



CALL FOR PAPERS FOR 1977/AVIS DU COMITE DU PROGRAMME DE 1977

The CHA's (1977) Programme Committee, in keeping with the association's two year planning procedure, invites members to submit proposals for papers to be presented to the association's Annual Meeting in Fredericton in June 1977. Proposals for individual or group presentations must be accompanied by a brief (250-300 word) description of the suggested paper or papers, along with title, theme, sources and methodology. The deadline for the receipt of proposals is 1 May 1976. Proposals should be sent to Carman Miller, Chairman, CHA (1977) Programme Committee, History Department, McGill University, Montreal, Quebec.

* * *

Pour faire suite à la décision du Conseil de la SHC d'échelonner sur deux ans l'organisation des futurs congrès, le comité du programme de 1977 invite les membres de la Société à présenter des projets de communications pour le congrès annuel qui aura lieu à Fredericton, en juin 1977. Les intéressés doivent préparer un résumé de 250 à 300 mots des communications individuelles ou collectives qu'ils désirent suggérer. Ce condensé doit comprendre le titre, le thème, les sources et la méthodologie du projet. La date-limite pour la réception des propositions a été fixée au 1^{er} mai 1976. On voudra bien faire parvenir celles-ci à l'adresse suivante: Carman Miller, président, Comité du programme de 1977, Société historique du Canada, History Department, McGill University, Montréal, Québec.

AVIS DU COMITE DES MISES EN CANDIDATURE/A REQUEST FROM THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE

La présidente du comité des mises en candidature, Patricia E. Roy, invite les membres de la Société à lui faire part de leurs suggestions pour trouver:

- (1) deux candidats pour le poste de vice-président.
- (2) au moins huit candidats et au plus douze pour remplir quatre postes au Conseil. Le comité désire vivement assurer une représentation régionale équitable. Il veut aussi que les membres du Conseil appartiennent à des secteurs de recherche aussi variés que possible.
- (3) au moins quatre et pas plus de six candidats pour remplir les postes vacants au comité des mises en candidature.
- (4) au moins deux candidats au poste de président du comité du programme de 1978.

Les membres devront faire parvenir leurs suggestions, avant le 15 mars 1976, à Mme Roy, Department of History, University of Victoria, British Columbia, V8W 2Y2.

* * *

The chairman of the Nominating Committee, Pat Roy, invites members to send suggestions for candidates for the posts that must be filled at the June Annual Meeting.

The CHA Nominating Committee is required to:

- (1) Nominate at least two persons for vice-president.
- (2) Nominate at least eight and no more than twelve persons for the four Council positions. The committee is anxious to obtain fair regional and subject representation on Council.
- (3) Nominate at least four and not more than six for the two Nominating Committee vacancies.
- (4) Nominate at least two candidates for 1978 Programme Chairman.

Professor Roy asks that suggestions be sent to her at the Department of History, University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, V8W 2Y2 not later than 15 March 1976.

COMITEE ON GRADUATE STUDIES/COMITE DES ETUDES SUPERIEURES

The CHA Committee on Graduate Studies was established in 1972 with broad terms of reference from the Council. It consisted of Professors I. Lambi (chairman), J.P. Gagnon, P. Harnetty, J. Monet, P.B. Waite, and S.F. Wise. The committee directed its efforts to three main areas within which it examined a number of specific topics as follows: (1) the quality of graduate work in Canada (what sort of graduate training in history has been provided in Canadian universities; should such training be limited to certain universities; could there be greater cooperation between universities in order to improve the quality and facilities for graduate work; and should there be any adjustment in the relationship between the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees?); (2) the employment opportunities for graduate students; and (3) the financing of graduate work.

The committee began its work early in 1973. It prepared a questionnaire in order to assemble information about graduate work in history in Canada. This was sent to chairmen of history departments across the country in May, 1973. The committee hoped the completed questionnaires would be returned by 30 October 1973, but this did not prove possible. By March, 1974, twelve departments had replied; an appeal was then sent to departments which had not responded urging them to do so. Six months later the committee had received responses from a total of twenty institutions and considered that the time had come to analyze the data and prepare a report. Professor Ivo Lambi prepared a draft report soon thereafter and early in 1975 the committee assembled in Ottawa to draw up a final report for submission to the Council of the CHA in time for its June meeting in Edmonton.

