles about the state of media history. This year's winter issue featured an article on generating enthusiasm for historical research among students, and another that warned historians about the dangers of memory and myth when writing historical narrative. Still another article, published in the spring issue, evaluated the tensions between social science and humanities in historical research.

Teaching

The History Division embraces the importance of teaching excellence at undergraduate and graduate levels, and supports teaching by sponsoring conference panels, by publishing articles about teaching in the Division newsletter, and by helping new history teacher/scholars succeed in the academy. This year, we weight teaching as our second most important area of activity.

The Division prides itself for its on-going support of the next generation of history teachers and scholars, the student members of the AEJMC History Division. The Division's outreach efforts across the board are aimed and assisting them in becoming entry-level members of the academy with the skills and dedication needed to succeed as effective and passionate teachers of media history. We do that both by supporting their attendance at conferences (with not only research awards, but

cash prizes and travel stipends for winners), and by sponsoring activities that focus on teaching excellence, including articles published in *Clio*, and panels at the annual conferences.

For example, this year the Division invited the Graduate Education Interest Group to co-sponsor the Twentieth Anniversary Celebration of the Catherine Covert Award for Research Excellence. The award is given to the best article on historical research published during the year. For the panel, we invited top history scholars and teachers, and asked them to focus their presentations on the future of teaching and researching media history with a graduate student audience in mind. The panel gave students an opportunity to meet and mingle with some of the finest historians in AEJMC.

The Division also strives to keep educators up to date about trends in the industry, focusing on historical context. Another of our teaching panels (co-sponsored by the Magazine Division) focused on "The Evolution of Web Logs and Their Journalistic Promise," which included industry experts Elizabeth Spiers from *New York* magazine and Mickey Kaus of *kausfiles.com*. The panel sought to help scholars understand the "Blog" phenomenon, and "how such personal long-form journalism has shaped both the past and perhaps the future of journalism," according to David Abrahamson who submitted the panel proposal. Division members also participated in panels at the Southeast Colloquium on "Jumpstarting Academic Professionalism: Graduate Students as Organization Officers, Moderators and Book Reviewers" and "Ideas and Angles: Helping Students Write Feature Stories."

As in past years, the Division newsletter focused on teaching excellence at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Division Teaching Standards Chair Ford Risley wrote an article for the Fall 2003 newsletter, the "Battle to

beat 'Net plagiarism," which offered teachers a variety of ways to battle the problem of student cheating. Division Head Janice Hume, in that same issue, focused her "Notes from the Head" column on "the fire to inspire," and the myriad ways history and "public memory" are used in journalism classes. Paulette Kilmer wrote about the same kinds of issues in "Those 'Big Fish,' historians and 'the one that got away'" in the Winter issue. Colleen Callahan, in "Far away and personal, Generating enthusiasm for history proves 'relative'" (published in the Winter issue), shared a terrific assignment she uses in her undergraduate History of Mass Communication class, a comparative analysis called "18th Birthdays." And Dane Claussen, *Clio* editor, wrote about the tension between social sciences and the humanities, offering valuable insight to those who teach graduate level historical methods classes.

PF&R

The History Division believes strongly in supporting professional freedom and responsibility, and did so this year. This activity area is weighted third for 2003-2004. We continued our tradition of reaching out to professionals and to other interest groups to produce programming and publications reflecting PF&R topics. We worked with other groups in sponsoring both research and panel sessions and produced a variety of panels reflecting PF&R concerns. We served our outreach goals not only through our conference programming but through the J-History listserv.

History Division was the lead sponsor for several panels at the Toronto conference that concerned important PF&R issues. The panel "Referencing the Past in Documentaries" (co-sponsored by Radio and Television Journalism) explored the ethical tension

see Excerpts, page 6

between the qualities of visual media and the depth and detail required for historical scholarship. This panel featured award-winning independent documentary film producer Eric Stange. Authors of several dozen media history monographs and textbooks shared insight about the media publishing industry in another panel (co-sponsored by the Public Relations Division). Still other panels explored important ethical and diversity issues, including "Myth and Media History: Accounting for a Distorted Record" and "Women's Work: The Influence of ideas in Women's Movements."

