

## FOREWORD

In the fall of 1992, supported by colleagues and enthusiastic students, Professor Frank Luttmmer proposed a journal that would publish student papers and documents related to the field of history written, transcribed, and/or translated by students from any department of Hanover College. An editorial board of students was selected to determine which papers and documents would be chosen for the journal, and also to edit them for uniformity of style in preparing the journal for publication. Professor Luttmmer provided support to the editors in the early stages of preparing the journal, while Professor Daniel Murphy helped oversee the final copyediting for the printer.

The inaugural issue of *The Hanover Historical Review* appeared in Spring 1993 and enjoyed great success. The *HHR* flourished for the rest of the decade, but was published only sporadically after Professor Luttmmer's illness and untimely death. At the outset of the 2016-17 academic year, the Hanover College History Department decided to resume publication of the *Hanover History Review*, provided that we could find sufficient support for this project among our students. Twelve of our students immediately volunteered to serve on the *HHR*'s editorial board. Working with this group of eager and diligent students and now their successors in 2017-2018 has turned out to be a great joy for us as faculty mentors. The result of their diligent efforts may be found within the covers of this latest volume of the *HHR*.

Throughout the 2017 fall semester, the *HHR* editorial board met every other week on Thursday evenings at 7 p.m. to discuss the 2017 *HHR* Call for Papers and submission guidelines, as well as to draft a constitution and by-laws for the *HHR* editorial board. The 2018 *HHR* contains, once again, transcriptions of primary sources, this time a set of letters dating from the First World War and written by members of the Rogers family. These were given to the Hanover College Archive, overseen by Hanover College Archivist Jennifer Duplaga, and transcribed by students of Professor Sarah Vosmeier with her oversight. This year the board also decided to create a more permanent historical record of the "The Lutheran Reformation: 500 Years Later Symposium" commemorating the 500<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the posting and publication of Luther's *Ninety-Five Theses* on October 31, 1517, which was held at Hanover College on October 31, 2017. Toward this end, the 2018 *HHR* includes a reprint of the symposium program along with the seven student papers that were presented that day. In order to create a historical record, these are published here exactly as they were read at the symposium and without further revision or expansion.

The historical essays included in this year's *HHR* have all been written for classes at Hanover College. All submissions must conform to *The Chicago Manual of Style* and are reviewed by the board members anonymously. Only Professor Raley knew the identity of the authors until the essays had been reviewed by the board members. This the board regarded as especially important at a small liberal arts college such as Hanover College, where everyone knows everyone else; beyond this, however, a few of the board members wished to submit

essays for consideration, and to ensure impartiality here Professor Raley distributed these, minus their authors' names, to other members of the board for anonymous peer review.

Eight specific criteria guided the board's reviews:

1. Does the essay have a clear thesis that is supported with focused arguments and plausible evidence? (If yes, please also state the thesis.)
2. Is the thesis supported with an ample supply of primary sources, critically interpreted for the reader?
3. Is the author's argument placed within the field of current scholarship on the subject (historiography)?
4. Does the essay make a substantive contribution to our knowledge of the subject matter? In other words, does the essay advance the current scholarship in new directions?
5. Are the footnotes/endnotes correctly formatted in Chicago Style? Do they show evidence of attention to detail?
6. Is the writing style clear and fluid? Is the argument interesting?
7. Does this still seem like a paper written hurriedly for a class, or has the author carefully revised the essay for consideration by the *Hanover Historical Review* editorial board?
8. What specific revisions or additions would you suggest that the author make to improve the article pending its acceptance for publication?

Following the review process, the authors of the submissions were provided with summaries of the board members' comments. The review process, the board decided, would yield one of three ratings: (1) accept for publication as is (or with only minor editing required); (2) revise and resubmit (typically requiring more research and substantive revisions and/or additions as well as reediting the prose and reference notes); or (3) reject for publication. This year we rejected no submissions outright, though some authors chose not to revise and resubmit their work. Those who did revise and resubmit their work were expected to pay close attention to the comments and suggestions for substantive revisions as well as for the editing of the text and formatting of the notes that had been provided by the board members in their reviews. The Junior and Senior Editors of the *HHR* took over from here, reading all essays still under consideration again and suggesting editorial grammatical and format changes for consistency and clarity. Professors Murphy, Raley, and Sarah McNair Vosmeier oversaw the final editing of the journal, which was printed on campus by Carol Persinger.

What we as faculty members have found refreshing has been the seriousness and dedication with which these students and also the authors of the articles appearing in this volume have approached their tasks. In the midst of the burdens of daily college assignments, athletic commitments, club and student senate responsibilities, rehearsals for campus musical organizations, community volunteer work, and part-time employment, each gave willingly and

freely of his or her time to make this project come to fruition. In the process, these students not only performed a worthy public service, but also no doubt learned a great deal in the process.

For all of these reasons and many more personal ones, we have thoroughly enjoyed working with these fine students. We hope that you will share our enthusiasm as you read the articles and documents published within these covers (or within this .pdf file if you are reading the digital version).

Daniel P. Murphy and J. Michael Raley,  
Managing Editors  
June 2018