Dear Friends of Berkeley History,

May this season of reflection find you feeling gratitude and satisfaction as you look back and look ahead. That’s certainly the case on our beautiful Cal campus. In the History Department, we’re thankful to have flourished this past year. We’ve been captivated by the energy and enthusiasm of new cohorts of students, new staff members, and newly added faculty. We’re moving forward into the new year with a deep appreciation for the strength of our community, and for the chance to connect again with you.

This fall we’ve been fortunate to welcome a wonderful incoming class of Ph.D. students. Their intellectual range and probing questions are already adding to the rich mix of our graduate program. Graduate students are at the heart of our department. As scholars and educators in formation, they contribute essentially and irreplaceably to teaching, research, and our rich academic community. It’s been a high-level goal for the department to improve their conditions of living and working. This goes hand-in-hand with enabling them to unfold their sparkling intellectual brilliance in their studies. We have high hopes that they will soon be able to secure a substantial increase in their support.

Our Winter Newsletter typically highlights the faculty of the department. We have three new faculty this fall, whose profiles alert readers of this newsletter will already have encountered. They are Ussama Makdisi in the history of the modern Middle East, Hide-taka Hirota in US history with a specialty in immigration, and Rebekah Ramsay, a historian of the Soviet Union and Central Asia. We’re thrilled to have them in the halls of Dwinelle. In addition to their pathbreaking research, each of them is already adding to the richness of our teaching for all of our students. The range and depth that they bring are essential to a world-leading history department, opening doors for our students into new areas of study.

In this newsletter you can get the inside story of what our current and emeritus faculty are up to. You can read about the innovative pedagogy that Ronit Stahl is implementing in the cornerstone course of History 7B. You can learn about the future of the past as refracted in a unique symposium spearheaded by Byzantine historian Maria Mavroudi, and get news on developments that Christine Philliou has been leading in Modern Greek Studies. And of course our book reviews—Rebecca McLennan on Sandra Eder’s study How the Clinic Made Gender, Stacey Van Vleet on David Henkin’s reflections on The Week, and Elena Schneider on Rebecca Herman’s Cooperating with the Colossus—a treasure trove!

This year we are thrilled beyond measure to celebrate the life of Leon F. Litwack, scholar and teacher extraordinaire, with a new endowment that launches the field of African American history. This endowment will support student prizes and other efforts that serve the vitality of this crucial area at the heart of the Berkeley History Department. The endowment has been generously initiated by an anonymous mentee of Professor Litwack, and it is open for contributions from all who wish to sustain the memory of one of Cal History’s transformative teachers and scholars.

We are also endlessly grateful for the ongoing opportunity presented by the family of Richard Herr, a distinguished scholar of the history of Spain and a much-loved faculty member. In memory of Professor Herr, who passed away in the spring at the age of 100, we are fortunate to renew the Richard and Valerie Herr Graduate Student Support Fund in History. The Herr family has generously opened their doors to generations of graduate students, and we are in their debt. To learn more about either of these special funds supporting History Department programs, you can email Anya Essiounina at anya.essi@berkeley.edu.

The History community at Berkeley is a living source of inspiration to me: faculty, students, staff, alumni, and friends all united by the desire to bring the past to light and understand our human world. Wherever this newsletter reaches you, I hope it helps you stay connected to this wonderful community.

— Cathryn Carson, Department Chair

JAN DE VRIES was recently selected by his peers to be included in the inaugural membership of the Society of Fellows of the Economic History Association. His most recent book, The Price of Bread: Regulating the Market in the Dutch Republic, published by Cambridge University Press, was released in 2019. Since then he has been active on several fronts, with published articles on the difficult relationship of global history and micro history, a rethink of the concept of proto-industry, and an examination of indigent travelers tramping the roads in mid-seventeenth century Friesland. Articles include: “Playing with scales: the global and the micro; the macro and the nano,” Past and Present Supplement 14 Global History and Micro History (2019); “Rethinking Proto-Industry: Human capital and the rise of modern industry,” in Kristine Bruland, et al., eds., Reinventing the Economic History of Industrialisation (Montreal and Kingston, McGill-Queens University Press, 2020); “On the Road. Poor travelers in mid-seventeenth century Friesland,” Journal of Interdisciplinary History 52 (2022).

SANDRA EDER’S book, How the Clinic Made Gender: The Medical History of a Transformative Idea, was published by the University of Chicago Press this summer. Her book tells the story of the invention of gender in American medicine, detailing how it was shaped by mid-twentieth-century American notions of culture, personality, and social engineering. She was promoted to Associate Professor in October and is starting her research on a new project on the “Science of Happiness.”

SUSANNA ELM co-organized two conferences last summer: one with Kristina Sessa on “War and Community in Late Antiquity” at Berkeley and a second one with Barbara Vinken, “Pretty/Ugly,” at the Villa Vigoni in Menaggio, Italy. In addition, she was honored to have been asked to deliver the Gerald and Norma Feldman Lecture here at Berkeley. She is trying valiantly to revise her manuscript, The Emperor’s Eunuch, and managed to submit a couple of papers. Life goes on...

