

History of Canada: Moments that Matter

HIST 235 (101)

2016W1

Professor Bradley Miller

Email: brmiller@mail.ubc.ca

Office: Buchanan Tower, room 1105

Office Hours: Monday 2-3:00pm; Thursday 11am-12:00pm; by appointment; drop-in's welcomed

Note: I have an open door office policy: if I'm in the office I'm generally more than happy to meet with you, whether it's during office hours or not.

Teaching Assistants

David Adie: david.adie@alumni.ubc.ca

Barrie Blatchford: barrie.blatchford@ubc.ca

Tyler Hagan: tyler.hagan@ubc.ca

Lectures: Mondays & Wednesdays, 1-2pm, Buchanan A202

Welcome to History 235! In this unconventional introduction to Canadian history we will focus on the question of what “moments” have mattered in Canada’s past and what meaning they have in the present. Through lectures given by an array of UBC history professors, tutorials, and assignments, we will investigate different interpretations of a number of “defining moments” that have shaped northern North America from early European colonialism to twenty-first century debates over human rights. Along the way, we will learn more about Canada’s past, and we will reflect on what matters about how this past is approached and understood today. You will also be introduced to key methods of historical practice, which can serve you well both in and beyond the study of history.

Course Details

Design and structure: Instead of encountering just one interpretation of Canadian history, you will be introduced to an unusual range of voices and perspectives. Lectures will be delivered by seven different professors from UBC’s Department of History. Drawing on their particular areas of expertise, each lecturer will develop their own responses to the question: what moments have mattered in Canada’s history, and why? Readings, assignments, and tutorial discussions will then give you an opportunity to assess their answers, to understand each moment in its broader historical context, to make connections between different moments, and to explore other possible responses to the central questions of the class.

Lectures will be delivered on Mondays and Wednesdays from 1pm to 2pm. You should also be registered in one tutorial section, which will meet weekly (except for weeks 1, 6, 9, 10 and 13, when there will be no tutorials). Your engaged and regular attendance is expected in both lectures and tutorials.

Objectives: You will all have different hopes and goals for this course, but no matter where you start, in History 235 you will have the opportunity: 1) to expand your knowledge and

understanding of key topics in Canadian history; 2) to explore the significance of different interpretations of or perspectives on Canadian history, and on the study of History more generally; and 3) to develop your skills in key areas of historical practice. Course content, assignments, activities, and discussions are designed to work together towards these three goals so that by the time you walk out of the final examination in December, you should be able to:

- Explain, analyze, and connect a number of key events in Canadian history by situating them in and assessing their significance within their broader historical contexts.
- Recognize how our interpretations of Canadian history continue to matter in and shape the world in which we live, and in so doing, discuss and evaluate what is at stake in how we interpret Canadian history today.
- Demonstrate and apply developed or refined skills in historical research, analysis, writing, and communication.

Course Readings

Required: The textbook for this course is Margaret Conrad, *A Concise History of Canada* (Cambridge University Press, 2012). It is available in the UBC Bookstore, and has been placed on reserve in the library (two-hour loan). All tutorial readings are available online through the UBC library website. Readings will not be posted on the Connect site.

Recommended: I recommend Jeffrey W. Alexander and Joy Dixon, *Thomson Nelson Guide to Writing in History* (Toronto: Thomson Nelson, 2006 or 2010), which is a helpful resource when it comes to writing in History. The book is available in the UBC Bookstore, while an online version is also available here: <http://www.history.ubc.ca/content/writing-centre>

Assignments and Evaluation

Tutorial Participation – 25%

In tutorial, we will discuss the academic articles listed in the syllabus under the heading “tutorial readings;” the textbook readings will not be discussed, though you will be responsible for using that material on the mid-term test and final exam. Active participation in these discussion sessions will be vital. ***If you come to tutorial but say nothing you will fail this portion of the class: tutorial attendance will count for only 30% of the participation grade.*** The TA’s will be evaluating participation based on engagement with and participation in the discussions.

