

# CHA FALL 2022 | WINTER 2023 VIRTUAL WORKSHOPS & ROUND TABLES



# SHC AUTOMNE 2022 | HIVER 2023 ATELIERS & TABLES RONDES VIRTUELS



Towards a More Global CHA | Vers un SHC plus globale

Transcript | Transcription

HAZZAN: Welcome, to this, to our fourth roundtable and ninth event in the Canadian Historical Association's Virtual Workshop and Round Table series. Thank you all very, very much for joining us today for this important event. My name is Dave Hazzan, I am a graduate student at York University's Department of History, and one of the CHA's two organizers in charge of moderating this series. It is my very distinct pleasure today to discuss "Towards a More Global CHA" with our distinguished guests, Alexandre Dubé, Juanita de Barros, Meredith Terretta, Wendell Adjetey, Twisha Singh, and Paula Hastings.

Bienvenue à notre quatrième table ronde et neuvième événement de la série d'ateliers et tables rondes virtuels de la Société historique du Canada. Merci beaucoup à tous de vous joindre à nous aujourd'hui, pour cet événement important. Je m'appelle Dave Hazzan, et je suis un doctorant à l'Université York, et l'un des deux organisateurs du SHC en charge de l'animation de cette série. J'ai l'immense plaisir aujourd'hui de vous présenter une discussion au sujet, « Vers une SHC plus globale. » avec nos invités distingués, Alexandre Dubé, Juanita de Barros, Meredith Terretta, Wendell Adjetey, Twisha Singh, and Paula Hastings.

Nous commencerons avec la reconnaissance de notre présence sur les terres autochtones. Je suis à Toronto, où est situé l'Université York, alors j'utiliserai le texte de mon institution. Je vous invite à réfléchir aux terres autochtones sur lesquelles vous êtes maintenant. L'Université York, reconnaît sa présence sur le territoire traditionnel de nombreuses nations autochtones. La région connue comme Tkaronto a été préservée par la nation anishinabek, la Confédération Haudenosaunee, les Hurons-Wendats et les Métis. Elle est désormais le foyer d'un grand nombre de peuples autochtones. Nous reconnaissons les titulaires actuels du traité, la première Nation des Mississaugas de New Credit. Ce territoire est soumis au traité de la ceinture wampum (« Dish with One Spoon »), entente définissant le partage et la préservation pacifiques de la région des Grands Lacs.

York University recognizes that many Indigenous Nations have longstanding relationships with the territories upon which York University campuses are located that precede the establishment of York University. York University acknowledges its presence on the traditional territory of many Indigenous Nations. The area known as Tkaronto has been care taken by the Anishinabek Nation, the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, and the Huron-Wendat. It is now home to many First Nation, Inuit and Métis communities. We acknowledge the current treaty holders, the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation. This territory is subject of the Dish with One Spoon Wampum Belt Covenant, an agreement to peaceably share and care for the Great Lakes region.

Just a few notes before we begin. This session is being recorded and a transcript is being made. We will edit out the Q&A session at the end, but in the meantime, know that Big Brother is recording all you say and do. Please mute yourself if you are not talking, and save your questions for the end of the presentation.

Avant de commencer, je me permets de vous expliquer le déroulement de cette séance. Cette séance sera enregistrée et une transcription sera disponible dans les jours qui suivent. La vidéo qui sera affichée sur YouTube n'inclura pas la période de questions et réponses. Seule la table ronde sera enregistrée. Nous vous demandons de vous mettre en sourdine (mute) sauf si vous avez des questions à la fin de la présentation.

So, without any further ado, I bring you our chair, Dr. Alexandre Dubé! Alexandre Dubé est professeur régulier au département des sciences humaines et sociales de l'Université du Québec à Chicoutimi, où il enseigne l'histoire du Canada, de la Nouvelle-France et du monde atlantique. Docteur en histoire de l'Université McGill, ses intérêts portent sur l'histoire du politique, de l'État, de l'économie politique et de la culture matérielle. Ancien fellow de l'université Caltech (2016-2017), il a enseigné de nombreuses années à la Washington University de Saint-Louis. Ses recherches lui ont en outre mérité des bourses postdoctorales de l'Omohundro Institute of Early American History and Culture et de la John Carter Brown Library.

DUBÉ: Merci à tous, bienvenue à tous à cette table ronde, "Vers une SHC plus globale." Merci aux participants pour s'intéresser au jeu. Je vais commencer en français, parce que ça fait un petit moment que j'utilise mon anglais, alors je me dérouille un peu. Alors, la conversation, je

présume, et je vous invite tout le monde de faire leurs interventions et poser leurs questions dans la langue de ton choix, je présume que ça ce ferai particulièrement en anglais. Quant à cette situation, si ça vous intéresse, je vous invite a regarder la précédente table ronde de la SHC, sur les deux solitudes, qui traite précisément sur cette question linguistique à la CHA.

