

# Research Seminar in Public History

HI 791.001

Spring 2019

T 6-8:45

Withers 243

NC State  
University



## COURSE DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

This semester, you will become acquainted with many of the critical questions and concepts that scholars have developed as tools for thinking about public history as an intellectual enterprise. This is not a course on the practical application of public history or on the history of public history. We will not be reading books to learn the subject matter, although if you learn something about applying history in public spheres that would be a pleasant bonus. Instead, we are studying historiography, the assessment of public history as an intellectual discipline that tries to discover and interpret knowledge.

The success of this class depends on building a community of researchers who support each other in the development of research plans during the course and over the coming years. To do so will require that students think hard throughout the course not only about their own projects but also about those of their colleagues. A strength and challenge of this course will be that research projects from all sub-fields of public history will be represented; in some cases, then, active engagement will involve thinking about issues separate from your own specialties.

Students' objectives in this course are to: 1) define a research topic and question, and relate the significance of both; 2) relate the framing questions for the dissertation; 3) preliminarily outline the dissertation; 4) describe the historiographical contexts for the dissertation; 5) produce a historiographical essay as the foundation for future dissertation work; 6) develop skills to analyze and assess relevant primary and secondary sources.

**In this course, we identify and develop public history research subjects, sources, and their evaluation, research techniques and problems, and writing and argumentation.**

## Professor Craig Thompson Friend

office hours: T 2-3 pm, Th 2-3 pm, or by appt.  
office: Withers 368

email: [ctfriend@ncsu.edu](mailto:ctfriend@ncsu.edu)  
office phone: 919-513-2227

## REQUIRED BOOKS

-  Bruggeman, Seth. *Here, George Washington Was Born*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008.
-  Kelman, Ari. *A Misplaced Massacre: Struggling over the Memory of Sand Creek*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2015.
-  Meringolo, Denise. *Museums, Monuments, and National Parks*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2012.
-  Popkin, Jeremy D. *From Herodotus to H-Net: The Story of Historiography*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.
-  Rymza-Pawlowska, M.J. *History Comes Alive: Popular Culture and Public History in the 1970s*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2017.
-  Sodaro, Amy. *Exhibiting Atrocity: Memorial Museums and the Politics of Past Violence*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2018.
-  Stanton, Cathy. *The Lowell Experiment*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2006.
-  Steedman, Carolyn. *Dust*. Manchester, Eng.: Manchester University Press, 2002.
-  Trouillot, Michel-Rolph. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History*. Boston: Beacon Press, 2015.
-  Turabian, Kate L. *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations: Chicago Style for Students and Researchers*. 9<sup>th</sup> ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2018.
-  Upton, Dell. *What Can and Can't Be Said: Race, Uplift, and Monument Building in the Contemporary South*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015.

---

## WADERS, SNORKELERS, AND DIVERS

Students often think that making a good grade in a course is what matters. Well, when you were an undergrad, that may have been true, but it is not the measure of success for graduate students. It is entirely possible to do well in this course without being transformed by your newfound knowledge, but it would be a darn shame. Imagine we are standing on a seashore and the course is the ocean. Enter with me and go as deep as you dare.

**WADERS** will roll up their pants legs and get their feet wet, concerning themselves with **WHAT** they see in the shallow waters. There's nothing wrong with staying near the shore where you feel safe. You may find a neat seashell, but your learning experience will be just as shallow as the water.

**SNORKELERS** are willing to take in a deep breath and look beneath the surface. They want to see how the tide ebbs and flows, to know **HOW** an interpretation developed and how that seashell ended up in the shallow waters.

**DIVERS** go deeper, fully immersing themselves in the historiographical waters. They not only want to see the ebb and flow of the tide, but they want to know the dangers of the undercurrents. They want to interact with all that lies beneath the surface because they are concerned with **WHY** historiography matters.

# THE SAC METHOD

For every reading that you do in this course you should be able to summarize, assess, and critique—SAC! You should prepare for each class AS IF YOU WILL BE LEADING DISCUSSION! You may be called on to do so. For all readings, you should be able to SAC!

**S**ummarize: What is the reading about? What is the story that the author is presenting? What is the argument?

**A**ssess: Why is the story written in such a manner? How is the argument supported? What is the conclusion?

**C**ritique: How effective is the story? How convincing is the argument? How does it contribute to the larger historiography?

By being able to summarize, assess, and critique individual readings, you will develop the skills to see broader historiographical landscapes and situate your own work and perspective. For public historiography, by the end of this course, you should be able to answer

-  How have historians “invented” the field of public history?
-  How did historians working in different subfields decide what kinds of approaches and methodologies to incorporate into their studies?
-  How and why have scholars interpreted public history as a practice-based, rather than intellectual, enterprise? How does this disadvantage the public history scholar? How does it disadvantage the public history scholar?