Mid-Term Test – 15%

The mid-term test will take place on **Wednesday 2 November 2016**. It will consist of short answer questions and questions where students will identify and describe the historical significance of particular people, terms, issues, objects, or dates. This test will cover all of the lecture materials and readings from weeks 2-9. Students who cannot attend the test will need to supply a doctor’s note or other documentation to demonstrate that there was a significant barrier to their attendance or other extenuating circumstances.

Reading Responses – 20%

Students will write four short response papers (each should be 3-4 double-spaced pages, using 12 point Times New Roman font) about the assigned tutorial readings in **weeks 3, 5, 7, and 11**. The papers will argue that one of the two articles was better than the other, and will support that argument by analyzing each for their strengths and weaknesses while making a clear argument about the difference in quality. As you decide which article you want to argue was better, remember that it is important to get beyond your personal stylistic or subject matter preferences. Things to consider about the articles in making your argument may include: how effective the articles are at making and supporting a provocative argument, how clearly the articles identify and address an important gap in the literature, how logical and well-structured the papers are and how their structure and style impacts their effectiveness. Students may also want to consider whether the authors seemed to be trying to make broader ideological points about things like law, colonialism, identity, race, or gender, and how effectively these points are articulated. (*But please note:* all of these are intended more as questions to get you thinking than as issues you must tackle in your paper. Trying to address all of these issues will leave you trying to cram far too much into your paper. Be selective in what you choose to explore.) The focus of this paper will be on demonstrating your own ability to understand and critique the work of scholars, and to make a concise and convincing argument about the quality of that work.

For citations, students may do an abbreviated MLA format, putting citations in brackets using only the author's last name and the page number (eg., (Whitfield, p. 42)).

The reading responses will be due in tutorial.

Late Policy: *Late reading responses will be penalized at 2% per day including Saturdays and Sundays.*

E-Copy Policy: *Although students are required to submit reading responses in hard copy, they are also required to keep an e-copy in case the hard copy is lost.*

Research Essay – 20%

After spending much of the semester engaging with and critiquing the work of historians, students will have their own opportunity to explore a moment that mattered in Canadian history. Students will write and submit a research paper of ca. 8 pages on one of the topics listed in the essay primer to be posted on Connect in October. Your essay should develop and support a clear, insightful, and original argument that explains why the moment that you have picked mattered in Canadian history. The essay must have footnotes and a bibliography, and should draw from at least six relevant secondary sources. Students will be required to submit their papers through turnitin.com.

The essays will be due in the Department of History main office (Room 1297, Buchanan Tower) by 4pm on **Friday 2 December 2016**.

Late Policy: *Late research essays will be penalized at 2% per day including Saturdays and Sundays.*

E-Copy Policy: *Although students are required to submit research essays in hard copy, they are also required to keep an e-copy in case the hard copy is lost.*

Final Exam – 20%

The final exam will take place during the exam period and will be in two parts, each worth 50% of your exam mark. For each part you will answer one essay question. For the first essay you will answer a question that the teaching staff will pick. For part II you will have a choice of two questions and will pick one to answer. These questions will all be drawn from a long list that will be emailed out and posted on Connect approximately two weeks before the end of term.

Plagiarism and Academic Honesty

Plagiarism will not be tolerated. It is your responsibility to familiarize yourself with the University of British Columbia's academic honesty and plagiarism rules and regulations.

All written work must be your own. All quotations and material drawn from another source should be properly cited, in the form specified in your assignment. Failure to acknowledge your sources constitutes plagiarism, which will have serious consequences (ranging from failure of an assignment to failure of the course or suspension from the University). If you are in doubt, *cite everything*.