Our topic for today is an old one for the CHA. The CHA has the, I'm not sure really sure if I want to use the uneasy, but rather the kind of conflicted beginning of both being an association that purports to represent all historians in Canada, regardless of their fields of study, but at the same time has historically been the playing field, or at least the professional association that has attracted mostly historians of Canadian history. That tension is not new, in fact if we look into the archives of the society, we can see that it's already being discussed in the 1930s, and is an ongoing debate, a recurring one, and an important one, which I think is one that we need to be doing every few years or so, precisely because of that tension, and precisely because of what Canadian history is, represents, or what we want it to be. So, to talk about this and explore further these issues today, we have a panel of remarkable scholars whose contributions to both Canadian history and global history are quite extensive. I'm going to present them in turn, in the order they are going to intervene in our conversation today. And then, you know, they will present their own views of that, I'm not sure I want to use delicate, I think it's just an important question and is a recurrent one, that central question of global history and global CHA, two things being linked. So, they're going to make their presentations and we're going to foster the discussion after that.

So, first we'll have Juanita De Barros. Juanita De Barros is professor in the department of history at McMaster University and is also the director of the McMaster Centre for Human Rights and Restorative Justice. She is also a former president of the Association of Black American and Caribbean Studies, she teaches courses on the history of the Caribbean, the history of the African diaspora, and the history of colonial health and medicine. She is also an associate fellow for the Centre of Research in Latin American and Caribbean Studies and is a fellow at the Harriet Tubman Institute on the Global Migrations of African people. Her research concentrates on the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century Caribbean in the context of the diaspora and the British Empire, and addresses topics such as urban history, gender, history of childhood, social history of health and medicine, and reproductive health. Her most recent book is *Reproducing the British Caribbean: Race, Sex, and Politics After Slavery*, published by UNC Press in 2014, and explores the ideas and policies about population growth and infant and maternal welfare in the British Caribbean colonies from the 19<sup>th</sup> century to the 1930s. I want also to mention a recent article she penned, "The Death of Molly Schultz: Race, Magic, and the Law," it's a prize-winning article about the Caribbean, published in the journal of *Social History* in 2021.

Then we will hear Meredith Terretta. Meredith Terretta is Professor of History at the University of Ottawa. Her work examines the transregional legal and rights activism, both past and contemporary, and I really like that formulation, the mixed outcomes of international solidarities. Her most recent monograph is *Nation of Outlaws, State of Violence: Nationalism, Grassfield*

*Tradition, and State Building in Cameroon.* She is currently working on a new monograph tentatively titled “Activism on the Fringes of Empire: Rogue Lawyers and Rights Activists in Twentieth Century Africa.” Amongst her many publications, I’ll take the opportunity to cite this one in French, “Avocat de la Cause anticoloniale: Activisme politique et état de droit dans l’Afrique Française, 1946 à 1960,” et c’est publié en *Politique Africaine* en 2015.

Next we’re going to hear from Twisha Singh. Twisha is a PhD research scholar, advanced PhD candidate, in fact she is defending very, very soon, at the Department of History and Classical Studies at McGill University. She joined the Department in 2016 and worked under the supervision of Elizabeth Elbourne and Subho Basu. Her research covers Modern British History, South Asian History, Modern Theatre and Performance Studies, Gender and Sexual Studies, and her theoretical approaches include feminist and postcolonial literary theories. Her project analyses political engagement, social and political identity, occupational mobility and creative ability of women, working as stage actresses in Calcutta and London. Her dissertation is titled, “The Infamous Performer: A Study of Creative Labour and Social Political Identity of Stage Actresses in London and Calcutta, 1850-1950,” and as I said, she’s defending very soon. She’s also been part of multi-university projects on memory and oral history, modalities of cultural trauma, which is located at the University of Zagreb in Croatia.

After that, we’ll hear from Paula Hastings. Paula is Associate Professor of History at the Department of Historical and Cultural Studies at the University of Toronto – Scarborough, and a Tri-Campus Graduate Program at the University of Toronto. Her research and teaching centres on the imperial and global contexts on Canada’s political, social, and cultural histories during the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. She is interested more specifically in Canada’s evolving relationship with Britain and the Caribbean since Confederation, and the histories of imperialism, colonialism, race, migration, and nationalism. Her book, *Dominion Over Palm and Pine: A History of Canadian Aspirations in the Caribbean* was just published in English last September by McGill-Queen’s, congratulations, and she’s conducting research on a second book tentatively titled, *Reorienting the Map Around the Pacific: The Panama Canal and Shifting Spatial Imaginaries in Twentieth Century Canada.* Amongst her many publications, I’m just going to mention this one because I really like it and I’ve taught it to great success in the classroom, “Our Glorious Anglo Saxon Race Shall Ever Fill the Earth’s Highest Place: The Anglo Saxon Construction of Identity in Late Nineteenth Century Canada.” That is in Philip Faulkner and Daniel Francis’s *Canada and the British World.* That was published in 2006.

