AT: Welcome to the Infinite Women podcast. I'm your host Allison Tyra, and today I'm joined by Dr. Kimberly Voss, a professor of journalism at the Nicholson School of Communication and Media at the University of Central Florida. Now, while there have always been incredible women in American journalism, like Nellie Bly, Ida Tarbell and Ida B. Wells, Dr. Voss is particularly interested in the 1950s and '60s. So why don't we start with a bit of context for what the media landscape looked like at this time?

KV: Women have always been part of American media from the very, very early days. And part of that was investigative journalism, what they used to call sob sisters, the idea that women would cover trials best because they were in touch with their emotions, and stunt girls who would fly around the country or do things that were literally stunts, that kind of thing. And those things were important in many ways because they made the front pages of a newspaper. And so that part of journalism allowed women to compete in kind of a man's space, if you will. And these stories would run in every metropolitan newspaper in the country. My favorite part of women in journalism was in the women's pages. And that started in the 1880s at about the same time that sports sections began running in American newspapers, thanks to Pulitzer they would run kind of together. And initially, women's journalism in the 1880s, 1890s wasn't quite that important in terms of their topics. It was very much about household issues, clothing, sewing, that sort of thing. But as we go into the pre-World War II years, it actually got pretty important. They were talking about pay inequity, child care, these kinds of things that during World War II became very important. And so these sections that started out as not that significant became a mix of hard news and soft news.

AT: One of the things that comes up in various conversations is things that get classed as women's media. And so in a journalism context, I feel like you've sort of told us what that meant. But I'm curious how it's evolved or not since this time period and what we're seeing today in stuff that's primarily targeted at women.

KV: Sure. So the early women's pages were called the four Fs: family, fashion, food, and furnishings. And historians have largely said that's fluff, in other words, not important. And I've always found that problematic because I think those four things are often what we most care about, right? What we wear, what we eat, our family, who we like or maybe don't like at certain times, and where we live. And so those things to me are so incredibly important from a personal level. But because it's personal, historians and male editors of the time said, "why would we cover that? That's not important." But again, I think it's central to who we are as humans. And so when we talk about what we do today in terms of women's news, I think it's a mix of these things. We talk about, honestly, still female firsts quite a bit, particularly in America, about women that take on new roles that haven't been done before. And so we mix that in with traditional women's news. And I would also argue that readers always loved women's news. It's really historians and managing editors that said, "well, these topics aren't important." But they always have been to readers.

AT: And so I'm sure that there were differences then versus now in the messaging that conveyed what are socially acceptable roles for women and girls. But I also feel like there is, in this particular moment in the US, a return to conservative media, not that it ever fully went away. But it actually seems like you've got a lot of, tradwives, for example, are sort of the epitome of that, where it's almost like this nostalgia for something that never really existed. And in fact, doesn't actually exist for the tradwives. Like if you actually look at it most of the time, it's like, "no, she actually has a bunch of money. And she's not actually doing like real labor. She's just doing it aesthetically for Instagram or whatever."

KV: Right. And I also think it devalues things that women might like to do. I do a lot of work on food journalism. Often the weekends are the big meal planning, making the multi-course meal. And somehow that means that a woman isn't serious about her career or her life if she wants to cook a big meal. Or we've seen over recent years women who are beginning to sew again, or crochet or do some sort of fabric-related work. And I've

always found that problematic that somehow that makes a woman lesser. Whereas a man who wants to say, fix his car, he's not lesser for doing that. There's no trad husband version of that. Or if he wants to be a farmer or do something with his lawn. And I think it's this continual devaluing of women's work because it somehow means if they care about some aspect of tradition, that means that they don't care about modern feminism, for example. If women want to do whatever they want to do, shouldn't that be okay? I have sons and if they want to bake cookies, everyone's like, “yay, they want to do something that's female.” But if females want to do something that's traditionally feminine, somehow that's not as accepted. And I find that truly bizarre.