Professor Leslie Paris of the History Department has articulated a concise but not exhaustive definition of plagiarism in the academic context: "Plagiarism means claiming someone else's work (arguments, evidence, or words) as your own, without crediting him or her. Plagiarism can include 1) pasting material from the internet or another essay into your work, without any attribution, 2) citing a source in your footnotes, but retaining the original author's sentences outside of quotation marks (or changing only a word or two of their original writing), or 3) using another scholar's specific arguments or historical evidence, in your own words, but without acknowledging your source in the footnotes. You can face severe penalties from the university if you are found to have plagiarized. If you have questions about when and how to ascribe information or ideas to others, please see your professor or TA so that we can discuss appropriate citation techniques."

More details on citation and plagiarism are available at the History Department Writing Centre at:

<http://www.history.ubc.ca/content/common-questions-about-citations>

Details on University policies on misconduct are available at:

<http://www.calendar.ubc.ca/vancouver/index.cfm?tree=3,54,111,959>

Medical Exceptions / Accommodations

If you are experiencing medical problems (including mental health issues) or if you have special circumstances that prevent you from engaging actively in class discussions or handing

your assignments in on time, please talk to your teaching assistant or to me about them or contact Arts Advising. *We do not want to penalize students who have special circumstances, but if we don't know, or if Arts Advising doesn't contact us, there's nothing we can do to help you.*

Reading Critically for Class

Participation in the discussion sessions will be vital. In this class we'll be asking you to read, debate, and critique the work of academic historians. But reading academic journal articles and book chapters critically isn't easy. It takes a lot more than skimming a few paragraphs or highlighting some details to develop your own opinions on the merits and problems of a given piece of writing. Here is a short essay written by an American professor suggesting ways to read better and more critically. It contains a lot of things I wish I'd been told as an undergraduate:

Reading history: Some Suggestions on Critically Evaluating Your Reading in History

Historians commonly distinguish between primary sources and secondary sources. A primary source is a source created at the time of the event you are interested in--an eyewitness account, a newspaper editorial, a set of letters, a manuscript census return, a photograph, even a physical artifact such as the ruins of a house. A secondary source is an account or interpretation of the event which is based, in turn, on primary sources. Thus a work of history is a secondary source.

In reading a work of history (a secondary source), the place to begin is to seek out the author's main points--to find out what she is trying to tell you. Only when you understand what it is she wants to convince you, can you begin to ask critical questions about the book or article. Basic to this task is the distinction between theme and thesis (plural, theses). Essentially the theme is what the book or article is about; the thesis is what it attempts to prove. All books have a theme, or topic; good ones have both a theme and a thesis (or, in fact, several theses with one or two dominant ones which run through the entire work). A thesis is often quite simple and direct, not necessarily an extremely subtle or brilliantly new idea. But it is an idea which needs explanation and defense before you, the reader, can be expected to agree to it.

The main theses of a work are usually to be found stated clearly in the introductory chapter and the final chapter. In a chapter or essay, they will usually appear at the beginning and near the conclusion. So these are the parts to read first. You probably don't need to read each page consecutively, from page 1 to page 488. Instead, rapidly read through the preface, introduction, and conclusion. Also, look over the table of contents, bibliography, and footnotes. Rather quickly you ought to be able to get a sense of the scope of the book or essay and of its central points or theses. Similarly, glance over each chapter before reading it more carefully. Generally you will find that the details of the argument, the examples, the dates and names, stick with you much more easily when you understand their place in the over-all argument which the work is making.

If a history book is reasonably clearly laid out, you ought to be able to read and evaluate it in a couple of hours or so. Try it--test yourself! Give yourself, say, 45 minutes to look over a

history book, after which you will write a page describing the main points of the book. This won't work with a textbook, which is too big and compressed and will probably have to be read more slowly--but you could do it with each chapter of a textbook.

Having figured out what the author is saying, how do you critically appraise the work? Unfortunately, some students find this difficult because they think such an appraisal requires that one be an authority in the field with which the book deals. Obviously, if you are an authority it makes the job of evaluation easier. But, equally so, to be an authority on every book you read is rarely the case for anyone; even a world authority on a given subject reads books in fields in which he or she is relatively uninformed. Yet he must try, if he is to be a thoughtful person, to come to some conclusions as to the value of the book. Likewise, you may not be an authority comparable to the authors you read, but you can exercise your critical faculties on the interpretations they advance.