PAULA FASS, Margaret Byrne Professor Emerita, just returned from a conference she helped to organize at the University of Texas at Austin on “Children in Crisis.” Stimulated by recent experiences with the COVID pandemic, the conference included speakers from the US and Europe, including historians, psychol-
ologists, and others. The result was an important and lively discussion of how children in the past and present have been affected by and responded to crises in health, education, and nurture, as well as disruptions caused by war and abandonment. She is the author of a long essay on Children and Childhoods in the “The Age of Enlightenment,” edited by Daniel Trohler (part of the Bloomsbury Cultural History of Education), and a short personal reminiscence, “Henja,” published in the Winter 2022 edition of Raritan.

BRUCE HALL, with colleagues Mauro Nobili (University of Illinois) and Mohamed Diagayeté (Institut Ahmed Baba, Mali), received a three-year grant from the U.S. State Department to create a database for the most important archive of Arabic manuscript material in West Africa, the Institut Ahmed Baba. The project will use the tools of the West African Arabic Manuscript Database, based at Berkeley, collaboratively with partners in Mali. He is spending the academic year 2022-23 as a member of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, New Jersey.

JOHN HEILBRON’S Quantum Drama, a historical account of interpretations of quantum mechanics, written in collaboration with Jim Baggott, will appear from the tolerant Oxford University Press next year.

DAVID HENKIN, along with teaching about immigration, information, life writing, and early North American history, has spent much of the past Gregorian year promoting his 2021 book on the history of the modern week—in bookstores, on university campuses, over Zoom, in radio broadcasts, on podcasts, and now in departmental newsletters. The Week: A History of the Unnatural Rhythms That Made Us Who We Are (Yale University Press) is due out in paperback in April.

REBECCA HERMAN’S first book, Cooperating with the Colossus: A Social and Political History of US Military Bases in World War II Latin America, was published in September by Oxford University Press. In the spring, she resumed archival research for her new book project on the South American Antarctic with a trip to Ushuaia, the world’s southernmost city. In the fall, she went on leave with the support of a Humanities Research Fellowship to continue work on the new book, and spent more time in the archives, in Buenos Aires and in Amsterdam.

HIDETAKA HIROTA greatly enjoyed his first semester at Berkeley. He is currently writing a new book manuscript, The American Dilemma, which examines the fundamental tension in US history between nativism against foreigners and demand for their labor. During the fall semester, he presented portions of the project by invitation at the UC Berkeley Center for the Study of Law and Society and at the University of Toronto Centre for Diaspora and Transnational Studies. He is currently serving as the invited guest editor of the special issue on Asia and the United States in the Civil
War Era in the *Journal of the Civil War Era*. In the meantime, his review of *The Chinese Question: The Gold Rushes and Global Politics* by Mae Ngai was published in the September 2022 issue of the journal. Besides academic work, he continued his public engagements as an immigration scholar and published an opinion piece, “The disturbing precedent for busing migrants to other states,” in *The Washington Post* in August.

DAVID A. HOLLINGER has published *Christianity’s American Fate: How Religion Became More Conservative and Society More Secular* (Princeton University Press, 2022). He recently participated in symposia at meetings of the American Historical Association, the Organization of American Historians, and the American Church History Society. He is a regular contributor to *H-Diplo*, the blog for historians of American Foreign Relations. He is the current President of the UC Berkeley Emeriti Association, and serves, off campus, on several committees of the American Philosophical Society and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and on the Advisory Board of the Obama Oral History Project at Columbia University.


Marty is currently preparing his next collection

**ETHAN KATZ** just submitted the manuscript *When Jews Argue: Between the University and the Beit Midrash*, a co-edited volume that will be published in 2023 both as a book through Routledge and as a special issue of *Jewish Law Association Studies*. This book brings together scholars of history, law, philosophy, rabbinics, linguistics, and other fields to reconsider a fundamental issue in Jewish studies: the tensions and chasms between the world of the traditional Jewish study house (the Beit Midrash) and that of academic Jewish studies in the university.

This fall, Ethan has been an inaugural Matrix Faculty Fellow. This gave him a teaching release to continue writing his current monograph on the resisters in Algiers who helped the Americans land in Operation Torch. As part of the fellowship, he is also planning a spring symposium on wider questions of motives and paths of resistance.

Earlier this year, Ethan traveled to Paris for a conference in conjunction with the major exhibition, “*Juifs et Musulmans: De la France colonial à nos jours,*” held at the National Museum of Immigration History and based largely on the French edition of Ethan’s first book. Ethan also has continued his work around antisemitism education.