Twenty-five competitive papers presented at Toronto and at mid-year conferences dealt with areas of ethics, free expression, media criticism and accountability, race, gender, inclusion and public service.

Goals

New goals for 2004-2005 are:

- Increase the active involvement of graduate students in Division activities.
- Seek a review of the judging form for the competitive paper competition to ensure that major flaws and deletions in papers are accounted for in the numbers.

Continuing goals are to:

- Increase the active involvement of Division members in producing and presenting research at our conferences. This is something we can always improve upon.
- Increase our efforts to stress the importance of history in the curriculum. Members have repeatedly expressed concerns at history's seeming loss of status in the nation's journalism

and mass communication programs. The Division will strive to undertake programs to help our members meet this challenge in their colleges and universities.

- Increase our activities in the area of teaching, a goal which has historically received less attention in our Division than have research and PF&R.

The Standing Committee can help us to meet these goals by reassessing the number of topics, themes, and events

Forty-two faculty research papers were submitted for prospective presentation at Toronto and 24 (or 57%) were accepted. Seventeen student papers were submitted and nine (or 53%) were accepted.

we are expected to address within each area of activity.

Our programming over the last year reflects the attainment of two out of three goals. We need to heighten our efforts to encourage member involvement. Graduate student (and faculty) paper submissions were down this year, likely because of the distance and expense of attending the Toronto conference. However, our lively newsletter and program of panels included new

and different topics related to teaching, research, and PF&R.

Conference papers

Forty-two faculty research papers were submitted for prospective presentation at the Toronto convention, Twenty-four (or 57%) were accepted.

Seventeen student research papers were submitted and nine (or 53%) were accepted.

Overview of judging process: The judging of research papers was accomplished as recommended in "Judging the Research Paper Competition Fairly."

The judging process was similar to that followed by the Division in previous years. Experts in the United States and Canada were solicited to serve as reviewers for the Division's paper competition. These solicitations were made via the Division's newsletter, the Division's email listserv, and related listservs.

Judges were selected from the Division's pool, using those known to evaluate research carefully and fairly. No graduate students were used as judges. Judges read three or four papers each (with two exceptions), and each paper was read by three judges. In allotting papers to judges, care was taken to avoid potential conflicts of interest. Additionally, all submitted papers were reviewed before being mailed to judges to ensure that all author and institutional identification was removed or obscured.

The judges provided quantitative feedback using a Likert scale measuring

see Excerpts, page 7

History Division officers, 2004-05

Head: Patricia McNeely (South Carolina)

Vice Head: Dane Claussen (Point Park)

Secretary/Newsletter editor: W. Joseph Campbell (American)

PF&R Chair: Earnest Perry (Missouri)

Teaching Standards Chair: David Copeland (Elon)

Research Chair: Dane Claussen (Point Park)

Webmaster: Kittrell Rushing (Tennessee-Chattanooga)

Book Award Chair: Patrick Washburn (Ohio)

Covert Award Chair: Karen List (Massachusetts)

a list of qualities, as well as qualitative feedback in extensive written comments. Judges also were asked to rank the papers they read. The Research Chair tabulated the quantitative results for each paper, and then accepted or rejected papers based on those numbers as well as on the acceptance recommendations and qualitative comments.

Raw rating scores from the evaluation forms were used to create standardized scores for all the submitted papers. Following the procedures outlined in the "Standardized Scoring" appendix to "Tips on Evaluating Papers from the AEJMC Standing Committee on Research," z-scores were derived from the evaluation forms.

Given the both Division's success in recent years in encouraging student research and the resulting high quality of student submissions, it was decided to continue the tradition of simply combining student papers with those submitted by faculty for the purposes of judging.