You can do this not by attempting to impugn or dispute the evidence--that generally requires considerable expertise in the field--but by trying to see whether the evidence actually supports the conclusions the author draws, or whether it adds up to what she asserts it does. As you read, questions should rise in your mind: Are the author's examples representative or only exceptions? Does she offer sufficient examples to illustrate the case thoroughly, and to suggest that many more examples could have been introduced had space permitted? Does the view agree with views you have read about elsewhere or with what you know from personal experience? Does the author interpret a bit of evidence in one way, but you can see that it might logically be interpreted equally well in another fashion? Does she explicitly acknowledge arguments contrary to her own, and convincingly explain why they are inadequate?

Such questions as the above rely on a distinction between fact and interpretation. Actually, this distinction is rather difficult to delineate. The more you read and think about history, the more you will recognize that the line between fact and interpretation is not at all clear. This is so partly because large numbers of so-called "facts" are actually generalizations or interpretations, but have attained the status of "facts" because they are so well established that no one argues about them. For example, it is a fact, in this sense, that in the sixteenth century the influx of gold from America into western Europe caused a marked rise in prices. Obviously this is not a fact of the same order as the statement, "Abraham Lincoln was born February 12, 1809," but both have more in common with each other than with the statement, "There is some reason to believe that the Negro suffered less than any other class in the South from slavery." The latter assertion is clearly an interpretation--a conclusion drawn by the author from his study of the history of the pre-Civil War South. It may be true, it may be exaggerated, it may be wrong; but immediately upon reading it we recognize that this is not something everyone accepts.

Another problem with the fact-interpretation distinction is that historians, like all social observers, select their facts. That is, they choose from an infinite number of data about everything that ever happened in the past. But their choice of facts is shaped by the questions they ask. The facts are not simply lying there, waiting for the observer to come along and put them in the "correct" pattern. The facts are selected depending on the author's questions and methodological approach. We might even say that without interpretation, there can be no facts. For more on this subject, see chapter one of E.H. Carr, *What Is History?*.

Critical reading does not necessarily mean disagreement with the author's thesis or evidence. But if you agree, you should know why you agree. Similarly, you should be able to explain why you disagree and to think of evidence supporting your opinion. It is important to be specific in either case. Only by giving specific reasons why you agree or disagree with a point made by the author can you make clear what your own standards of judgment are.

Bearing in mind that these questions often will not work, you might find the following helpful some of the time:

1. What seem to be the author's assumptions and values? (Sometimes these are not directly stated.) What kind of academic training or other experience did the author have? What kinds of evidence does the author feel comfortable using? Whom does he appear to be addressing? Why does he think the topic is significant? Does he seem to subscribe to some ideological system such as Marxism (but don't let it prejudice you against the writer)?

2. How does the work relate to other reading in the course, or other books you've read? How does it relate to your personal experience?

3. If the author is correct, so what? Does the work suggest further questions or problems to be examined? Does it change our view of the past or of the present? If each good work of history has a thesis that the author is trying to elaborate and defend, that implies that historical writing is a kind of ongoing debate about the past. Historians occasionally bring to light new evidence--new facts--but for the most part, they debate issues of interpretation. No serious historian doubts that the Holocaust occurred, for example, but they are still debating many questions about the Holocaust. Was the event a logical outcome of deeply-rooted antisemitic attitudes in German (and European) culture or was it an aberration? Did most Germans know about and support the Holocaust? Was it a unique event or should we view it as one among many attempts in world history to destroy entire peoples? What have been the effects of the event on postwar European politics and culture? Discussion centers on why and how an event took place and what the consequences of the event have been. This applies not only to the Holocaust but to many other events of the past from the voyages of Columbus to the invention of the computer.