The principal conclusions and recommendations of the committee, based on the data provided by the universities, were as follows. We concluded that adequate resources for graduate work in history, both in terms of manpower and research materials, do exist in Canada. As far as employment opportunities for history graduates are concerned, the present combination of inflation and changing public and governmental attitudes towards universities makes for a gloomy outlook. The twenty universities together estimated a maximum of

31 new permanent posts in history over the five years from 1973-78. It is probable that library budgets will not rise as fast as the price of books and periodicals. There appears to be reduced support for graduate students in history on the part of governments and the Canada Council.

The committee made the following recommendations:

- (1) There should be greater cooperation between history departments in pooling their resources by offering joint programmes and by avoiding unnecessary duplication.
- (2) In order to promote more rapid dissemination of information about major library acquisitions, the editors of the CHA newsletter should be instructed to periodically secure such information from the chairmen of history departments for the purpose of publication.
- (3) Canadian universities housing research collections should provide ready access to all graduate students and faculty. Inquiries should be made by the CHA to find out whether such access is, in fact, granted at present.
- (4) M.A. programs as constituted at present should be continued without any deliberate contraction.
- (5) The Ph.D. degree should be kept basically as it now is, possessing the rigor necessary for training university teachers, but the number of students admitted to Ph.D. programmes should be limited to those who are outstanding and who are specializing in fields for which there appears to be a demand. In this connection, Canadian universities should give preference to Canadian citizens and graduates of Canadian universities in their hiring of historians during the next five years.
- (6) The CHA should continue to compile statistics on the graduate student population and on job opportunities on an annual basis, or until such time as another agency assumes the responsibility.

On 4 June 1975 Council considered the committee's report and recommendations as follows:

- (i) Council received the report of the committee. It was agreed (Thomas-Morton) to circulate the report, when finalized, to all Canadian graduate departments of history and to publish a short precis in the newsletter. The committee's recommendations were dealt with as follows:
 1. Accepted without reservation (Morton-Friesen).
 2. No motion on this question since the information is readily available in the new edition of the Public Archives of Canada's Union List and through the National Library's telex service. Information about these services and any other major developments in this area should be published in the newsletter.

3. No motion on this question: it was thought no longer to be a fundamental problem.

4. Accepted (Wise-Morton).

5. Accepted (Wise-Morton).

6. Accepted (Morton-Wise). The SSRCC is to be approached with a request that they help in the compiling and digesting of the statistics. Professor Wise emphasized the importance of this statistical service so long as there was no other body willing to undertake the task (the federal government must be encouraged to enter the field, to give us the benefit of their data and expertise). The committee should consult the experienced group which compiles detailed statistics for the American Historical Association.

(ii) Council accepted (Wise-Morton) the committee's recommendations and asked that they be presented to the Annual Meeting. After they have been read and commented upon by university departments, Council will again consider its position on these matters.

(iii) I. Lambi's resignation as chairman was accepted with regret. P. Harnetty was named to replace Professor Lambi, who will remain on the committee.

(iv) J. Friesen asked the committee seriously to consider the aims and objectives of Canadian Ph.D. programmes. What are they? What should they be?

* * *

Le comité des études supérieures de la Société historique du Canada a été formé en 1972. A la demande du Conseil, MM. I. Lambi (président), J.-P. Gagnon, P. Harnetty, J. Monet, P. Waite et S.F. Wise acceptèrent de faire partie du comité, qui se vit confier un très large mandat. Le comité décida d'orienter ses efforts dans trois directions principales et d'étudier plus particulièrement les questions suivantes:

- 1^o la qualité des études avancées au Canada: quel genre de formation les étudiants gradués reçoivent-ils des universités canadiennes? quelles universités devraient offrir les études supérieures en histoire? pourrait-on améliorer la coopération entre les universités, afin de favoriser les études avancées? devrait-on modifier les rapports entre la maîtrise et le doctorat?
- 2^o les opportunités d'emploi pour les étudiants.
- 3^o le financement des études supérieures.

Le comité s'est mis au travail au début de 1973, en préparant un questionnaire sur les études avancées au Canada. Au mois de mai suivant, il demanda aux directeurs des départements d'histoire de bien vouloir le compléter, avant le

30 octobre. Cependant, en mars 1974, douze départements seulement avaient répondu. Le comité dut faire pression auprès des autres pour qu'ils complètent le questionnaire le plus tôt possible. Six mois plus tard, huit autres départements avaient répondu à l'appel et le comité estima le moment venu d'entreprendre l'analyse des données et de préparer un rapport. Le professeur Ivo Lambi rédigea alors un rapport préliminaire et le comité se réunit à Ottawa au début de l'an passé, pour mettre au point le rapport final dont le conseil de la SHC prit connaissance lors de sa réunion de juin, à Edmonton.