Lastly, is Wendell Adjetey. Wendell hasn’t arrived yet, but we will be eventually joined by Wendell Adjetey, who’s currently teaching. An Assistant Professor of History at McGill University, his upcoming book, *Crossborder Cosmopolitans: The Making of a Pan-African North America* situates fundamental questions of US history, immigration, civil rights, racial identity, revolution, counter-revolution, imperialism, and neocolonialism, within a diasporic North American and Trans-Atlantic frame. Professor Adjetey’s new project also includes work on warfare and African led abolitionism on the Gulf of Guinea Coast, and gender and black

messianic leadership in the States. Amongst his publications, I'd like to signal "In Search of Ethiopia: Messianic Pan-Africanism and the Problem of the Promised Land, 1919-1931." And that's been published by the *Canadian Historical Review* in 2021, so very recently.

So these are our wonderful panellists. And without further ado, we're going to leave the virtual floor to Juanita De Barros, to share her reflections on Toward a More Global CHA.

DE BARROS: Thank you so much Alex for that introduction, and thank you so much Steven for inviting me to participate in this really interesting event and to talk to these colleagues and exchange some of our thoughts about this subject. So, yes, I was so intrigued by what was mentioned early in the introduction, that this has been a conversation in the CHA going back to the 1930s, I just found that absolutely fascinating. The panellists, when Steven first invited us to participate in this, had an initial email exchange, and I found Meredith that you actually had a very interesting point, and you were asking, you were sort of wondering the terms that we as historians use to define ourselves, and specifically whether historians who don't conduct research on or teach Canadian history define ourselves as, quote-unquote, "non-Canadianist." And actually I found that observation really intriguing, and it sort of prompted me to think about how I define myself as a researcher, as a historian, and as a university teacher, how that definition has changed over time, and how that intersects with the CHA's question at the heart of this conversation, about the CHA's interest in becoming more global. So what I'm going to do in the few minutes that I have is I'm going to say a couple words about my research, and my teaching in this respect, and then I'm going to come back to think about a more global CHA, how that is in fact possible.

So, first of all, in terms of my research. Like a lot of historians, I've been increasingly moving away from focusing on one territory to researching from a more comparative perspective. I was trained as a historian of one particular region, so that is the Caribbean, but like many Caribbeanists, I focused on one, that was certainly the case when I was doing my dissertation and archival work in the 1990s, I focused on one colony. That colony was British Guyana, or today, Guyana, it's an independent nation. And in fact, even when working on Guyana, I concentrated on the capital city Georgetown, and to be perfectly honest, if I could have focused on about four square blocks I would have done that. So to say that my doctoral work was geographically limited is a pretty dramatic understatement. But the topics I was interested in, broadly, the place of race, class, and gender within the context of colonial institutions, that deal with social welfare and health, led me to move my research away from Georgetown, and away from British Guyana. And so these interests, over the last couple of decades, have made me become much more of a regional historian, much more of a comparative historian, and someone who focuses on a number of Caribbean colonies. As someone who look at connections to developments, also in other parts of the British Empire, including Canada. And so I find myself regularly looking for colonial officials as they move from the Caribbean to Canada and back and forth. I regularly look for Canadian laws, to see what kind of an impact, especially in my recent project, on the history of abortion in the Caribbean, the influence of, or possible influence of, Canadian abortion laws on

those in the Caribbean. And so I find myself looking for connections between the Caribbean and other parts of the empire, including Canada. And so now I see myself, and I define myself really as a Caribbean historian fundamentally, but someone who works on the intersection between health and the law in an imperial context. So not just someone who works on Guyana, but someone who works in a much broader context. This evolution reflects primarily intellectual curiosity, so as I've indicated, the subjects I'm interested in, so specifically the emergence and evolution of public policies and government institutions in the realm of health and social welfare, really has encouraged me to think comparatively within the context of the British Caribbean, and to look for connections with other parts of the British Empire much more broadly. So in essence, the questions I'm interested in exploring as a historian, can't just be answered by looking at a single colony, or even a group of colonies like the British Caribbean, I have to move much more widely than that.

So my evolution as sort of a more comparative, trans-regional sort of historian also affects my work as a teacher. So, and this is again a pretty common phenomenon for many historians. So the two permanent teaching positions I had, an earlier one at the University of Western Michigan and my current position at McMaster for the last 18 years, these positions were for trans-regional historians. So the job in Western Michigan was for a British Empire historian, and then my job at Mac is as an Atlantic Historian. And so in both of these positions, I was when I was at Western Michigan and now at Mac, I've been fortunate enough to be able to teach courses that focus on the Caribbean at the undergraduate level, but I have also, as a reflection of the position I was hired for, but also in response to student interest and demand, I've also been developing thematic trans-regional courses at the undergraduate and graduate level, and you know, practically speaking, students are interested in studying Caribbean history, but not enough to sustain large, the kind of large courses that universities want these days. And so I've been increasingly developing trans-regional comparative courses at the undergraduate regional level, History of Slavery, a Global History of Medicine for example, and at the graduate level, a History of Health and Medicine. All those courses have a Caribbean component to them, but they are very much transregional and thematic in focus.