Neither the Research Chair nor the Division Head submitted a paper in this Division.

Four faculty and four student papers were recognized at the Toronto convention as the Division's best research papers. Names of the winners and the titles of their papers follow.

Top faculty papers

First Place: **Elizabeth V. Burt**, Hartford. "Not in Mexico but in Colorado!: Newspapers' Responses to the Ludlow Massacre."

Second Place: **Jane Marcellus**, Middle Tennessee State. "These Working Wives: The Two Job Woman in Interwar Magazines."

Third Place: **Linda J. Lumsden**, Western Kentucky. "Woman's Angle in War: World War II Reporter Ruth Cowan Nash's Tightrope Act Across the Separate Spheres."

Fourth Place: **Randall Patnode**, Xavier. "Path Not Taken: Wired Wireless and Broadcasting in the 1920s."

Top student papers

First Place: **John F. Kirch**, Maryland. "Raymond Bonner and the Salvadoran Civil War: 1980 to 1983."

Second Place: **Kimberly Mangun**, Oregon. "The (Oregon) *Advocate*: Boosting the Race and Portland, Too."

Third Place: **Kevin R. Kemper**, Missouri. "'WE SHALL NOT SUBMIT': How the Twenty-Fourth Congress and the Jackson

Administration Attempted and Failed to Stop the Circulation of Abolitionist Publications through the U.S. Post Office during the late 1830s."

Fourth Place: **Laura Resnick**, Ohio. "Shot Down: the Women Air Force Service Pilots and the U.S. media."

The History Division annual report was submitted by Janice Hume, Georgia, Division Head, 2003-04.

Honoring the memory of Peggy Blanchard

The History Division honored the memory of Margaret "Peggy" Blanchard at the Toronto Convention by distributing 400 tribute ribbons among Division members and other convention-goers.

The Division's annual business meeting opened with tributes to Blanchard, a media historian and First Amendment scholar who died in May 2004. A number of Blanchard's colleagues at UNC-Chapel Hill and former students spoke at the meeting about her scholarship and her collegiality.

Blanchard's 1992 book, *Revolutionary Sparks: Freedom of Expression in Modern America*, was nominated for a Pulitzer Prize in history. She was the author of two other books and was editor of *Mass Media History Encyclopedia*.