En s'appuyant sur les données fournies par les universités, le comité en arriva aux conclusions et recommandations suivantes. Il conclut d'abord que le Canada dispose des spécialistes et des matériaux de recherche requis pour les études supérieures en histoire. Les perspectives d'emploi, de leur côté, apparaissent plutôt sombres à cause de l'émergence simultanée de l'inflation et des changements dans l'attitude du public et des gouvernements vis-à-vis les universités. Au total, les 20 départements ont estimé à 31, au maximum, le nombre d'emplois permanents en histoire, qui seraient créés de 1973 à 1978. Il est probable aussi que l'augmentation du budget des bibliothèques sera inférieure à l'accroissement du coût des livres et des périodiques. De même, il semble que les gouvernements et le Conseil des Arts du Canada réduiront leur appui aux étudiants gradués en histoire.

Le comité a fait suivre ses conclusions des recommandations suivantes:

- 1^o Les départements d'histoire devraient accroître la coopération entre eux, en mettant leurs ressources en commun pour offrir des programmes conjoints et pour éviter des doublages inutiles.
- 2^o Les éditeurs du Bulletin de la SHC devraient prendre contact avec les directeurs des départements d'histoire pour connaître les principales acquisitions des bibliothèques et ils devraient en publier la liste dans le Bulletin.
- 3^o Les universités canadiennes qui ont acquis des collections de documents et d'ouvrages pour servir à la recherche devraient en permettre la consultation à tous les professeurs et à tous les étudiants gradués. La SHC devrait chercher à savoir si les universités limitent présentement l'accès à leurs collections.
- 4^o Les universités ne devraient pas diminuer délibérément le nombre d'étudiants à la maîtrise, telle qu'elle existe actuellement.
- 5^o Considérant que le doctorat doit assurer aux étudiants qui s'y destinent la formation nécessaire pour devenir professeur d'université, les universités ne devraient pas y apporter de modifications majeures.

Cependant seuls les étudiants brillants et ceux qui se spécialisent dans des domaines de recherche pour lesquels on a besoin de spécialistes devraient être admis au doctorat. Par ailleurs, durant les cinq prochaines années, les universités canadiennes devraient donner la préférence aux citoyens canadiens, dans l'engagement des historiens dont ils ont besoin.

- 6^o La SHC devrait continuer à compiler annuellement les statistiques relatives aux étudiants gradués et aux possibilités d'emploi, jusqu'à ce qu'un autre organisme assume cette responsabilité.

Le 4 juin 1975, le Conseil a pris connaissance du rapport du comité et il a approuvé les propositions suivantes:

- 1^o Le rapport reçu par le Conseil devra être envoyé à tous les départements d'histoire qui offrent la maîtrise et/ou le doctorat et un résumé devra paraître dans le Bulletin (Proposition Thomas-Morton).
- 2^o Le Conseil approuve sans réserve la première recommandation du comité (Proposition Morton-Friesen).
- 3^o Le Conseil juge la deuxième recommandation superflue: on peut obtenir ces renseignements en s'adressant à la Bibliothèque nationale qui dispose du télex ou en consultant la nouvelle édition du Catalogue collectif des manuscrits des archives canadiennes, publié par les Archives publiques du Canada.
- 4^o Le Conseil émet une opinion semblable au sujet de la troisième recommandation; il considère qu'il ne s'agit plus d'un problème important.
- 5^o Le Conseil approuve la quatrième et la cinquième recommandation (Proposition Wise-Morton).
- 6^o Il approuve aussi la sixième (Proposition Morton-Wise). La SHC doit présenter une requête au CCRSS pour qu'il apporte son aide dans la compilation et l'analyse des données. S.F. Wise insiste sur l'importance de cette tâche dont la SHC devrait s'acquitter tant qu'aucun autre organisme ne s'en chargera. Le comité devrait consulter les responsables d'un travail similaire entrepris par l'American Historical Association.
- 7^o Le Conseil demande que l'assemblée générale soit informée des recommandations du comité et il manifeste le désir d'en prendre de nouvelle connaissance lorsque les départements d'histoire les auront étudiées et commentées (Proposition Wise-Morton).
- 8^o Le Conseil accepte à regret la démission d'I. Lambi comme président du comité et il désigne P. Harnetty pour lui succéder. M. Lambi restera membre du comité.

9° J. Friesen demande au comité d'examiner attentivement les objectifs des études doctorales, au Canada. Quels sont-ils? Quels devraient-ils être?