During the summer, he and John Efron secured a major grant from the Glazer Foundation in support of the Antisemitism Education Initiative that Ethan continues to co-direct at Berkeley. This will enable the initiative to hire its first full-time Program Director and continue to expand its programming to support a number of under-served universities across California.

Meanwhile, as co-chair of the Task Force on Antisemitism of the Association for Jewish Studies, Ethan co-authored a *working report* that has become a significant resource for a number of colleagues and administrators at universities across the country.

**MAUREEN C. MILLER** spent three months in Italian archives over her sabbatical last spring, which has given her exciting new documentation to digest from both the monastic archive of Cava de’ Tirreni and the diocesan archive of Città di Castello. She presented the results of her analysis of the records of Bishop Matteo’s visita-
tions of rural parishes in the 1230s at a conference on “Priests’ Wives and Concubines in the Medieval West (800-1200)” this October. Spoiler alert: nearly all the clerics of the parishes visited were ordered to get rid of their female companions, but they successfully remonstrated with their bishop to allow support of their sons and daughters so that the “sins on the fathers” not be visited on their children.

MICHAEL NYLAN recently gave a talk on Intergenerational Equity for Zhongshan daxue, China (Philosophy Department), and on environmental justice for the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (Program for Chinese Culture). Michael also submitted two essays devoted to the biographies of “Confucian” scholars, for the College de France, and to the writings of Ci Jiwei, on Chinese democracy “and the coming crisis.” At year’s end, Michael will submit the final version of two chapters written for an upcoming Cambridge History volume devoted to classical learning in China, Japan, and Korea. In October, Michael hosted three two-person dialogues “with China” at the Townsend Center for the Humanities, as well as two new movies (as yet unseen, aside from film festivals) at the Pacific Film Archive. With Shoufu Yin (University of British Columbia, a former Ph.D. of the History Department), Michael will be speaking on “Voting the Divine” in Classics, on February 6, 2023. Finally, Michael’s translation
of the Documents classic and its major commentaries (some 1800 pages at present) has passed two readers’ reviews with flying colors, so one can expect publication by the University of Washington Press within a year or so.

BERNADETTE PÉREZ’S research centers Latinx and Indigenous peoples in the West and is situated at the intersection of multiple subfields of history, from race and environment to labor, migration, and colonialism. She received a 2022-2023 Hellman Fellowship to support the completion of her first book, an environmental and labor history of the Colorado sugar beet industry, and lay the groundwork for an oral history project exploring the legacy of environmental injustice in Colorado. Her next book-length study will grow from this work.

ELENA SCHNEIDER spent academic year 2021-2022 on research leave as a Kemble Fellow at the Huntington Library in Pasadena. There Elena had a chance to enjoy their beautiful gardens as she worked on her second book project. The project started as a study of maritime marronage, or those who escaped slavery by sea, in the Caribbean, and she published an article and edited a special issue in Slavery & Abolition on the theme. During the course of her research year, Elena ended up shifting the project to focus on a group of several hundred Africans who had been brought to Cuba as slaves and who managed to gain their freedom and return to their homelands in the Bight of Benin during the mid-nineteenth century. Some of these individuals even managed to find their families again in the war-torn Yoruba territories. Elena is working through accounts of their journey in the British abolitionist press, and she hopes to consult relevant records of African and British missionaries in the Bight of Benin during the coming year. To do so will require a trip to the UK with her new baby in tow!

JAMES VERNON has been working hard as Chair of the Berkeley Faculty Association to help all those academic workers who make so much of the research and teaching at UC Berkeley possible. Last year, lecturers (who now account for almost half of instructional faculty on our campus) went on strike and secured a better contract for their poorly paid and insecure positions. This year, graduate students are on strike to make graduate school affordable for everyone. Right now that is not the case. According to the UC Regents, 20% of graduate students at Berkeley are food insecure and 5% are homeless. The strike by graduate students is the largest strike in the history of US higher education, including 48,000 workers across the UC system. But it is even larger than that, for it is the culmination of a decade of organizing to challenge the common sense of privatization and austerity that has taken grip of the academy since 2008. Those policies have suppressed wages and created insecure and unsustainable working conditions for many. James’s hope is that the strike will help to build a new vision of the academy where everyone can support themselves and thrive as they train to be the next generations of professors.
When I tell people I teach in the History Department at Berkeley, one of the most common responses is, “I wasn’t a history major, but I remember History 7B.” Agreeing to teach History 7B, “Introduction to the History of the United States: The US Civil War to Present,” was intimidating. Then the pandemic hit. Suddenly I had to rethink 7B for the Zoom era.