In your reading, then, you should not expect that historians will always agree, and you should not write a paper by trying to add up everything they say about a subject and assuming that the sum equals "the truth." Instead, look for areas of disagreement, issues that people seem to be discussing and debating and on which two or more interpretive ideas seem to have taken shape. Those unsettled areas are the ones your professor is likely to want to discuss in class. They are the ones where you yourself can most readily make a contribution as a writer of history.

For the original: <http://apps.carleton.edu/curricular/history/study/read/readinghistory/>

LECTURE AND TUTORIAL SCHEDULE

Week 1: Beginnings

Wednesday 7 September

Professor Bradley Miller – Introducing the Moments that Matter

Week 2: Contacts

Monday 12 September

Professor Tina Loo – Encounter at L'Anse aux Meadows

Wednesday 14 September

Professor Coll Thrush – 'British Columbia' and Beyond: The Indigenous Worlds of Captain Cook

Tutorial Readings

-Coll Thrush, "The Iceberg and the Cathedral: Encounter, Entanglement, and Isuma in Inuit London," *Journal of British Studies*, 53(1), 2014, 59-79.

-Kathryn Magee Labelle, "'They Only Spoke in Sighs': The Loss of Leaders and Life in Wendake, 1633-1639," *Journal of Historical Biography*, 6, 2009, 1-33.

Textbook Readings

Conrad, *Concise History*, 26-50.

Week 3: Proclaiming Rule

Monday 19 September

Professor Paige Raibmon – The Royal Proclamation and the Treaty of Niagara: The Turning Point that Should Have Been (but don't write it off yet!)

Wednesday 21 September

Professor Bradley Miller – Loyalism and Liberty after 1776

*Tutorial Readings – **READING RESPONSE DUE***

-Harvey Amani Whitfield and Barry Cahill, "Slave Life and Slave Law in Colonial Prince Edward Island, 1769-1825," *Acadiensis*, 38(2), 2009, 29-51.

-Erica M. Charters, "Disease, Wilderness Warfare, and Imperial Relations: The Battle for Quebec, 1759-1760," 16(1), 2009, 1-24.

Textbook Readings

Conrad, *Concise History*, 80-100.

Week 4: Democracies, Large and Small

Monday 26 September

Dr. Colin Grittner – Local Democracy: Governing Colonial Cities and Towns, part 1

Wednesday 28 September

Dr. Colin Grittner – Local Democracy: Governing Colonial Cities and Towns, part 2

Tutorial Readings

-Philip Girard, “I will not pin my faith to his sleeve’: Beamish Murdoch, Joseph Howe, and Responsible Government Revisited,” *Journal of the Royal Nova Scotia Historical Society*, 4, 2001, 48-69.

-Allan Greer, “From folklore to revolution: charivaris and the Lower Canadian rebellion of 1837,” *Social History*, 15(1), 1990, 25-43.

Textbook Readings

Conrad, *Concise History*, 120-133.

Week 5: Transformations in the Fur Trade World

Monday 3 October

Professor Paige Raibmon – 1830, A Turning Point in Canadian History?: Margaret Taylor, Frances, Ramsay Simpson, and Changing Marriage Practices in the Canadian Fur Trade

Wednesday 5 October

Professor Tina Loo - Why Bison Matter: Energizing Change in Canada

*Tutorial Readings – **READING RESPONSE DUE***

-Carolyn Podruchny, “Werewolves and Windigos: Narratives of Cannibal Monsters in French-Canadian Voyageur Oral Tradition,” *Ethnohistory*, 51(4), 2004, 677-700.

-Jean Barman, “Aboriginal Women on the Streets of Victoria: Rethinking Transgressive Sexuality During the Colonial Encounter” in Katie Pickles and Myra Rutherdale, eds., *Contact Zones: Aboriginal and Settler Women in Canada’s Colonial Past*. (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2005), 205-227.

Textbook Readings

Conrad, *Concise History*, 100-106.

Week 6: Constitutionalism after 1867

Monday 10 October

Lecture Cancelled – Thanksgiving Holiday

Wednesday 12 October

Professor Bradley Miller – *Citizens Insurance Co. v. Parsons* and the Constitution, 1881

Tutorial Readings

No tutorials this week

Textbook Readings

Conrad, *Concise History*, 134-157.