RAPPORT DU PRESIDENT DU COMITE DU PROGRAMME DE 1975/REPORT OF 1975 PROGRAMME COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

Le comité du programme de 1976 s'est probablement déjà rendu compte des problèmes variés et difficiles que présente l'organisation du congrès annuel. L'une des questions les plus controversées porte sur le nombre des séances. Y en a-t-il trop ou pas assez? Si l'on organise plusieurs séances en même temps, les participants se plaignent qu'ils ne peuvent assister à toutes les communications qui les intéressent. Si l'on diminuait le nombre, on reprocherait au programme d'être trop peu varié. D'autre part, les historiens qui présentent une communication n'apprécient guère de devoir le faire le premier ou le dernier jour du congrès; ils ont alors tendance à accuser le comité du programme de malice ou d'ignorance, dans le choix de la date de la séance. Par ailleurs, certaines séances donnent lieu à des critiques, parce qu'il est parfois nécessaire de regrouper certaines communications qu'il vaudrait mieux ne pas présenter en même temps. Enfin, le comité du programme reçoit plusieurs suggestions pour mettre sur pied des séances non-traditionnelles; bien peu d'historiens, cependant, sont disposés à y participer. Dans la plupart des cas, il n'existe aucune solution qui puisse satisfaire tout le monde. Il faut donc essayer de trouver la plus acceptable.

Deux expériences tentées en 1975 semblent mériter qu'on les continue. La première est l'envoi d'un programme préliminaire, plusieurs mois avant le congrès. La seconde est la remise aux présidents de séance d'une formule à remplir lorsqu'ils font leur rapport au comité du programme. En 1974, celui-ci n'avait reçu que quelques comptes rendus. L'an passé, la situation s'est beaucoup améliorée puisque le comité a reçu des rapports pour près des deux tiers des séances. Quelques-uns des comptes rendus étaient très détaillés et contenaient des commentaires et des suggestions utiles.

En se basant sur ces rapports et sur mes propres observations, je peux tirer plusieurs conclusions. Dans l'ensemble, la présence aux séances a été satisfaisante, si l'on considère le nombre relativement bas d'inscriptions au congrès. Les séances les moins populaires portaient sur l'Amérique latine, probablement parce que l'Association canadienne pour les études latino-américaines s'était réunie une semaine avant la SHC. Les séances les plus populaires concernaient le Crédit social, l'Histoire du Canada en images et l'Histoire des femmes; elles ont attiré plus de cent personnes chacune.

En général, les présidents de séance se sont dit satisfaits de la qualité des communications, des commentaires et de la discussion. L'importance des commentateurs ne saurait être surestimée; un

bon commentateur peut transformer une séance pauvre en une séance profitable; le contraire est aussi vrai. Certains présidents ont affirmé qu'à leur séance, le manque d'unité dans les communications avait rendu la discussion difficile. D'autres ont dit, au contraire, que la diversité des communications avait stimulé la discussion. Il semble que les commentateurs ont fait la différence en grande partie, suivant le talent avec lequel ils ont soulevé des comparaisons et des contrastes.

Je dois dire avec regret qu'en général les séances les plus faibles ont été celles auxquelles ont participé des spécialistes de d'autres domaines d'étude. Il semble bien qu'elles n'aient pas été vraiment interdisciplinaires. Les chercheurs de champs de recherche différents semblent incapables de résister à la tentation d'abandonner leur spécialité propre et d'écrire de la mauvaise histoire. Si l'on pouvait persuader les sociologues, par exemple, de présenter de bonnes communications sociologiques plutôt que des mémoires historiques médiocres, le résultat serait plus satisfaisant. Les séances de ce genre présentent un autre problème: l'évaluation de la compétence des spécialistes des autres disciplines. Cette tâche est déjà difficile quand il s'agit des historiens; elle devient presque impossible avec ceux-là, à moins que l'un des membres du comité du programme connaisse un chercheur et soit familier avec son travail.

Les séances dont on a dit le plus de bien sont celles qui comportaient des documents audiovisuels. Les enregistrements d'Aberhart fournis par les Archives sonores des Archives publiques du Canada étaient très bien présentés et ont donné beaucoup de relief à la séance sur le Crédit social. J'ai entendu aussi des commentaires favorables au sujet des diapositives présentées lors de la séance sur l'Histoire du Canada par images. Le comité du programme devrait donc encourager fortement l'organisation de séances analogues.