By the time I started developing the syllabus in the summer of 2020, not only had a pandemic disrupted American life, but the murder of George Floyd renewed attention to the history of racism and injustice, policing, and rights in the United States. And, just weeks before the semester began, the January 6 attack on the US Capitol, along with Trump’s efforts to delegitimize and overthrow his electoral loss, made teaching the history of the United States since the Civil War even more urgent and significant. Indeed, my opening lecture, “The United States in 1865,” began with January 6, 2021, asking students to describe and analyze an image of a Trump supporter carrying a Confederate flag in the US Capitol in front of paintings of John C. Calhoun (pro-slavery senator from South Carolina) and Charles Sumner (abolitionist Radical Republican senator from Massachusetts) and to think about what questions this generates about the relationship between 1865 and 2021, between past and present.

But lectures are only one part of a much larger course. Pandemic constraints led to a more innovative class. What does this mean? While lectures offer students an opportunity to learn history, homework and sections became spaces for doing history.

Each week, students complete a “discussion project” that requires doing research in different online archives. Over the semester, there are 12 discussion projects. They included a scavenger hunt in the Freedmen’s Bureau’s papers; comparing the experiences of Chinese-American immigrants through a family archive and official immigration case files; uncovering the experience of indigenous Americans sent to the Carlisle Indian Industrial School; and using the FBI Vault to track the surveillance of Prohibition-era gangsters. While we couldn’t get inside the Bancroft Library, students used the library’s extensive digitized records to explore the lived experience of Japanese-American incarceration. Likewise, students reconstructed labor strikes from local newspapers, listened to oral histories of ordinary people active in Chicano civil rights movements, and combed through PBS shows from the 1970s.

These projects complement lectures with a deep dive into sources, often ones with divergent goals and perspectives, thus showing the messiness of the past. Most of all, they give students—future majors and non-majors alike—a taste of the delights and challenges of being a historian: the uncertainty and incompleteness of the archives, the need to read and reread sources with new information, the difficulty deciphering and interpreting documents, the pleasure of reconstructing the past based on new material. In the words of one student, “Each discussion project was like a tiny present.” Indeed, because students became experts on particular sources, they had the chance to teach one another and identify different, sometimes uncommon, stories that emerged from the archive. The discussion projects became a course highlight. One student stated, “We got to do archival research right from the beginning... It allowed me to really go in-depth on the material...” — History 7B Student

“We got to do archival research right from the beginning... It allowed me to really go in-depth on the material...” — History 7B Student
In the fall of 2020 (a difficult semester taught entirely online everywhere around the country), I frequently communicated with the Ottomanist Cornell Fleischer (a visiting faculty member at Berkeley in the 1990s, now a professor at the University of Chicago) about a shared research project on the intellectual history of the Byzantine and Ottoman fifteenth century. In the process we realized that, although we served at two top research universities with presumably divergent profiles (“public” vs. “private” was the most obvious difference) we shared the same anxieties about the future of our respective disciplines at the face of societal and academic change, exacerbated by a sense of diminishing resources. That fall the MacArthur Foundation circulated a call for proposals to convene public events, for which MacArthur Fellows were eligible to apply as pairs or groups. Fleischer had received a MacArthur Fellowship in 1988 and I in 2002. We decided to apply together in order to organize a public event that would address these anxieties and bring together MacArthur Fellows who wanted to participate. The funds could only be disbursed to a 501(c)(3) public charity, which by default made Berkeley the place to host the meeting. Supplementary funding was provided by the Townsend Center for the Humanities and the Center for Middle Eastern Studies, which also extended administrative support. Invaluable practical help was offered by Eva Seto, the Associate Director of the Social Science Matrix, where the event was held.

The event focused on the memory of the past in public discourse and the intersection (or lack thereof) between academia and society. The starting point was the fact that the study of the past is viewed as secondary (and even tertiary) to the study of STEM; COVID-19 and other factors even before its rise create an enormous amount of social tension, for which historical perspective is needed although it is almost never provided; universities are in the process of profoundly revising their intellectual agenda and institutional structure, according minimal place to the study of the past.

Invited presenters were given the task of reflecting, from within their own disciplinary perspective each, on the following: in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the modern university was conceived as an instrument for nation building and was expected to lead societal and political trends. Inevitably, instruments and methodologies for the study of the past developed at that time, were influenced by these programmatic goals. Following WWI, older imperial entities were dismantled. The new world order took the homogeneous, territorially bounded nation state as the “natural” social and political unit. In this context, the role of the university was to train the elites that would run the nation state. As for a humanistic education, its role was to inculcate a sense of “nationhood” through the study of history and literature. As a result, the study of the past occupied a respected and vital position in both secondary and tertiary education.

During the second half of the twentieth century, the nation state was found unsatisfactory as a political formation guaranteeing the well-being of its citizens. Societal and academic priorities shifted towards social justice. At the same time, nationalist emphases on land, collectivity, and sovereignty were challenged by ideologies and economic “realities”: increasingly monolingual/Anglophone globalization, the autonomy and dominance of “Free Market” forces, and an emphasis on entrepreneurial (and fiscally measured) metrics of success that renders the past irrelevant, even objectionable. Universities are no longer expected to lead social change, only to reflect it in their curricular, administrative, and fiscal structures. What can the
study of the past offer in this changed context? How can/should we use the old methodological tools in new ways? Do we need to get rid of them altogether and create new ones? Is it possible to wed academic tradition with academic innovation? How can the academic study of the past interface with current societal needs?