Week 7: Gender and Law

Monday 17 October

Professor Bradley Miller – The Persons Case, 1929, part 1: Gender and Law

Wednesday 19 October

Professor Bradley Miller – The Persons Case, 1929, part 2: Constitutions and Courts

Tutorial Readings – **READING RESPONSE DUE**

-Tarah Brookfield, “Divided by the Ballot Box: The Montreal Council of Women and the 1917 Election,” *Canadian Historical Review*, 89(4), 2008, 473-501.

-Sheila Gibbons, “‘Our Power to Remodel Civilization’: The Development of Eugenic Feminism in Alberta, 1909-1921,” *Canadian Bulletin of Medical History*, 31(1), 2014, 123-142.

Textbook Readings

Conrad, *Concise History*, 178-187.

Week 8: War in Europe

Monday 24 October

Professor Robert McDonald – ‘Death So Noble’: The First World War and the Nation

Wednesday 26 October

Professor Robert McDonald – Workers’ Revolt, 1919

Tutorial Readings

-Tim Cook, “Fighting Words: Canadian Soldiers’ Slang and Swearing in the Great War,” *War in History*, 20(3), July 2013, 323-344.

-Lyle Dick, “Sergeant Masumi Mitsui and the Japanese Canadian War Memorial,” *Canadian Historical Review*, 91(3), 2010, 435-463.

Textbook Readings

Conrad, *Concise History*, 194-202.

Week 9: In the Wake of War / Mid-Term Test

Monday 31 October

Lecture Cancelled: study for the Mid-Term Test

Wednesday 2 November
Mid-Term Test

Tutorial Readings
No tutorials this week

Textbook Readings
No textbook readings this week

Week 10: The White Paper

Monday 7 November
Professor Paige Raibmon – White Paper, Red Paper: Indigenous Resurgence in Canada, part 1

Wednesday 9 November
Professor Paige Raibmon – White Paper, Red Paper: Indigenous Resurgence in Canada, part 2

Tutorial Readings
No tutorials this week – Remembrance Day Holiday

Textbook Readings
Conrad, *Concise History*, 226-241.

Week 11: The Other Quiet Revolution

Monday 14 November
Professor Michel Ducharme – The Maple Leaf: Flagging a new Canadian Identity, part 1

Wednesday 16 November
Professor Michel Ducharme – The Maple Leaf: Flagging a new Canadian Identity, part 2

*Tutorial Readings – **READING RESPONSE DUE***
-Ryan Edwardson, “‘Of War Machines and Ghetto Scenes’: English-Canadian Nationalism and The Guess Who’s ‘American Woman,’” *American Review of Canadian Studies*, 33(3), 2003, 339-356.

-Paul Litt, “Trudeaumania: Participatory Democracy in the Mass-Mediated Nation,” *Canadian Historical Review*, 89(1), 2008, 27-53.

Textbook Readings
Conrad, *Concise History*, 241-257.

Week 12: The Cold War

Monday 21 November
Professor Steven Lee – Canada-US Relations, Europe, and the Early Cold War

Wednesday 23 November

Professor Steven Lee – Canada and Cold War Crises

Tutorial Readings

-John Herd Thompson and Stephen J. Randall, “Canada in the New American Empire, 1948-1960,” *Canada and the United States: Ambivalent Allies*. 4th ed. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008), 171-198. [Online through Ebrary]

Textbook Readings

Conrad, *Concise History*, 216-225.

Week 13: Constitutional Reform and Constitutional Rights

Monday 28 November

Professor Bradley Miller – The Constitution and the Charter of Rights, part 1: The Push for Change

Wednesday 30 November

Professor Bradley Miller – The Constitution and the Charter of Rights, part 2: Courts, Rights, and Politics

Textbook Readings

Conrad, *Concise History*, 258-287.

Tutorial Readings

No tutorials this week