And that sort of brings me back to the question that this roundtable is organized around, the possibilities for a more global CHA. And so I think the kind of comparative, transregional work, and thematic nature of the work that a lot of us are doing provides an opportunity for the CHA to increase its appeal to historians who don't work on Canadian history exclusively, or even at all. You know, but when I was thinking about that, I found myself wondering, how does that even facilitated, how is that even possible? And I was sort of meditating on a recent experience I had when presenting some co-written research on Caribbean migration to Canada at the CHA last spring I guess. And it sort of made me think about this a little bit. A colleague and I, we were doing some research on Caribbean migration to Canada, and we presented our work at the CHA because we were looking for a venue in Canada to present this research. And so we reached out to a panel organizer, I think I saw the call for papers on one of my email feeds, I can't even

remember where from, and we thought okay, this could be a great venue. But I find myself wondering, in the context of this panel, how, if there hadn't been a Canadian element to our work, and if we hadn't been looking for a Canadian venue, if in fact we would have reached out to this panel organizer at the CHA to present our research. If this paper had been, for example, solely on a Caribbean topic, realistically, I probably would have just sent it to the ACA, the Association of Caribbean Historians, right? So that makes – and so the question is, would I present this work in a Canadian context, in the context of the CHA, if it didn't have a Canadian element, and I think the correct answer to that is no. And I'm sort of wondering in this session, what would have changed that no to a yes. What would make me, a Caribbean historian, and someone who is very transregional and thematic in her approach, what would bring me to try and see the CHA as one of my go-to venues. I don't have an answer to that, it's just one of my go to questions I think I'd like us to think about maybe in the discussion. I think it's important, because there are rewards for the CHA but there are also rewards for us, historians, and it helps us connect to our colleagues in Canada. It's incredibly enriching in my experience with the CHA, our experience in the spring we got wonderful feedback, that I would not have gotten in another venue. So I think the rewards are totally two-sided, so these are really questions that are worth pursuing. I think I'll leave it there, and I'm looking forward to hearing what everybody else has to say. Thanks.

TERRETTA: Merci Alexandre. I use the word jab, so hopefully it won't be taken as too adversarial or too attacking, but I will come back to that question as well, thanks for Juanita for putting it out there to start with. So I don't really have – well, firstly, thanks to everyone for coming and participating in this. Thanks encore une fois Alexandre pour l'introduction, très sympa. I just want to say I'm getting to know the CHA now, I mean I was always aware of its existence since coming to work as an historian in Canada since 2007. But now I'm on the council, so I'm just learning about the lay of the land. So I don't really know if I have prescriptive answers for how to make the association more global. But like Juanita I was drawn immediately when contacted about my willingness to participate in this panel. It was something that really resonated with me, because like Juanita, I was trained with a very bordered, geographical focus. I was trained as an historian of Equatorial Africa, and sort of an area studies moment, or era, rather, in the United States. So this was, the local was very much emphasized, the learning of indigenous languages, field research with oral history, those kinds of things. So my path has been, I mean, like Juanita, my dissertation was very locally focused in Cameroon. And then one of the things I noticed during that dissertation research was that the actors I was focused on, who were political actors, who were struggling for the independence of Cameroon from British and French rule, they were themselves internationalists and they had internationalist trajectories. They had transnational trajectories, transregional trajectories, whatever you want to call it, whether those trajectories were taking them towards a Pan-African outlook or whether they were looking at taking them toward the United Nations, because the jurisdictional status of Cameroon was such that these were United Nations trusteeship territories, and this means that the actors I was focused on were very acutely focused themselves on the United Nations. So

there were things that would come in my data, for instance, Cameroonian nationalists sending petitions to the United Nations and using, in the late 1950s, an address c/o the International League of the Rights of Man in midtown Manhattan in New York. And my supervisor sort of encouraged me to put these questions to the side and to leave them for IR types and political scientists, right. And that's what I ended up doing, I did write a very locally focused dissertation analysing the articulation between liberationists or anti-colonial politics and local culture. But I would say since 2010 or so, all my published work has incorporated some kind of border crossing. And that's what's carried me forward as a historian who has moved from this very focused area studies background to one who works on rights claims, as generative of new connections, ruptures, contestations, and this of course has led to new insight. And of course it's given me an insight into a way to connect conceptually to historians trained in all kinds of geographies and intellectual histories. So it's pushed me across disciplinary boundaries as well, into forums where sometimes I'm the only historian in the room, and that in turn has made me think in terms of new projects and collaborations. So this is sort of an autobiographical, like Juanita, I'm starting off with a brief autobiography of why it is that the notion of a global CHA is so important to me.