We wanted to elicit responses to these questions from within a truly interdisciplinary perspective. The invited speakers included four scholars on the ancient Graeco-Roman world; a poet; two novelists; a physicist who has served the study of the past through his inventions; an evolutionary biologist; a computer engineer; an ethnomusicologist and folk music advocate; and a financier with a track record of philanthropy to support the study of the past. Six of the fourteen participants were MacArthur Fellows.

The program included a panel on the study of the ancient world with the following presenters: Maria Pantelia, a scholar of ancient Greek literature and director of the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG) presented this complex digital tool for the study and linguistic analysis of Greek texts which was first conceived in 1971. This makes the TLG by far the oldest example of “digital humanities.” Pantelia explained how the TLG was developed out of techniques for studying and analyzing texts used from antiquity into the medieval and early modern period and how it can aid the analysis not simply of the Greek language but language at large. James Porter, a scholar of ancient literature and its modern reception, discussed the history of philology (a poorly understood and much maligned discipline in many academic quarters during the last few decades) from the eighteenth into the twenty-first century. Joan Breton Connelly, a classical archaeologist, highlighted the need to maintain the memory of the discipline’s history among a younger generation of scholars; the challenges in preserving and interpreting evidence collected by increasingly bigger digs; and the urgency to protect cultural heritage when it is treated as a commodity for global tourist consumption and occasionally also as an impediment to “progress.”

The next panel featured two novelists who have written historical fiction, Aleksandar Hemon and Indu Sundaresan. They reflected on what a historical setting does for an author, how it may influence a reader’s expectations, what place anachronism may occupy in historical fiction, how their personal historical experience is reflected in their work, and how the use of English (which they both learnt as a second language) influences the process of writing.

A third panel focused on how poetry meets history. The Greek poet Panayotis Ioannidis outlined the collision of poetry and history (as both subject and process) during the Greek financial crisis that erupted in 2010. Through concrete poems, this collision was shown to include both ancient and modern history. The Turkish classicist Ekin Öyken discussed the translation of Latin poetry into Turkish sign language through video footage. A dead language has a reception as limited as sign language, but does their small reception render them inconsequential? And how far back can one trace a history of sign language?

A fourth panel introduced the perspective of scientists. The physicist Carl Haber offered reflections on the future of the past in education and research. He identified some commonalities among the humanities, social, and physical sciences and suggested, through concrete examples, some ways to better highlight these connections. The computer engineer (and well-known champion of the Portugese revolution of 1974) Pedro Ferraz de Abreu discussed his efforts, since the late 1970s, to use history and the social sciences in order to grasp how the internet could help, but effectively impedes, participatory democracy. These impediments are created by governments and institutions ranging the entire political spectrum, from the liberal to the conservative. Understanding why this is so requires computer engineers to use the tools of the social sciences, although the practitioners of these disciplines do not always appreciate what this interdisciplinarity can bring to their work. The evolutionary biologist Phil DeVries explained that forgetting the history of his discipline (its roots in direct observation and data collection through field research conducted personally) disengages a younger generation of biologists from directly connecting with the natural environment and has dire scientific, political, and environmental consequences.

The ethnomusicologist and folk music advocate Christopher King outlined that recordings made from the 1890s into the 1950s are a lens through which to understand historical developments and cultural change, as well as the function of music. If the function of music is to nourish the human soul, then politicizing music is incomprehensible—and yet it is done. This presents a problem analogous to the politicization of
history, which is both a universal human experience and something jealously “owned” by various groups. Inevitably, politicization produces a certain historical amnesia.

Andreas Zombanakis, a private equity investor who has served as trustee or advisory board member in several educational institutions, drew from his experience to answer questions such as the following: how does the institutional hunger for money distort the outcomes of research? As a society, can we afford a “boutique” education focused on “exotic” disciplines? If we marginalize the historical disciplines in education, where will the next generation of philanthropists who can support the past come from?

The event was designed to maximize audience participation: it was held in person rather than online, and ample time was reserved for discussion. Its panels drew audiences ranging from 50 to 70 attendees that included undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, MacArthur Fellows who live in the Bay Area, and alumni. A significant number of attendees identified themselves as belonging to the STEM disciplines and asserted that good scientists are all interested in history (with emphasis on good). Members of the audience (and others who could not attend) expressed the desire for a second such forum in the near future.