En terminant, j'aimerais remercier les membres du comité - René Durocher, Lewis Hertzman, C.B. Koester, Jack Ogelsby et Leslie Upton - pour leur coopération et leur travail ardu. Je voudrais offrir aussi mes remerciements à Ken Munro et Pat Prestwich qui se sont chargés de l'organisation locale. Olive Baird, Dorothy Fearon et le personnel du Département d'histoire de l'Université de l'Alberta m'ont fourni une aide indispensable en dactylographiant plusieurs centaines de lettres et de nombreux brouillons du programme, en plus de voir à leur travail régulier.

* * *

As I suspect the 1976 Programme Committee has already discovered, any attempt to arrange a meeting of this size and scope presents the organizers with a variety of painful dilemmas. Should the meeting have many sessions or few? In

the first case there will be complaints that people were unable to attend all the sessions they wished. In the second case there will be criticisms of the lack of variety in the programme. Those who find their sessions scheduled on the first or last days of the meeting will suspect malice or ignorance or both on the part of the committee. The need to arrange the various proposals into sessions of two or three papers will mean some rather strange juxtapositions. There will be many suggestions for non-traditional formats for sessions but few will be willing to participate. Most of these problems are inherently insoluble to the satisfaction of all (even all the Programme Committee), so that a choice of evils is necessary.

Two innovations attempted in 1975 seem to me worthy of preservation. The first is the circulation of a draft programme well ahead of the meeting. The second is the distribution, prior to the meeting, of forms for chairmen of sessions to use in reporting. In contrast to the 1974 Annual Meeting, for which we received few reports, this year's meeting produced reports from more than two-thirds of the sessions. Some of the reports were very detailed and contained useful comments and suggestions.

On the basis of the reports and my own observations a number of conclusions are possible. Attendance at most sessions was good considering the relatively low overall registration. The least popular sessions were those dealing with Latin America, probably because the Canadian Association for Latin American Studies met a week before the CHA. The most popular were the sessions on Social Credit, Canada's Visual History and the History of Women, as well as the Labour History sessions, all of which had over a hundred in attendance.

In general chairmen were pleased with the quality of papers, comment and discussion. Many of the chairmen singled out the commentators for special praise. The importance of commentators cannot be overemphasized: a competent one can rescue a poor session; an inept one can spoil the effect of good papers. Some chairmen complained that the diversity of papers in their session made discussion difficult. Others said that the differences stimulated discussion. The difference seems largely due to the ability of the commentator to bring out comparisons and contrasts.

I regret to say that the weakest sessions generally were those in which scholars from other disciplines participated. The reason for the weakness appears to have been that these sessions were not truly interdisciplinary. Scholars from other disciplines seem unable to resist the temptation to abandon their own specialties and write bad history. If sociologists, for example, could be persuaded to present sound sociological papers instead of embarrassingly amateur histories, the result would be much more satisfactory. The other problem with sessions of

this kind lies in assessing beforehand the capabilities of individuals from other disciplines. This is a difficult enough task in our own field; with outsiders it becomes almost impossible unless someone on the Programme Committee is personally acquainted with the individual and his work.

The sessions which prompted the most favourable comment were those that made use of audio-visual materials. The Aberhart tapes provided by PAC Sound Archives were very well presented and added immeasurably to the session on Social Credit. I heard equally favourable comments on the slides presented at the Visual History session. Clearly the Programme Committee should do its utmost to encourage sessions of this kind.

I would like to thank the members of the committee - Rene Durocher, Lewis Hertzman, C.B. Koester, Jack Ogelsby and Leslie Upton - for their cooperation and hard work. I would also like to thank Ken Munro and Pat Prestwich for their equally indispensable work on local arrangements. The job would have been impossible without the work of Olive Baird and Dorothy Fearon and the History Department office, University of Alberta, who typed several hundred letters and numerous drafts of the programme in addition to their regular duties.

Roderick Macleod

HABITAT 1976

John H. Taylor of Carleton University, the CHA's representative to the United Nations Habitat Conference on Human Settlements, has submitted a preliminary account of his pre-conference activities. Professor Taylor's report will be placed before Council. The editors believe, however, that the report's general interest justifies its appearance in this number of the newsletter.

* * *

M. John H. Taylor, le représentant de la SHC à la Conférence des Nations-Unies sur les établissements humains qui aura lieu à Vancouver, en juin, a préparé un rapport qui sera soumis à l'attention du Conseil. Les éditeurs ont pensé que l'intérêt de ce rapport justifiait sa parution dans le numéro d'automne du Bulletin.