Then I wanted to make two more brief points. One of them, again Juanita and I did not consult but I'm following your lead in terms of moving into what this transformation as a historian prompted me to do as a teacher. And so, for my second brief point I guess, I wanted to mention the History Across Borders Initiative, that seven or eight colleagues and I undertook at the University of Ottawa Department of History, starting in about 2017 or so is when we began conceptualizing this, and we intentionally came together because we wanted to facilitate having conversations with students and each other across the boundaries of our specializations. So from the get-go in this group, what's interesting about is, all the global geographies were represented, we had Americanists, we had Canadianists, we had Europeanists, Latin Americanists, historians of Africa, Asia, Middle East, a historian of indigenous populations, a historian of science and technology, so as a group we met several times to discuss how to bring this trans-regional approach into our curriculum, and we ended up with this broad thematic framing of History Across Borders, which is a series of courses and seminars that we put on the third and fourth year levels. So, the descriptive purpose that appears in the course catalogue is "Exploration of Problems and Issues that Cut Across Spatial, Temporal, and Disciplinary Boundaries," "Study of Historical Processes," "Examinations of Various National Experiences Within a Trans-Regional Context." So that's the descriptive language for the course codes, but each semester the course is run, any given instructor brings their own subtitle along to add and put on for that course code. So, just to give you an array of some of the courses we've run using these codes: "History of Human Rights," "History of Refuge Seeking," "History of Trauma," "History of Disease," "The Atlantic World," "Soccer, Culture, and Politics in Latin America." So, that's not a comprehensive list, it's just to give you an idea, and as you might imagine, the instructors who are teaching in this history across borders series have been trained, like Juanita, like me, with area specializations in various geographies: sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, Canada, I mean



Canadianists are teaching in this it's important to note. American history. And as for periodization, this series attracts instructors trained in medieval, as well as early modern periods, and so on. And it's challenging to geographically categorize these courses, just as it is challenging to geographically categorize methodological courses, different approaches, and here I'm thinking of Public History, Digital History, these are courses that we are putting on more and more. So these courses tend to get filed as Other in any instance in which someone is trying to put a BA program together thinking about geography. So these courses pile up in the Other, and the Other category is getting larger and larger over time.

So, that brings me to my last point, where I'll sort of circle back to that initial planning stages in the email to which Juanita was referring, and it circles back to the purpose of the panel today, which is to make the CHA more global. So, as I was invited to participate in the panel, I got hung up on the essential question, and it's a question that figures in the description of the panel that brought you here as well, so this is the question, what do we as an association need to do to build relationships with non-Canadianists, teaching at Canadian universities. So not to get too philosophical, but non or Other is not an identity. It's a label applied by someone who is not whatever it is they're describing. The historical data tell us that it is not an inclusive label by the way, I think we should put that out there. So who recognizes themselves in the label, "non-Canadianists"? I mean, I want to just let that sit there for a minute. I don't. But the interesting thing about it is I observe a number of historians trained in the history of Canada who also now privilege other ways of describing what they do, over the geographical. So I guess I'll end with the question, how do we juxtapose this language of Canadianists and non with this age where more and more researchers are doing comparative, thematic, connected, transregional, diasporic, etc. history, which may or may not include Canada. And is this binary, Canadianist and non-Canadianist, that figures as our central starting question today, is it working at cross-purposes with the implied intent of the panel. So, maybe in the conversation as it unfolds, we can think of ways to tweak this starting question to help us better get to where we want to go. Thanks.

SINGH: Thank you very much Alexandre for that introduction. A slight tweak, I started my PhD in the year 2017, not in the year 2016, and I am about to submit this year, so I am considering myself as a Pandemic PhD, technically if that's a category at all. I would also like to thank Professor Steven High for inviting me today to this very, very important discussion. Thank you Juanita and Meredith for setting the platform for the conversation and especially what Meredith, I was nodding along with you, literally, vehemently, that why this term of non-Canadianist, thank you so much for putting that forth, because that's what stuck with me when I read the two important questions this panel deals with. So I am primarily, I'm not, I don't identify with one specialization, my dissertation sort of moves away from categorizing myself as a South Asianist or a Modern British historian, I'm doing both. There are conversations where historians think the history of the empire cannot be linked with the history of the colony or vice-versa. I am looking at it as a transnational history. So, a little about what I am working on. I'm particularly looking at and analysing the history of stage actresses between 1850 to 1950 in both the cities of London