2004 History Division research paper judges

Ford Risley/Penn State

Kit Rushing/

Tennessee-Chattanooga

W. Joseph Campbell/American

Ginger Rudeseal Carter/

Georgia College

Barbara Reed/Rutgers

Dane Claussen/Point Park

Agnes Hooper Gottlieb/Seton Hall

David Sachsman/

Tennessee-Chattanooga

Dwight Teeter/Tennessee

Bill Click/Winthrop

Frank Fee/UNC-Chapel Hill

Lillie Fears/Arkansas State

Jim Upshaw/Oregon

David Copeland/Elon

Pat Curtin/UNC-Chapel Hill

Carolyn Kitch/Temple

Ann Colbert/Purdue

Paulette Kilmer/Toledo

Hazel Dicken- Garcia/Minnesota

Catherine Mitchell/Tennessee

Scott Fosdick/Missouri

David Spencer/Western Ontario

Andrea Tanner/South Carolina

Mike Sweeney/Utah State

Pat Washburn/Ohio

Leonard Teel/Georgia State

David Davies/Southern Mississippi

Jane S. McConnell/Minnesota State

Aleen Ratzlaff/Tabor

T. Harrell Allen/East Carolina

Sonya Duhe/South Carolina

Henry Price/South Carolina

Richard Junger/Western Michigan

Wally Eberhard/Georgia

Joe Mirando/Southeast Louisiana

Brad Hamm/Elon

David Abrahamson/

Northwestern

Dru Riley Evarts/Ohio

Joe Bernt/Ohio

Brian Thornton/Northern Illinois

Marilyn Sarrow/Winthrop

Carl Sessions Stepp/Maryland

Debbie Van Tuyl/

Augusta State-Georgia

Ron Farrar/South Carolina

Janice Hume/Georgia

Ernie Wiggins/South Carolina

History Division business meeting minutes, August 2004

The History Division's annual members' meeting was called to order shortly after 6:45 p.m. on August 6, 2004, by Head Janice Hume of the University of Georgia. In attendance were Vice Head/Research Chair Pat McNeely of the University of South Carolina; Secretary/*Clio* Editor Dane S. Claussen of Point Park University; PF&R Committee Chair Earnest Perry of the University of Missouri-Columbia; Teaching Standards Committee Chair Ford Risley of Pennsylvania State University; and about 25 other members.

Hume allowed time for remembrances of Margaret "Peggy" Blanchard of the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, a noted media historian and First Amendment scholar who died in May 2004. Several persons in attendance, including Blanchard's colleagues at the North Carolina, offered tributes to her life and scholarship.

Hume reported that the Division's treasury had nearly \$4,000, owing to a large membership and the minimal expenses of publishing the Division's newsletter electronically. She also said

the Division continues to subsidize from membership dues the travel grants to graduate students, covering shortfalls in the Emery fund.

Pat Washburn of Ohio University, chair of the judges' committee for the Division's annual Book Award, announced that no award was given for books published in 2003.

Minutes of the 2003 annual Members' Meeting were approved unanimously by those present.

Past Head David T.Z. Mindich explained that recent moves by the H-NET listserv system at Michigan State University necessitated the Division to take a vote on what the exact nature of the relationship between the Division's JHISTORY listserv, and H-NET. Previously, JHISTORY had operated with the understanding that it owned its own content, even though it was part of the H-NET system, an arrangement H-NET was not willing to continue. The three options presented by Mindich were withdrawing from H-NET; allowing JHISTORY to be owned by H-NET; or arranging for JHISTORY to be co-owned by H-NET

and the AEJMC History Division. The third option was approved unanimously.

Hume asked members to provide her with input about suggested future convention sites.

Vice-Head McNeely presented top faculty and student research paper awards. Elizabeth Burt of the University of Hartford received the first place award in the faculty paper competition for her paper, "Not in Mexico but in Colorado!: Newspapers' Responses to the Ludlow Massacre." John F. Kirch of Maryland who the student competition for his paper, "Raymond Bonner and the Salvadoran Civil War: 1980 to 1983."

McNeely then presented Hume with a plaque recognizing her accomplishments during her year as Division Head. McNeely asked that Division members commit themselves to recruiting one new member each during the coming year.

She also asked for panel ideas for the 2005 AEJMC convention in San Antonio.

The meeting was adjourned.

Call for papers: Southeast Colloquium meets in Athens in early March

Members of AEJMC's History, Law, Magazine, Newspaper and RTVJ divisions will convene in Athens, Georgia, on March 3-5, 2005, at the annual Southeast Colloquium. Host for the Colloquium will be the Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Georgia.

In keeping with Colloquium tradition, each participating division will accept research papers for sessions. In addition, researchers can submit papers on other topics to the "open" competition.

Send three blind copies, one

original and a 250-word abstract. On the cover page of the original, state the division for which the paper is intended, the paper's title, as well as the name, title, affiliation, address, office phone, home phone, fax and e-mail address of the author(s). On the cover page of three blind copies, note the division for which the paper is intended as well as the paper's title. Include no information that identifies the author(s). Authors may submit papers in any and all divisions, but a single paper may not be submitted to multiple divisions simultaneously.

Papers must be sent to the respec-

tive research chair and postmarked on or before November 28, 2004. Papers may not be faxed or emailed. Authors who include a self-addressed stamped postcard will be notified that their papers arrived.

On or before January 9, 2005, authors will receive word about whether their papers were accepted. Authors of accepted papers are to attend the Colloquium. Please see the Colloquium Web site for additional details, including the registration form and names and addresses of research chairs. The URL is: www.grady.uga.edu/southeast