Somewhere in the order of 15,000 of the expert, interested and merely curious will gather in Vancouver in mid-year 1976 to confer on the problem of human settlements. This "Habitat" conference, under the auspices of the United Nations, is cousin to recent similar meetings on The Environment, The Population and The Sea, and like them will represent, in broad terms, the opinions of two groups: those of governmental organizations, and, to embrace the other half of humanity, Non-Governmental Organizations. The division is perhaps as much a commentary on our times as the conference itself. The Canadian

Historical Association can number itself among the Non-Governmental Organizations (hereafter NGOs), having been represented at two preliminary NGO conferences, the last December 11 to 13, 1975, in Ottawa.

How did the CHA come to be lumbered with the sobriquet NGO? Why was the CHA represented at the two preliminary meetings? The simple, if somewhat implausible answer, is: Why Not? The federal government (host of the "Habitat" conference) invited the CHA to send someone. By the rational choice of an Ottawa member, the first time was at no cost, and the second time at a cost of \$20 (for registration). This passive entry into the state of being a non-governmental organization was probably more the rule than the exception among the 200-odd NGOs represented at the two preliminary meetings. The new role was indicated by the delegates' cautious bewilderment (the suspicion generated by a government invitation is at least matched by curiosity), by the heterogeneity of the representation (the CHA mingled with the Anglican Church, the Canadian Labour Congress, the Girl Guides of Canada, the Royal Bank, and the Mouvement pour l'agriculture biologique), and by the heavy representation of headquarters' participants from the red tape triangle of Ottawa, Toronto and Quebec City. Many participants at the meeting were, however, expert NGOs. (The acronym is used interchangeably to refer to the organizations as well as the persons representing them). The experts had trailed around the world in the wash of other U.N. conferences where NGOs have, under the U.N. charter, certain rights of representation. Still other NGOs clearly had a direct and often professional interest in conferences, habitation or the United Nations (like B.O.A.C. Destination Habitat, the Bureau of Municipal Research, the Canadian Institute of Planners and the United Nations Association). The CHA interest in such conferences - like that of many other NGOs - is rather less direct in the sense that though most or all of its membership are "Habitants" (I suppose), a rather small proportion purport to study "Habitat" directly.

Does the CHA, then, have much business, if any, at such conferences? The answers obviously range from much to none. In theory somewhere in between would be a nice place to be, but in practice, partial or conditional representation is next to impossible. The footprints at the entrance to the monster's cave, alas, point in only one direction. At present we are in the position of circling about in front and peering in. Should we plunge in or clear off? A case can be made for either course.

It can be argued that the eclectic nature of history presents the CHA with staggering responsibilities of representation. Since everything happens in time and much is conditioned by the past, an appreciation of the history of a problem or condition is essential to its proper solution. Indeed, one could argue that such an appreciation is an essential pre-condition to any solution. That would seem to imply participation

in solving what are called "contemporary" problems. Indeed, it would seem to imply so much participation over such a wide range of subject matter, and imply the consumption of so much time and energy, that advocacy of history would soon supplant the doing of history. We would necessarily have to give up the one or the other.

It can equally be argued that the basic concerns of the CHA are and should be few and limited: mainly the provision of services, such as internal communication among members, and seeing to the good condition of the professional infrastructure, like the well-worn rut to the Canada Council. Beyond these few collective interests, the prevailing attitude should be *laissez-faire*, each historian representing himself to society in his own way. The over-riding strategy should be one of doing good history and letting history speak for itself.

Three problems with such a position emerged from the Ottawa NGOs conference. First, the value of history is not as apparent to other people as it is to historians. More important, simply to argue the case (usually with each other) is not to prove it. History must not only be done, it must be seen to be done. Second, if historians are not present at such gatherings to do history other people inevitably will. What passes for history usually ends up having a marginal utility and a questionable relevance. History is thereby beggared by the tongues of non-practitioners. Finally, many contemporary structures, like the Non-Government Organizations conference on human settlements, deny *entrée* to individuals. The collectivity is often, nowadays, an essential vehicle for individual representations.