and Calcutta, looking at their labour as legitimate creative labour, making it a part of the larger metanarrative on labour, and how their political engagement basically enabled them in the first half of the 1900s to become part of the political movements. So in London I look at the suffrage movement and in Calcutta I look at the communist movement. So in that light I've also published a couple of papers, last year and in 2021 and 2022, but I have often been embroiled in this question when I am applying for conferences or presentations, that where does my thesis fit in. Is it South Asia? Is it Modern Britain? So by none, it is a transnational history on women, gender is the overarching critical category that I'm looking at, and not the geographical space. Apart from that, I have been working with the Canadian Historical Association as a member of the Graduate Student Committee since 2021, and to represent the students' voice is what concerns me the most in this panel, and that's why I agreed to be a part of this panel which deals with global history. So instead of arguing for decategorizing, I'm arguing for more inclusivity of students, international students who are a part of Canadian universities. For example, McGill University, my university, it has 30% of the students are from international spaces, be it South Asia, Asia, Europe, so it becomes very important to talk about their experiences in being a part of the Department of History and how they can further their career aspirations in becoming a part of the Canadian Historical Association. So me with my committee members at the CHA, we have been working hard to represent their voices more, so there is more inclusivity in terms of conference presentations, or in terms of student engagement. Because what we felt in the first few years was that international students were not a part, were not engaging as much with the students' committee, or with that of any of the workshops that we organize. So we worked to seek contact persons in different universities to reach out to international students and making them aware that CHA represents history students, not just Canadianists, non-Canadianists, it's not categorizing. That has been one of the major concerns of making it apparent, making it evident to other students that it is a global platform.

With that, also the kind of discussions we are having today about the global, the international, the cross-national, is as we know one of the most pertinent and promising strands of the new historiographical trends. And it has minute historical interest in the social and economic, recently now which is also connected. So there's a growing focus on the international and transnational history writing, especially with my cohort, I've seen that, with the younger cohort in my department, a lot of the students are writing cross-border, cross-national histories and there has to be a space in the CHA conferences, roundtables, workshops, to engage them more. So, as members of the Graduate Students' Committee, we are also working on that. Apart from that, more speaking from experience, is that there has been in the larger conferences, I also applied for the Canadian Historical Association and conference, it has been difficult to fit in my research, personally, speaking from experience in the larger context of the panels that are being organized in the conference and the annual conference of the CHA. So one way out which I could think of was to have more interdisciplinary, cross-disciplinary panels in the conference sections itself, to engage students who are ready to participate but they don't know where they fitted. And since there is a fear attached to the membership and also the conference, it prevents the international

students from being a part or applying for the conference, where they cannot see a clear-cut panel where their research fits in. So that is one of the concerns which I would like to raise to other speakers this afternoon and thank you so much for hearing me out, and I'm looking forward to the conversation at the end of the session.

HASTINGS: Thank you so much and thank you to Steven for inviting me to this panel, I've really enjoyed listening to what others have to say on the topic and approaching it from different angles. And when I thought about the questions that were posed for this roundtable, I thought there were several dimensions to the questions of how the CHA has been or might be or should be globalizing, or extending its engagement beyond Canada. And one dimension of course, as many have already spoken about, is the kinds of research that is being conducted and at the CHA, in particular at the annual conference, and by CHA members that identify themselves as Canadianists, which I think really does make up the membership's core. And for several years now, I think there does seem to be really a robust and growing interest in different aspects of the Canadian past, situated in a broader trans-national and international and global context. Of course, this development reflects broader trends within many disciplines – within the humanities, and the social sciences disciplines, I would say maybe back to the 1990s. And then another dimension is the extent of participation among those who do not have a Canadian element to their research who are based at Canadian institutions, because of course, the CHA scope of representation is not limited to those who identify as Canadianists. And then a final dimension I was thinking about was the extent to which the organization is attracting graduate students and scholars who are working at institutions outside Canada, whether the research has a Canadian dimension or not. I was interested in this dimension, because of course one of the questions framing today's roundtable was how the annual CHA conference might open outward to the world in future years. So when I was thinking about these questions, I kept thinking about the conference, about the annual conference. And I was wondering what recent CHA programs might tell us about the extent of participation by those who do not have a Canadian element – I'm trying to avoid the term non-Canadianist! That don't have a Canadian element but are based in Canada, and on the other, are international participation, from scholars outside of Canada that may or may not have Canadian elements to their research. And my sense was the participation of both of these groups was a fairly small proportion of annual participation. So I decided, I was quite ambitious at the start, I would look at the past five years or ten years of the CHA program, and I thank Michel and Steven for directing me toward those programs that have just recently been put on the new website of the association. So I ended up collecting two sets of data from the CHA programs in 2015, 2017, and 2019. So I was collecting information about the contributions of individuals who were affiliated with non-Canadian institutions, their participation in traditional panels, roundtables, poster presentations and keynotes. And the second one, the papers presented on topics without a Canadian element in traditional panels only. And I excluded roundtables and posters and keynotes because they tended to focus quite a bit on Canadian or Canada-based themes. Now I hoped to include 2021, but I kind of underestimated how time consuming it would be to collect all this information, and I think 2021 would be really helpful to