The enthusiastic response to this event shows that anxieties about the “Future of the Past in Academia and Society” are not exclusive to historians but are shared much more broadly. Its organization was driven by the conviction that the best way to handle the present difficulties is not to lament them but visualize a positive way forward. The goal was to conceive and articulate such a path, both for the organizers and the attendees. Was this goal met? What did the participants take away from the meeting? As one of the presenters put it, “What I’ve brought away from the symposium is that we, all of us present, are valued not for what we think but for how we think. Unorthodoxy—being an ‘outsider’—is embraced and esteemed among this group of friends just as much as scholarship. Thank you.” This suggests that the future of the past depends on academia’s and society’s willingness to safeguard a well-known and frequently quoted principle attributed to Voltaire: “I wholly disapprove of what you say—and will defend to the death your right to say it.”
Sandra Eder’s much-anticipated book traces the study and treatment of intersex people—the estimated 1.7% of people whose chromosomal, reproductive, or sexual anatomy do not fit standard definitions of male or female—at the Pediatric Endocrinology Clinic at Johns Hopkins Hospital during the mid-20th century. Founded in 1935, the Hopkins clinic quickly became the world’s leading center for the study of congenital adrenal hyperplasia (CAH), the most common cause of intersexuality. First recognized in the 1930s as a distinct adrenal disorder, CAH was a life-threatening condition that typically presented as apparent anatomical deviation from what medical science viewed as the standard patterns of children’s sexual development. By the 1950s, the Hopkins clinic was a well-funded, multidisciplinary medical institution in which social workers, psychiatrists, and psychologists worked alongside endocrinologists, surgeons, and other medical specialists to theorize and implement treatments for dozens of CAH patients. The clinic saved many lives through its endocrinal therapeutics; surgeons also carried out multiple sex assignment and reassignment surgeries, on the principle that a patient’s best chance at leading a happy, “well-adjusted” life was to be either male or female—not intersex.

In tracing the development of the clinic’s protocols and procedures, Professor Eder tells a fascinating and, at times, deeply moving story about CAH and its diagnosis and treatment. The story brings to light the medical profession’s changing approach to natural variations in human sex, patients’ own experiences of intersexuality and of the clinic, and clinicians’ conceptualization of a novel—and ultimately highly influential—theory of gender. It is in regard to this theory of gender that the book is particularly insightful. In the course of the 1950s, treatment at the Hopkins clinic increasingly pivoted around what staff psychologist John Money theorized, for the first time in 1956, as the patient’s “gender role.” Gender, Money argued, was a social role that was learned rather than innate or biologically determined. Intrinsic to identity, gender provided a cognitive map through which a person made sense of and oriented themselves in the world. Although gender was correlated with sex, one’s sex did not directly determine one’s gender. In treating CAH, Hopkins clinicians took the patient’s sexual anatomy and/or chromosomes into account, but they did not consider markers of sex to be determinative. If anything, clinicians aimed to engineer the patient’s sex to fit their gender.

The idea that gender was a learned or socially constructed role was not entirely new. A few years earlier, French philosopher Simone de Beauvoir had theorized a similar concept of gender in The Second Sex (“[o]ne is not born, but rather becomes, a woman”). But it was at the Hopkins Pediatric Endocrinology Clinic that the idea of gender as a learned role was oper-
ationalized. Indeed, the Hopkins clinic successfully transmitted this concept of gender to intersex clinics throughout the world, and eventually, into mainstream American culture.

Money's theory of gender roles was potentially radical, even liberatory. In theory, if gender roles were socially determined, numerous genders (not just the masculine and the feminine) were possible. If a person's gender was learned, and not innate, it might be fluid and even capable of changing in the course of one's lifetime. And if gender was not directly determined by biological sex, then perhaps sexuality—sexual desire, identity, and object choices—was not determined by biological sex either. In the late 20th and early 21st centuries many feminists and LGBTQ people, seeking freedom from rigid gender roles, legal persecution, and compulsory heterosexuality, would retrofit Money's gender-role concept to these ends. But in the mid-20th century, Money and his Hopkins colleagues foreclosed the more radical implications of the theory, arguing that gender was learned in early childhood, whereupon it quickly hardened into the unchanging foundation of an unchanging identity. Gender was binary—either masculine or feminine. And although the clinic's own researchers had long since established that human bodies were ambisexual (irreducible to one of two, clearly delineated sexes), treatment proceeded as though bodies were necessarily either male or female. A person's sex—male or female—and their gender role—masculine or feminine—should mirror and reinforce each other.