AT: It's also interesting because like you were saying these things are important. So clothing, not necessarily fashion, depending on how we're defining fashion, I'm probably on the least fashionable side of the spectrum. But what we put in our bodies and what we put on our bodies are fundamentally important parts of our lives. And this idea that cooking is somehow not intrinsic to our very survival is ridiculous (KV: Right, exactly). And I see that as someone, my husband does basically all the cooking in our house because he's a foodie. He likes the mechanics of food. And because of that, he's better at it. I don't want to be one of those people who implies, “oh, he's just naturally good at it” and act like I'm weaponizing my incompetence. But you know what I'm saying? (KV: Yeah, I do.) This is an intrinsic part of our lives that everyone who is an independent adult should be able to sew on a button, should be able to cook themselves dinner. And if you care about what you're putting into your body, you should be able to cook a nice dinner. And by nice dinner, I don't mean anything complicated. But when my husband is on business trips, yes, he leaves me a freezer full of leftovers because I'm not sure he trusts me to feed myself. But I am capable of doing so. We both know I can.

KV: Well, and you also shouldn't be ashamed of liking doing it. That's the thing I find shocking about this time period. Liking cooking somehow makes you less of a feminist or less of a working woman. Why would that be lesser than? It seems to me like, you should be able to enjoy that and like that. And if you don't, that's fine too, of course. But there's almost this shame I see when women like to do things that have been traditionally kind of a tradwife situation.

AT: Well, and let's get into one of your books, *The Food Section: Newspaper Women, and the Culinary Community*. Since we're talking about food, tell me about your book about food.

KV: Sure. That was the first book I wrote. And honestly, my favorite, because that was such a place for women who were looking to work in journalism. They could be experts in food, and no one would question that, because that's what women did. And so it was really truly an amazing thing. And historians had never looked at it. I wrote that book in 2014, and there was pretty much nothing that had been written. And I remember historians coming up to me at a conference going, “I wish I would have thought to write that.” And I was like, “it was always there.” It was always there. But it really was significant because that was one of the few things that women could do without question. And every newspaper across the country whether it was a metro newspaper, a Black newspaper, a Jewish newspaper, everyone had a food editor. And they told such great stories. For example, I'm from Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and it's a very, very German area. And the editor said, “I would never tell anyone how to make German potato salad” because you made it like how your mom made it. It was so hyper local in that way that it really made that kind of sense. Also, these women traveled not just the country, but the world. So many of the women, for example, would review restaurants and they would explain to their editors, “oh, I don't know what Italian food is unless you send me to Italy.” And it happened all the time. They traveled the world just getting to know the recipes and the taste and the dishes. They went to Africa, they went to Australia, they went everywhere. And it was just amazing what they did. They could put a restaurant out of business, for example, if they said the food wasn't any good. They had power in a way that they had no other power at their newspaper or in other parts of the readership, but they could do that. And sometimes because of home ec journalism or home economics journalism, they would share recipes. This was at a point

in time, we forget about this with Google, but they would call into their newspaper and say, “can you please send me this recipe?” And they would have just filing cabinet upon filing cabinet. And someone would just find the recipe and mail it to them. That's how connected they were. And that was eyeopening in some ways for me too, just to see how much these sections mattered to their communities. And it really was truly amazing. I ended up, I think with 65 food editors I looked at and they were just truly amazing.

AT: I find it really funny that someone, I assume men, were saying, “why didn't I think of this?” It's like, “well, because you probably didn't think that these sections were important because they were women's work.” (KV: Yep. Oh, a hundred percent.) But one of the things that's particularly interesting about food, as we're talking about food as like a woman's domain, at least today, it's very much, that's only in the home, only in an unpaid domestic context, because in the restaurant business, it is so completely dominated by men. If you look at the statistics for how many head chefs are women, it's a very small number. And so it's interesting when you're talking about how influential, how powerful these women were. So I'm just curious whether, because I assume that the restaurant ratios were about the same during this period, or maybe they weren't, I'm not the expert. But just that power balance of who has power on the reviewer side and who is actually running the kitchens in a professional context, who is influential in this community?