For the present we still seem to be looking. What might the CHA find should it enter the Monster's Cave? The first thing to be found would be a very healthy cynicism about the motives of the government and the efficacy of NGO representations. In the first evening's "accountability" session at the 1975 meeting the bulk of the questions tended to express those concerns. The most penetrating questions came from participants who had experience in earlier U.N. conferences or who were present at the first preliminary NGO conference on Habitat in 1974. They were clearly of the view that NGO participation, to be effective, required significant and continuous funding as well as on-going devices to ensure NGO activity between conferences. Perhaps more important, the questioners felt the "Governmental" organizations must make a demonstrably real commitment to involve and listen to NGOs during the evolution of "official" policy. One suggestion was that the Canadian government make public, prior to Habitat, its official policy on human settlements. Governments, being what they are, have tended to reserve the time and place for release of policy to themselves, and if past experience is a guide, that time and place is at the conference itself. In other words the policy is expressed too late for NGOs to react to it. If such a practice is

pursued at Habitat, many NGOs argued, then the preliminary conferences, and the soliciting of NGO views, is tokenism, and the NGOs are merely being involved for the sake of public relations.

Historians have special reason to be skeptical. The preliminary conference in 1974 had virtually no "retrospective" dimension and was oriented to the solution of "practical" problems in a way offensive not only to historians but to many other NGOs. The 1975 conference was much more oriented to "soft" issues and efforts were clearly made to develop an historical dimension. Two of six workshop sessions contained instructions to participants to consider the evolution of problems before going on to recommend solutions and means. The clear attempt to add the historical dimension (its efficacy will be considered below) was, however, given a somewhat demoralizing blow the first evening by a speaker assigned to provide general instructions for the conduct of workshops. He somewhat gratuitously remarked that in considering the evolution of problems participants might find that "what history teaches us is that history teaches us nothing." Silence on the matter was preserved by one historian present in order not to seem tacky, but what is more disturbing, by everyone else, possibly because they agreed with the speaker.

The silence is some measure of the task historians face, and probably poses a greater problem than the attitude of the governmental organizations. Whatever may be said about the Canadian government's motives, it is clear from the preliminary conferences so far that the strongest overtures for non-governmental participation have come from the governmental rather than non-governmental sector, that at no U.N. conference to date have so many NGOs been consulted so far in advance, and finally that the governmental organization has generally been quite responsive to many concerns and criticisms of the NGOs.

The workshops perhaps provided a more practical indication of the tasks facing historians. No resolutions (that I could see) emerging from them were clearly predicated on an appreciation of the historical dimensions of the problem to be studied. And in one of two workshops, which had, as part of its mandate, to consider "How did we get to where we are today?", the well-meant attempts to consider the historical dimension were disturbing to say the least.

The workshop in question would have provided fertile ground for the small but growing number of practitioners in the area of "use and abuse." Examples were fairly numerous and might be enumerated as follows:

- 1) A strong tendency to use "history" to substantiate positions arrived at by other, non-historical means.
- 2) A tendency to see in history the working of large, generative forces, which, in a pre-

deterministic way, brought us to our present pass.

- 3) A tendency to use history to develop projections to which policy can be fitted.
- 4) A tendency to assert as "fact" unqualified historical opinion.
- 5) A tendency to abuse the "facts" themselves.

But over-riding these tendencies was what might be called a tolerant impatience to get at and prescribe for the perceived settlements problems rather than to consider their origins.

Watching the use and abuse of history in practice serves not as a condemnation of the people in the workshop, but rather of historians themselves. Historians as educators and historians as participants have much for which to answer. But even had historians been numerous represented at the workshops, it is rather doubtful they could have made a substantial contribution. The embryonic state of the craft in these areas of current concern would have forbidden it.

An examination of the matter before the workshops - assuming for the moment that it has long-term relevance - provides an indication of areas that are of contemporary concern but lack substantial historical under-pinnings.

- * The relationship of social, cultural, environmental, spatial and economic aspects of human settlements.
- * The basis of governmental policy with respect to this relationship.
- * The basis of national regional and local planning.
- * Patterns of urbanization.
- * The nature of the small and middle-sized settlement.
- * The nature of the growth and decline of rural Canada.
- * The nature of policy and decision-making structures in human settlements.
- * The financing of settlements.
- * Housing policy, infra-structure and social services in human settlements.
- * Land use patterns.
- * Public participation.

These are only some of the areas "suggested" as points of departure in the workshops. The workshops themselves produced recommendations that indicated a series of concerns, related but not identical to those suggested. Most noticeable among these were questions of public or private ownership of land, of the exploitative versus the husbanding society, of the environment and public policy, and, as an indication of the power of a small organized lobby, the question of aboriginal rights and claims.