Attentive to the nuances, Eder rejects the temptation to either lionize or demonize John Money and his Hopkins colleagues. The story she tells is one of tensions and ironies. The Hopkins clinic saved lives, empowered some patients, and disempowered others. Clinicians theorized and applied a potentially liberatory conception of gender, while in practice limiting (though not eliminating) that potential. The team's decisions and protocols regarding CAH were inflected by many considerations, including the patient's perceived medical needs, available medical technology, the patient's wishes, and John Money's theories. Treatment, like all medical treatment, was normalizing in both the technical and moral senses: it saved lives and reinforced norms that some people, both then and now, considered oppressive. Finally, and as the title of the book neatly captures, the clinic made and disseminated the same, basic concept of gender—as socially learned rather than innate or determined by one's sex—that most of us take for granted today.
The Week: A History of the Unnatural Rhythms That Made Us Who We Are

Book by David M. Henkin
Yale University Press, 2021
Review by Stacey Van Vleet

David Henkin’s absorbing new work, *The Week: A History of the Unnatural Rhythms That Made Us Who We Are*, begins from the proposition that a history of the week must be approached differently from other histories of time. Unlike the timekeeping of calendars and clocks, observes Henkin, the seven-day cycle eschews the ambition of neat alignment with astronomical or meteorological processes. The reliance of the weekly cycle’s count on continuous human record-keeping means that it “finds its foundation entirely in history.” But while weekly rhythms are thus firmly social and cultural rather than natural, the week has resisted any major structural changes, even while spreading to all corners of the globe. Although weekly time has a history, Henkin argues, the usual paradigms for tracing historical changes in time consciousness—developments in technology, political regimes, law, or policy—are not sufficient to explain its rise as a primary unit structuring modern time. Following “subtle and cumulative” rather than dramatic or revolutionary transformations, *The Week* unwinds a far knottier tale of how the modern week came to be.

Henkin’s richly textured narrative focuses on the United States as the site of incubation for modern weekly timekeeping, particularly during the nineteenth century. One of the greatest pleasures of the book is peeking into diaries, letters, court testimonies, and menus from Chicago to Alabama, from Benjamin Franklin to Samuel Clemens, from soldiers and schoolgirls to enslaved plantation poets. These records and recollections are emplaced within far deeper and broader historiographies of time, from the astrological seven-day intervals of ancient Rome to the Bolshevik reforms that failed to introduce a five-day week in the twentieth century. Unsurprisingly, the Abrahamic religions play a fundamental role in creating “people of the week,” from Europe, the Middle East, and West Africa to (later and in both gradual and more dramatic fashion) the Americas, Oceania, and East Asia. Crucially, however, *The Week* aims to decenter the Sabbath and to complicate the idea of a bimodal cycle of rest and labor. Instead, Henkin foregrounds the growing role of the week as a technology for scheduling and coordinating all kinds of activities, giving rise in the process to a regime of differentiated daily rhythms and heterogeneous “weekly consciousness” shared among strangers. Henkin distinguishes four independent (though overlapping) historical conceptions of the week: the Sabbatarian or dominical cycle in which the weekend stands apart; the older astrological or hemerological week in which each day assumed a qualitatively distinct and customary character; the inventory week or week-in-review lumping together all seven days in relation to previous and future weeks for purposes of surveying and taking stock; and the appointed week as a scheduling device for both personal timekeeping and coordinating routines among strangers. While the first three
modes (illuminated in Chapter One) were part of the fabric of time in the United States by the early nineteenth century, it is the last mode that Henkin identifies emerging thereafter as the basis of modern time. Chapter Two surveys the varied and unexpected settings in which this transformation took place, particularly the realms of labor, commerce, schooling, entertainment, and communication. Henkin locates the basis for a new “physiognomy of the week” in the rise of weekly pay periods, housework routines, class schedules, market behaviors, voluntary association meetings, theater programs, and publication cycles. In Chapter Three, another publication and writing practice come to the fore: the proliferation of pocket diaries and journaling. In both blank and preformatted journals (as well as other written records), nineteenth-century Americans increasingly kept track of events with reference to weekdays. By attending to the all-too-familiar discomfiture these writers expressed when losing track of the day of the week, as well as their unremarked mistaking and correction of weekdays and calendar dates, Henkin shrewdly demonstrates how the former displaced the latter as popular anchors of memory. Chapter Four tracks a new self-consciousness of weekly time in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, tied to its further spread and consolidation through (and despite) coordinated projects of rational time synchronization. Here, it is Émile Durkheim and Henri Hubert who provide Henkin with his core understanding of weekly temporality as a “rhythm” of collective activities characterized by discontinuity and asymmetry, while at the same time ensuring regularity.

The stakes of The Week are viscerally clear from its prefatory remarks on “blursdays” during the Covid-19 era. But Henkin’s interest in weekly time predates our recent mass reckoning with the relationship between spatial isolation and temporal disorientation. Over the more broadly conceived recent past, the gradual encroachment of asynchronous work and entertainment, online commerce, and new technologies of communications and electronic scheduling threaten to unmoor us from “the delicate social rhythm of the seven-day week.” Ultimately, Henkin’s persuasive case for the deep-rootedness and resiliency of weekly time point both to the unlikelihood of the week’s end and to the profound implications were it in fact to be achieved.
During World War II the United States established over 200 defense installations in Latin America and the Caribbean. One chain of airbases ran through the Caribbean, along the northern shores of South America, and down the coast of Brazil. The other made its way through Mexico and Central America to the northern coast of South America. After the attack on Pearl Harbor, the US developed additional sites along the Pacific coast, in Peru, and in Ecuador and the Galápagos Islands. Later in the war more bases were also built in Bolivia and Paraguay and a state-of-the-art air base was established in the sleepy Cuban town of San Antonio de los Baños. In the early stages, the commercial airline Pan American Airways undertook a covert defense construction program to facilitate the building of these bases, which ranged in size from freshly paved runways guarded by a plain-clothed technician to the largest US airbase outside of US continental borders in the Brazilian Northeast, staffed with thousands of US soldiers.