KV: The food editors at newspapers were writing for home cooks. So that was clearly, they were writing for women. And it was clear from how they shared their recipes with each other. For example, there was one day at a northern US newspaper where the editor left out how much butter was in a dessert. And it was such a big deal that they would answer the phone by saying “a half a cup of butter.” It was that significant. So they were largely writing for home cooks. They were not writing for professional chefs. The only men that had columns in the section usually involved grilling. So it was very much like the fire, barbecue kind of thing is what they were doing. But again, it did give women this role of authority. Now very early US newspapers, and by early I'm talking about the 1940s, who were talking about restaurant reviews, were not the kinds of things that you would see today. They only wanted to write about good food. So at least in US newspapers, it's often kind of fun to mock bad food. Like “I went to this fancy restaurant. And the sauce was bad or overcooked” or whatever. If we're talking about say the ‘40s and 50s, the theory among the food editors, and again, they were all women, were simply, “if you're going to go to a fancy restaurant, I want you to get the best food you can.” And so if they had a bad meal, they wouldn't tell you about it because the theory was you only want the good stuff. And again, I realize it's kind of odd from today's perspective, but I respect these women whose point was that, it wasn't to mock something at the restaurant. It was to talk about how good it was. It's not to say they wouldn't criticize, they just wouldn't criticize the food. So there, for example, in my home state of Florida, they would mention, for example, the dress code, it was too much. You had to be overly dressed to eat at a not that great restaurant. Could you go there with a cane? Was it easy enough to get in if you were a disabled person? And this was in the ‘60s. This was before that was a common conversation. They were true journalists. I would say that if you looked at what we call news values today, that's what they were abiding by.

AT: So one of the juxtapositions that I'm feeling here is it seems like a lot of food reviewers today and in more recent decades, have this very elitist vibe going on. (KV: Yes, 100 percent.) And I think there's also this sense of women are less forgivable when we're seen as being mean. And so I do wonder how much of that snarky, being a jerk about stuff is gendered.

KV: Yes. And by the way, snarky is the word I should have used because it's exactly what the current food journalism is. But I guess I look at it a little bit as conversational. I think the food journalists and the women's page journalists, including them in a group, they weren't talking down to their readers. These were the people that they would have had coffee with, or gone to lunch with, that kind of thing. And I've always respected them for that. Because they didn't do the more snarky later years stuff, where there's almost a joy in making fun of a

restaurant's bad food. That's not at all who these women were. And in fact, one of the women that was a restaurant reviewer, near where I live, when she wrote a bad review, and she did, she would go on vacation for a full week. She was that nice. And she told the truth. But she didn't enjoy the snarkiness, the negativity. So she would literally go away for a whole week after she gave a negative review. And I think that was difficult for some of these women that saw themselves as friendly, or connected or conversational, to suddenly have to take on that role. And they did it, but I don't think they enjoyed it.

AT: Especially because, as you were saying, this wasn't New York City, where there's so many people. (KV: Right.) This is smaller communities where there's a good chance that you know that person, you know their mother. (KV: Right!) And this tone of talking, which I think also contributes to that feeling that you are talking to a friend rather than you are trying to position yourself as an expert who is here to speak down to the plebian readers. And “let me tell you what is true because I know everything about food.”

KV: Exactly. And I think that was like the dual role they played because the readers like them, but their editors are often critical and negative in their own way. And so they try to kind of find that middle ground.

AT: Now, switching gears from food to fashion, you've also written about newspaper fashion editors in the 1950s and ‘60s, Women Writers of the Runway.

KV: And this was a real joy because I knew the food editors a little bit, but I didn't know the fashion editors until I started working on this book. And when we think of where we are today, it's so easy to get any kind of clothing. You can go to the store, you go to Amazon, you order online, there's all these things. And it was so different to realize that people made their own clothes in a way that is not something that seems typical today. But in the newspaper, they would have patterns for clothing. And you have the pattern, but you still have to find the clothing. You have to have a talent, a skill if you will. And so it was amazing how women, particularly in the ‘50s and ‘60s, were changing from dressing like their mothers, because that was kind of the idea. You had white gloves and a hat and all that, into the ‘60s, which was a very changing time, particularly for young people. I'm in Florida where it's very hot all of the time. And I was amazed in the ‘50s that women would wear these big hats, white gloves. It was in the 90s! It was a very different understanding of things and what was okay and what was normal. In the 1960s, there were stories that people wore paper clothes, paper clothes, what you're thinking of, paper clothes. And so it was just really interesting, as well as I mentioned about the food editors. In post-World War II in Europe, there wasn't much fashion anymore after the war. And so American fashion editors who'd never been out of their city got to go abroad. And it was just really neat how they were doing these things and trying these things and how fashion makes you fit in or purposely rejects conformity, particularly in the ‘60s. It was really, really interesting. And also a reminder, as I mentioned to you earlier, that what we wear, it shows who you are or who you want to be. And I think often women who like clothing is treated as superficial. But if men like sports, it's okay. And that has just always bothered me. And ever since I wrote that book, I do pay attention to scarves and jewelry and things I never did before. And I definitely feel that there's a certain amount of judgment when I give talks because I'm too much. But I think that was what they created. And that's a foundation that shouldn't be rejected to me because by not doing that, it almost rejects what they put out there. And whether it's food, fashion, any of this stuff, I do find that women who overly project feminine ideals are somehow bad. Like you're more serious if you don't wear makeup or you don't work clothes with bright colors, that kind of thing. And then gosh, boy, that doesn't seem helpful to me.