include, not only because it would provide more recent data, but it was a virtual conference, so it would have been interesting to see whether there was an uptick in the first measure, of international participation with fewer barriers to access the conference. So I should say, before I show the “data,” which I use loosely, in the chat in the moment, but I should say I make no claims to having a sound methodology. Of course, there’s duplication of conference attendees across roundtables and panels, which is probably the big thing. I didn’t go through and take the time to account for that duplication when I was thinking about university affiliation. And the second thing is, you know, the Canadian content of particular papers was not always apparent from the titles. So sometimes I had to make an educated guess based on the panellists’ broader research area, which I gleaned mostly from Google. In that first conference that I looked at, in the 2015 program, that was at Ottawa, and there were 398 that I counted – roundtables, keynotes, poster presentations – and so 23 of those 398 contributions came from individuals that were affiliated with institutions outside. But of course there would be again duplication in the way of participants involving, being involved in panels, as well as being involved in roundtables as well. And then on the other measure, there were 290 traditional panels, so this was excluding roundtables, posters, and keynotes, on topics with a Canadian element, without a Canadian element, or on thematic research questions that were not explicitly or discernibly grounded in a regional or national space. And that figure was about 5%. And then for 2017, at TMU, it was 7% of people contributing who were from universities outside Canada, and 11% of those participating in – oh, I think I may have cut off something here, that figure 44 out of 448, or 11% - no I think that’s correct, that’s the final conference. Sorry, the way I’ve displayed it here is not very straightforward. You can see the data in terms of rough percentages, as I said there’s a lot of duplication so obviously we have to look at these numbers with caution. So in 2017, at TMU, with 7% and 10% of contributions within traditional panels. And then the final one from 2019, at UBC, contributions to pretty much everything was 11% for professionals and historians coming from non-Canadian universities. And then the final one was 17%, which I thought was a little bit of an uptick. So, I’ll kind of leave the data. It kind of speaks for itself, I didn’t find it all that surprising. I think I was a little bit surprised at the higher proportion of historians, or others, it may not be historians who participated, coming from outside, coming from non-Canadian institutions, I thought that was really interesting. I don’t know what I expected those numbers to be, but I didn’t expect them to be as high as they were. And I was actually surprised at the tendency to see that papers be grounded in particular geographic or national contexts and having thematic panels was something that there were, I think there were a number of thematic panels, but the number was split off from, again, ground themselves in particular national space when they were contributing to that panel. So I think, when I’ve been thinking about these questions, about how to make the CHA perhaps look outward to the world, I think it’s a really difficult question, a really important question, and I think that there are ways, very straightforward ways we might think about getting participation, more international participation, or maybe the more important question, is encouraging participation within Canada, because that’s within the mandate of the CHA to look after the interests of all historians within Canada. That there may be

ways to do this. I have an inkling, and I guess I am a Canadian historian, and that I think that maybe those who don't have Canadian elements to their research if there was a way for them to bring other scholars working on similar scholars with thematic synergies as well, perhaps from outside Canada or within Canada, or perhaps even with the Call to Papers, when it comes out in the fall, there might be an effort to explicitly encourage trans-national and thematic panels that are comprised of historians working within and without Canada, certainly there are many possibilities as others have mentioned, for multinational panels designed around thematic synergies, rather than rooted in place. And I think maybe the call for papers might be more explicit about soliciting presentations from scholars whose research does not have a Canadian element, both within and beyond Canada. And I think a final thing, there are ongoing discussions, which I think maybe discussions are not so ongoing anymore, about continuing to offer virtual or hybrid panels, to remove barriers to participation for graduate students and precariously employed scholars, that we might consider the extent to which virtual panels might attract more international participation. I just want to conclude by saying I think CHA membership, which I believe, and Michel and Steven can correct me if I'm wrong, I think it's around 650, last time I heard, I'm not sure. So I think it's relatively robust when we consider membership in the American Medical Association is about 15,000 I believe, and I don't know how representative the AHA and the CHA are in relation to the actual number of national based history professionals that are working. But given the plethora of history contributions in the United States compared to Canada, and the AHA is more international membership, I think 650 or so is a good figure. But of course, there's always more we can do to attract more members. I'll leave it there.