If anything in the above paragraph surprised you, you are not alone. The revelations in Rebecca Herman’s new book are striking and upturn what historians of US-Latin American relations thought they knew about the World War II period. The received historical narrative is that World War II was a moment of friendly collaboration in keeping with the “Good Neighbor” policy of the 1930s, whereby the United States—in an effort to improve relations with its neighbors—agreed to end three decades of military incursions in Latin America and the Caribbean. In contrast to the unbridled interventions of earlier eras and the nefarious covert military operations of the Cold War, scholars saw World War II as a time of hemispheric unity. In return for declaring war on Japan and Germany, Latin American and Caribbean nations received some economic aid and security collaboration, but that was the extent of it.

As Professor Herman points out, the construction of US airbases on sovereign territory in Latin American and the Caribbean would seem to violate the Good Neighbor policy and incite protests from popular audiences and anti-imperial voices in the region suspicious of US motives. A wave of revolutionary nationalism had swept through Latin America and the Caribbean beginning with the Mexican Revolution in 1910 and accelerating over the following decades. Latin American jurists, diplomats, and activists had lobbied for decades in order to extract from the United States its 1933 commitment to nonintervention. Why would the US be able to overturn this policy at such a surprising scale during World War II without popular protest? And why would historians be unaware of the extent of this World War II-era US base building and the surprising public-private compact with Pan American Airways, lightly disguised as a commercial undertaking, that made them possible?
To tell this remarkable story, Herman draws from research material in three languages extracted from local and national archives in five countries. Her methodology is an exemplary combination of diplomatic and social history, weaving together the machinations of the US state department, the strategic alignments of Latin American political leaders, and the resistance of ordinary men and women—bus drivers, sex workers, and construction workers—who lived in the shadow of these bases. She focuses on three countries seen as especially vital to US defense planning: Panama, Cuba, and Brazil. Panama and Cuba are perhaps obvious choices, for reasons of proximity and the strategic US assets of the Panama Canal and Guantánamo naval base. Brazil in turn became strategic to US defense experts as the most likely route of trans-Atlantic invasion of the Americas by air, given that its northeastern coastline was just 1700 miles from West Africa. While the extent of base building in all three countries is revelatory, it is Brazil where the bases were an unprecedented incursion and Herman’s findings most dramatically revise our understandings.

In addition to telling the story of how these bases came to be, Herman develops a powerful new concept for understanding US-Latin American relations: the idea of cooperation, which came to take on a particular valence in Latin American and Caribbean nations. Herman sees “cooperation” as a useful concept to understand how politicians and diplomats in the Americas, North and South, framed the wartime partnership, which set an unfortunate precedent going forward into the Cold War. Such a framework allowed leaders of Panama, Cuba, and Brazil to publicly distance themselves from the US-Americans but quietly do their bidding, in ways that undermined their own legal systems and local citizens’ rights. And yet the heart of Herman’s excellent new book is about how ordinary people in Latin America and the Caribbean contested this US power operating in clandestine alliance with their heads of state. Ultimately, it announces Herman as an exciting and important new voice in US-Latin American relations and the history of the region.
SAVE THE DATES

History Homecoming
Wednesday, February 15, 2023 • 6pm– 9pm
Berkeley Alumni House

The 101 Circus:
An Undergraduate Research Showcase
Wednesday, May 3, 2023 • 10am– 4pm • 3335 Dwinelle

History Commencement
May 2023 • To Be Announced
Donors play a critical role in the ways we are able to sustain and enhance the teaching and research mission of the department. The History Annual Fund is utilized in the following ways:

- Travel grants for undergraduates researching the material for their senior thesis projects
- Summer grants for graduate student research travel or language study
- Conference travel for graduate students who are presenting papers or interviewing for jobs
- Prizes for the best dissertation and undergraduate thesis
- Equipment for the graduate computer lab
- Work-study positions for instructional support
- A graduate space coordinator position

Most importantly, the History Annual Fund allows the department to direct funding to students in any field of study, so that the money can be directed where it is most needed. This unrestricted funding allows us to enhance our multi-year funding package so that we can continue to focus on maintaining the quality that is defined by a Berkeley degree.

To support the Department of History, please donate online at give.berkeley.edu or mail checks payable to UC Berkeley Foundation to the address listed on the inside cover of this newsletter. Thank you for your continued support!