AT: You can also argue that by rejecting femininity, not only are you dictating what another woman should do with her life, her time, her energy, her body, her money, which is just generally problematic regardless, you're also trying to tell women that they have to be “like men,” which is not what feminism is supposed to be. It's supposed to be, we are making space for women, not we are forcing women into male boxes.

KV: Right. And that's, that's pretty much the heart of everything I try to do, which is why can't we have both? Why can't we take the things that feminists fought for, particularly say in the 1960s and early 1970s, why can't that exist as well as things that might've been embraced in the 1950s? And that's why I hate the tradwife concept because it seems to imply that those things that women might like to do, like gardening and sewing and cooking and whatnot. Why can't that co-exist with women's work, paid work, and in other political issues? And it really did until we started talking about it more openly, I feel.

AT: One of the things I also find interesting is that I find, as mentioned earlier, being able to cook for yourself is a matter of independence. (KV: Yes.) But also when we're talking about the fashion side, I've seen so many creative women and girls, teenagers, who customize their own clothes. Or if you're a woman who's bigger than a size 4 US, then a lot of times knowing how to make changes to your own clothing so that they fit your body better. (KV: Right.) Because a lot of fashion is not designed to be inclusive, whether that's certain kinds of disability, whether that's what they call plus size, which I think is just anything that's over a 0. (KV: Yeah.) It just means it's in the positive numbers. But it's empowering to be able to take that control, whether it's creativity, whether it's expression, or whether it's just, “I want this to fit my body in a certain way that fast fashion does not allow for.” Like these are empower, feeding yourself and changing how you're clothing yourself, those are control, those are empowerment. That is feminism.

KV: Right. We just don't talk about it, I think, openly in that sort of way, like in a broad sense.

AT: Speaking of women expressing opinions, happens a lot on this podcast. (laughter) (KV: Good.) Another of your books is called *Women Politicking Politely*. So going back to that question of women are more acceptable when they are not seen to be mean. And so the subtitle is “well behaved women making a difference in the 1960s and ‘70s.” So tell me about from what you know, how respectability plays into both how women conduct activism and then how that activism is perceived.

KV: : There's a bumper sticker magnets, that sort of thing in the US that is “well behaved women rarely make history.” It's a very common phrase.

AT: I actually end every episode with that phrase. So you'll be hearing that phrase momentarily.

KV: But I've always felt, if that is true, that well behaved women are not part of history, it's the problem of historians.

AT: That's actually the original context, though. (KV: Yes!) So it's sort of been co opted to mean you have to misbehave but Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, and I think the actual phrase is “seldom” and I just couldn't say seldom. (KV: Yeah, I think you're right.) Yeah, I think that's on me. I say it wrong. But she was actually complaining that historians don't acknowledge they don't write about it's not that they are not part of history and they should not be celebrated. It's that we do not celebrate them. And that's what she was commenting on. So that is actually the correct usage of that phrase is, well behaved women should be acknowledged more.

KV: Right. And I give a lot of talks about women that live through the ‘50s and ‘60s and they love that line. That concept, because I do think there's this echo chamber when it comes to women's history that we talk about 10, a dozen, 20 women. It's the same women all the time. And so that's a big part of what I'd like to add, if you will, to that discussion of women's history are these women who are well behaved. And the women that I look at, I've often gone through their letters, their journals, that kind of thing. And they were very well aware that they wouldn't really probably be part of history. They made an immense difference, but they knew that within the ‘50s and the ‘60s, they couldn't. They had to be the well-behaved. And many of them mentioned the fact that

they could say whatever they wanted if they wore lipstick and heels or lipstick and white gloves, because that was the place they came from, the agency they had, but they made an immense difference. But I talked about this to my students sometimes, you can't look through our eyes at their time period. What you and I might do now is not the same thing you would have done in the 1950s, ‘60s, or ‘70s. And so I think that's important to think about too. What did they have at their disposal? What could they say? What could they do, particularly if they didn't want to get in trouble, didn't want to lose their jobs, if they wanted to continue making a difference? And those kinds of women, there's more than I could ever research. There's so many. And I often say in my talks at the end, “go and find the woman in your community that did this. The woman who's never been written about, who never got the attention, but really did create a library or a kindergarten or juvenile justice system. Go look at them because they're out there and they deserve recognition.”