Historians might claim to make a contribution to discussion of this subject matter and there is reason to believe their contributions could form a valuable part of contemporary policies, strategies and plans on human settlement. At the least they might stand guard over their domain to prevent abuse and to indicate use. Advocacy might lead to participation, participation to recognition, and Lord knows, recognition to employment other than the stereotyped. Seminars in "Applied History"? The mind boggles. Still, to be ignored is not only painful but perhaps dangerous. Vancouver might bear watching.

CAPTAIN JAMES COOK AND HIS TIMES

Simon Fraser University will present an international and interdisciplinary symposium in mid-April, 1978 on the occasion of the bicentenary of Captain James Cook's landing at Nootka Sound. This meeting is designed to offer a forum for the presentation in papers, panels and discussions of new research and reappraisals by scholars in many fields. The symposium will focus on the impact on British Columbia, the North West coast of North America and the North Pacific littoral of Cook's third voyage, as well as the impact on Oceania, North America and the European world of Cook's life of exploration and discovery. Please direct any enquiries, suggestions or comments to: Chairman (Captain Cook Symposium), Department of History, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, V5A 1S6.

ATLANTIC CANADA STUDIES CONFERENCE II

The second *Acadiensis* sponsored conference on the history of the Atlantic region will be held at the University of New Brunswick 8-10 April 1976. There will be ten sessions. Included among the themes for presentation are: Migration and Social Patterns; Government Structures in the pre-Confederation period; Early Acadia; Urban History; National Politicians; Industrial Relations; Canadian-American Relations; the Inter-War Years and the Politics of Culture. Further information and a final programme can be obtained from P.A. Buckner, Department of History, University of New Brunswick, Fredericton, New Brunswick.

CONFERENCE ON BRITISH STUDIES

The Conference on British Studies is pleased to announce that nominations are open for its quinquennial Book Prize. Eligibility is restricted to the first book by a North American author in the field of British studies. Books which are published between the dates 1 January 1974 and 31 December 1978 are eligible for the competition, and may be submitted directly to members of the prize committee by publishers or individuals. The judges for the prize are Robert Halsband, Department of English, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, Margaret Hastings, Department of History, Douglass College, Rutgers University and F.M. Leventhal, Department of History, Boston University.

REGROUPEMENT DE CHERCHEURS EN HISTOIRE DES TRAVAILLEURS QUEBÉCOIS


"Pour devenir membre en règle du RCHTQ, il faut avoir été ou être engagé dans des activités de recherches ou d'enseignement impliquant les travailleurs et souscrire annuellement un abonnement qui donne droit aux bulletins de liaison (le Bulletin RCHTQ), aux procès-verbaux et aux lettres circulaires expédiées sous l'égide du Regroupement."

C'est ainsi qu'a été définie la façon de devenir membre du RCHTQ dans le nouveau projet de constitution. Il s'agit d'une clarification des règles établies par le premier exécutif, qui exigeait de l'activité au niveau des recherches. L'abonnement s'avère nécessaire pour assurer le financement autonome du Bulletin et des autres formes de communication.

En attendant une décision définitive concernant la constitution, on recommande aux membres, et à ceux qui veulent se joindre à eux, de faire connaître leur intérêt au Regroupement. Il s'agit de signaler les recherches ou l'enseignement dans lesquels vous êtes ou avez été engagé, et d'envoyer un chèque antidaté au 1er décembre 1975 pour assurer l'envoi du Bulletin RCHTQ, des procès-verbaux et lettres circulaires en 1976. Le montant sera fixé à \$4.00, comprenant \$3.00 pour le Bulletin et \$1.00 pour les procès-verbaux, lettres circulaires, etc.

L'abonnement institutionnel actuellement en vigueur est de \$5.00 annuellement. Les anciens numéros du Bulletin RCHTQ seront vendus à \$2.50 le numéro.

On peut obtenir des renseignements additionnels sur le Regroupement de Chercheurs en Histoire des Travailleurs Québécois, en s'adressant à M. J.-D. Thwaites, Président, RCHTQ, Département des Lettres et Sciences humaines, Université du Québec, Rimouski, Québec, 724-1630.

newsletter CANADIAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION		bulletin SOCIÉTÉ HISTORIQUE DU CANADA
VOL. 1 No. 4 Autumn 1975		VOL. 1 N° 4 Automne 1975
<i>Edited by / Edité par</i> JEAN-PIERRE GAGNON NORMAN HILLMER		
<i>Public Archives of Canada</i> 395 Wellington Street Ottawa K1A 0N3 Tel: 992-3957		<i>Archives publiques du Canada</i> 395, rue Wellington, Ottawa, K1A 0N3. Tél: 992-3957