ADJETEY: Thank you so much Alexandre. Colleagues, good afternoon, it's great to connect with you all virtually. I'm really thrilled we're having this conversation, I'm often thinking about Canada and African peoples in a very global context. I'm often thinking about North America in a very global, hemispheric, trans-Atlantic context as well. And when I think about the CHA my thinking is perfectly positioned to push boundaries, to push boundaries in very serious geographic ways. But it's to push boundaries that would allow for incorporating other historians, other experiences, students, as well. So one of the things, one of the key takeaways I learned over the course of writing my book is that African peoples in so many peoples have made Canadian society such a global place. Whether Canada as a sort of pre-Confederation colony, Canada as a dominion, Canada as an aspiring empire of sorts, which professor Hastings so articulately has written on. Or Canada as a junior partner to the United States, the notion that this is very much a society with citizens, or with passers by, who believe it has its own global reach and global implications. But it's so easy to omit that African contribution to the globalization, or the internationalization of Canadian history, and I think this is where the CHA can really lend some heft, and also some institutional and scholarly and historical and geographical credibility by actually focusing on the ways that, for example, African peoples and also African intellectuals, African activists have seen Canada as being this sort of hemispheric and sort of, a western hemisphere metropole of the British empire, that Canada served as a gateway of sorts.

And one way I think that would make a great deal of sense in terms of incorporating scholars from beyond Canada, and also making some of the work we all do in our scholarship and in our public engagement much more meaningful, would be to focus on the African diaspora, something that is often not spoken of specifically, it's something we don't actually engage with the type of rigour and vigour that we ought to. So I'd love to see the CHA taking up the question of the African diaspora and what does it mean. And even looking at its antecedents, going back to the times of New France and the British Empire, looking at the ways what would become Canada is very much at the cross-roads of what an African diaspora in the Atlantic world, what that means in terms of individuals, in terms of ideas, in terms of even territory, right. And all the weight of the present moment, in terms of foreign policy, in terms of imperialism or colonialism, etc. First, just this idea of what the African diaspora means in terms of the CHA and that might be a point of entry to engage actors and intellectuals, historians from different parts of the world. And secondly, another way to bring, I would say, a more global perspective to our work, and certainly to our body of historians, and I might slightly remove my historian's hat and put on my public policy-focused kind of hat, and I'm sure we have colleagues who also focus on, whose scholarship have some more policy implications, the African diaspora and the African continent are concerned. But one omission that I find absolutely fascinating is that when you look at recent trends of immigrants, or the "sending nations", we know that Mainland China is very prominent, features prominently, Indian subcontinent features prominently, parts of what we now call the Middle East feature prominently and some parts of the Americas. But a glaring gap I would argue, and some observers would acknowledge is that Africa, despite being sort of the fastest growing territory in this world, which is projected to have a significant youth bulge, so like having a population with an inverted triangle, oh pardon me, a conventional triangle, where the majority of the population are young people under 30 years of age. Africa does not feature prominently in terms of engagement with Canada itself. What are some potential blind spots that might arise as a result of this, how do us as scholars and historians and again some of us who might have a more policy oriented scope to our work, how do we reckon with some of these trends, knowing the history, knowing the connections of the African continent to the British Empire, the British Empire which Canada still, in some ways, in the afterlife of the empire still remains a crown jewel of sorts. How do we make sense of that, how do we look at these trends and apply some type of meaningful implications and then takeaway. And that's it for now. The hazard of joining a panel half way through is you don't know how long to speak and you don't want to embarrass yourself, so I'll stop there.

DUBÉ: I just want to offer a little bit of synthesis, because I do think the question Juanita has opened with, which is to say, you know, it resonated, because I find myself in the exact same situation, I have to ask myself, where do I, who do I want to talk to. And would I present a paper on say, my French imperial agents of the 18<sup>th</sup> century in Canada or in the Caribbean historical Society, or any other venue that deals with Atlantic history or colonial history or even history of administration and bureaucracy. And I guess the answer always depends on who I want to talk to. And I guess one way to frame it is, what do we have to do for people who do not, and I'm

going to use Paula's formulation, might not have a Canadian component to their research, who want to talk to those who do. Because the core membership of the CHA will change. I don't think the Canadianists will exit, but yeah, so, what is it that we need, to feel it is a worthwhile audience, that we will foster – and I think Meredith has proposed a number of answers in terms of those trends and those interdisciplinary topics. But the answer might not be straightforward. And sometimes, I think we all know colleagues who are perfectly content to talk to people who will remain within either their temporal or geographical field, because either their research doesn't lend themselves to it, and will they find a place within the CHA, will they find the audience they need. Another way to frame my very basic and crude reflection on this, is sometimes it might be something on the CHA, I'm doing stuff to make it a worthwhile audience who do not have a Canadian component to their research. And sometimes it may be in the CHA's camp or ball to actually foster an historical imagination that would make it so that people think that Canadianists have something to say to their own research. And I think those two elements are not quite the same, right. Because sometimes people would think What do Canadians have to say about whatever it is that I'm working on, and sometimes the answer is maybe not that much, so please come and talk to us and tell us, and sometimes the answer is quite a bit actually, it's just that we rarely find ourselves in the same room. So thank you once again to everyone who participated in this wonderful conversation, I know it gave me a lot to think about it, and I hope it did for so many of you too. Alors, merci encore d'avoir participé, et je vous souhaite un bien fin-de-journée, et à la prochaine !