AT: I have another episode with Meg Campbell from the Boston Women's Heritage Trail. And one of the things that we were talking about is on their site, which they graciously allowed me to share the biographies from that site to the Infinite Women database. When you were saying, there's the same 10 to 20 women over and over again, that's actually where Infinite Women comes from because you see all these listicles about “five women artists you haven't heard of.” And there's never just five And so when I complain about, “oh my God, this work never ends.” And my husband's like, “you literally called it infinite. You did this to yourself.” But one of the things that Meg and I were talking about is that importance of local history societies and sites and all of that is getting these stories out. A lot of the stories on that site about women who maybe were immigrants who moved to Boston and opened up a restaurant and they were a community fixture for decades. And they did make a difference, but they didn't do it on a national scale. They didn't do it loudly. And so that gets lost. And so that's really important that those stories are still accessible and they are everywhere, like you were saying.

[Listen to Meg Campbell on the Boston Women's Heritage Trail] or [read the transcript].

KV: One of the women who was probably one of the most significant that I looked at, she wrote a letter to a friend and said, “no one will ever remember me.” And that's in the back of my mind on my worst days. It's my job. Most of the women I write about did not have children. A lot of them didn't marry. There was just not family that would continue their stories. And so I do find that an important responsibility to make sure that what they did, even if it was behind the scenes, they weren't on the front pages of the newspaper, that their stories are told because it adds to that conversation of how progress is made or sometimes how progress isn't made.

AT: And then in 2023, you published *Vivian Castleberry: Challenging the Traditions of Women's Roles, Newspaper Content, and Community Politics*. So as far as I know, this is the only book that you've written that focused on one specific individual woman. Is that correct?

KV: You are so smart. It was so scary. Yes. Because when you have lots of people, you bring in everything. Vivian was also the only woman I ever met, of the women I write about. So that adds to that responsibility. And Vivian was probably the most special person of any of the women I wrote about. She was from Dallas, Texas in the US. She covered the Kennedy assassination. She spent 50 years writing about every part of women's news. She was the first woman to be on the editorial board of her newspaper. She was very proud of that until she realized all they did was talk about football and she resigned. So she was that gal. And she had six children. The only boy died when he was only a few hours old, but she had five girls. And her husband said that they made everything work, he was a school teacher, because he knew how to braid hair. And he could take care of things. And his name is Curtis Castleberry. And that's the name of my oldest son. Because I thought if you could be that kind of dad, that's the best namesake I could give to my kid.

AT: Sorry, when you said that she realized all they talked about was football. And I'm like, “Oh, yes, the important men's business: sports.”

KV: That's really what she said. And she said, “I couldn't believe I worked so hard to get in that room to do all of that. And that was the result.” But then she also spoke about it. And that's an important thing, too, is that would women fight hard for a position, and then it's not what you wanted? Talk about that, too.

AT: And be willing to say, never mind, right? (KV: Yes.) Be willing to say, “I summited the peak, the view was crap. I'm heading back down where I can actually get stuff done. Because this is a waste of my time.”

KV: Yeah. And she was so vocal in her community. After she retired, she spent another 25 years working with women abroad to create peace. There's a peace center named for a university in Texas in her name. And it's a strange time, because she worked with Russian women. It's a weird time in America to think back to that. But she worked for peace. And it's really a strange thing how few universities and political organizations care about peace. And the more she used to talk about it, I thought, “why aren't we all talking about peace?” That seems like a really important thing. And that was Vivian.

AT: And so your current project is focused on newspaper advice columns in the 1950s and ‘60s. So what do, I guess, the questions people are asking and the answers they're getting tell us about the US at that time?

KV: What's amazing to me about these advice columns is that they're so similar to just the human condition that we have today. So most newspapers had national syndicated. So you have that national view. And they would also have a local columnist. So if there's a problem specific to that community, you'd hear about it. Almost every newspaper had a teen advice column, which is not something I feel like you hear much about today. But I always love that idea that in the ‘50s and ‘60s, if you had a problem, you're a teenager, and you don't feel like you have a parent or a teacher or a coach or anyone else to talk to, you had to sit down and write a letter. You had to figure out the address of the newspaper. You had to get a stamp. You had to find the mailbox. You had to send it in. And then every day, you looked in the newspaper to see if it was answered, which I just find to be just the most amazing aspect of newspapers in general. But the questions that they asked are the same kinds of things, whether they were teens or adults, that we would ask today. Arguing with your spouse, problems with your boss at work. If you're a kid, not liking your parents. Dating situations. I have a high schooler, and these questions could work today. And again, this was decades ago. And so I think what these advice columns tell us is that, in many ways, we haven't changed that much. We have the same questions, problems, good things and bad things. I will say that the advice columnists ran in the women's section, but it was one of the only parts of the women's section that men read. And it was because they would write in, because they were arguing with their wife, and they wanted some sort of validation for whatever the issue was. I always just thought that was just fascinating that they just wanted someone to say, “my wife is wrong.” And these ran in newspapers every day of the week, but some of these advice columnists would still write individually to the readers. So even if it didn't run in the newspaper, some of them would still make sure that these people felt heard, these readers. And I just thought there was something amazing about the fact that that was really the original social media.

AT: I find it funny that you say the only one of these sections that the men read, because I'm like, “or is it just the only one they admitted to read?”

KV: Oh, yes, I think you're on to something with that.Because yeah, I think they probably did and didn't admit it. You're exactly right about that. But it was interesting that they were so vocal about that one thing they did that I thought also probably gave a little bit of validation to an advice column they might not have otherwise had. But every time I saw a reference to it, it was completely an argument with a wife or girlfriend, only.

AT: I also think this speaks to what we were talking about earlier about, women's roles and fashion and all of

that. Being unpaid emotional support is considered a default duty of women, (KV: Yes.) whether that's for other women or for men, or even in professional settings where it's like, that's not part of my job, but I guess it's one of the functions that I'm serving. So good on them for at least getting paid for it.

KV: Right, exactly. Because all of the initial advice columns that went back decades were all initially called advice to the lovelorn. So the idea was that, as you said, women had that emotional intelligence that they could somehow make these kinds of decisions. But at least they had some kind of advocacy, if you will.

AT: Was this a period when they were called agony ants?

KV: Yes, yes, exactly. Yes. And that came out of the British advice columns. And it was always a family-related concept. So it was an aunt, it was a grandma, it was somebody. And I really do think that was part of what women can, if they wanted to get into the newspaper, they had to figure out what was going to be their expertise. And the aunt, the grandma, the niece, that kind of gave them that credence in that way.

AT: I just love that women are allowed to be an authority when it is your personal issues.

KV: Right. If you look back, that happened. And then sometimes it was simply taken away from them. If you look at, at least in the US, modern advice columns are often men now. And it's usually about advice having to do with sexuality. So it's a different kind of thing. When women stopped being food editors, it was all men. And they were, again, grilling things or creating cocktails and that sort. So it was interesting that once women created that expertise, then they lost it in ways that men got to take over. And part of that made me sad.

AT: Now, I feel like you've touched on a couple different points. But what, broadly speaking, are the lessons that you hope people will take away from all of your books, whether we're talking about journalists and editors, as historians, or just as audiences who consume media today?

KV: Women are a big part of our history that isn't told. I find it consistently shocking how few women really are part of history, specifically local history. They made such a difference and they don't get recognition for what they've done. We take advantage of the things they created without giving them the credit. I have been writing about these women for 25 years. And early on, I thought," write as fast as you can, because someone else is going to steal your idea. They're going to find this woman and write about her. And after 25 years, no one's ever done that. And I, in some ways, feel sad about it. I'm happy that I got to tell their stories, but after 25 years, I would have thought someone would have stole some of my ideas. And I almost wish they had, because I think the more these women's stories aren't told means that we have that echo chamber of the same women whose stories we already know being told. And we don't have a good history if we don't tell all of these stories. And the women that I specialize in, post-World War II through the '70s, that's kind of a long time ago, particularly in the lives of my students. The fact that history is created every day, whatever just happened. I'm amazed how little is told about these women.

AT: Join us next time on the Infinite Women podcast. And remember, well-behaved women rarely make history.