## ASSIGNMENTS

Participation	15%
Model Dissertations Assignment	15%
Exploratory Essay	10%
Annotated Bibliography	15%
Draft of Historiography—two copies	0%
Critique—two copies	15%
Final Historiography	30%

## GRADING SCALE

97-100=A+	87-89=B+
93-96=A	83-86=B
90-92=A-	80-82=B-
80>=F	

## What is a Public History Dissertation?

Public history sits at the intersection of historical scholarship and applied, mission-oriented research. Its situation makes it a tricky subject to research because there will always be public historians who question your emphasis on the academic or on the public.

- to help illuminate the ways in which the public ‘comes to understand information’ and interact with the past.”—Allison Marsh, USC

- ““evidence of sophisticated use (and discussion) of the method,’ which is logical because public history programs often expect faculty to teach methods-based courses.”—Marla Miller, UMass

- ““to write for the department as a whole, not the public history program’ in order to demonstrate one’s ability to serve all aspects of the department’s educational mission.”—Janelle Warren-Findley, ASU

- “develop his/her research for public outreach digitally or for a museum exhibit as well as for a scholarly monograph.”—David Glassberg, UMass

- ““perform a service to’ and even emerge out of “conversation with a constituency, stakeholder, or community beyond the academy.”—Seth Bruggeman, Temple

From Richard Anderson, “What ‘counts’ as a public history dissertation? Some views from the field,” *History@Work*, 10 August 2012, <https://ncph.org/history-at-work/what-counts-as-a-public-history-dissertation/>

## HOW THIS COURSE WORKS

**PARTICIPATION.** The seminar is taught in the Socratic method, meaning that there will be asking and answering of questions to stimulate critical thinking and to draw out ideas and underlying presumptions. Questions will be followed up with more questions in order to advance the discussion. You will be graded both on the frequency and the quality of your participation; attendance is clearly important for participation. Students are expected to arrive in class having read and considered the material for discussion that day. Attendance alone is not sufficient for full participation credit. Students must actively engage.

- A: Student is well prepared, attentive, always responds when called upon and volunteers often with pertinent answers or questions.
- B: Student is usually prepared, responds when called on and volunteers on occasion.
- C: Student shows evidence of being unprepared on occasion, has trouble when called on and does not volunteer often.
- D: Student is unprepared, inattentive, never volunteers, or comes to class late.
- F: Student exhibits a lack of concern for the class, sleeps in class, or disturbs the class.

**CRITICAL EVALUATIONS.** For each of the monographs that we will be reading, indicated by a ♥ on the reading schedule, you will submit **NO LATER THAN NOON ON THE DAY OF CLASS** a short (one full page; double-spaced; no notes) critical evaluation of that book. These are considered part of your participation grade. These evaluations will provide a basis for our discussions. This is NOT a review. You need not summarize the book or assess the author's success. Instead, go straight to the critique: aim to present a thoughtful, probing essay on an issue of historiographical significance, asking WHY the reading matters (or might matter) and what can be learned from it. For example, you may consider:

- 👁️ What is most suggestive, stimulating, provocative about the work? Why?
- 👁️ What are some of the implications or applications you imagine for the work in terms of methodology? What interpretations does it contain? What kinds of evidence are used?
- 👁️ What are some of the implications or applications you imagine for the work in terms of topic and themes?
- 👁️ Does the work enlarge your understanding of challenges in public historiography in important ways? How so?

**MODEL DISSERTATIONS ASSIGNMENT:** No more than five double-spaced pages. We will discuss a set of model history dissertations that have won major awards for outstanding quality, and a set of model dissertations in public history. Note that these dissertations can be accessed through the library's Dissertations and Theses database.

- 
- \_\_\_\_ Rosas, Abigail. "On the Move and in the Moment: Community Formation, Identity, Politics, and Opportunity in South Central Los Angeles, 1945-Present." PhD diss., University of Southern California, 2011; winner, Huggins-Quarles Award, Organization of American Historians **AND** Kruer, Matthew. "'Our Time of Anarchy': Bacon's Rebellion and the Wars of the Susquehannocks, 1675-1682." PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2015; winner, Allen Nevins Prize, Society of American Historians **AND** McKiernan, Zachary D. "The Public History of a Concentration Camp: Historical Tales of Tragedy and Hope at the National Stadium of Chile." PhD diss., University of California, Santa Barbara, 2014. **AND** Marcum, Andrew B. "Material Embodiments, Queer Visibilities: Presenting Disability in American Public History." PhD diss., University of New Mexico, 2014
- 
- \_\_\_\_ Capo, Julio, Jr. "'It's Not Queer to Be Gay': Miami and the Emergence of the Gay Rights Movement, 1945-1995." PhD diss., Florida International University, 2011; winner, Best Dissertation in Urban History, Urban History Association. **AND** Arvin, Maile. "Pacifiably Possessed: Scientific Production and Native Hawaiian Critique of the 'Almost White' Polynesian

Race.” PhD diss., University of California, San Diego, 2013; winner, Ralph Henry Gabriel Dissertation Prize, American Studies Association **AND** Mangan, Gregory. “Entering Sacred Ground: Public History at the National Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum.” PhD diss., Arizona State University, 2013. **AND** Stringer, Mary Kate. “Enriching the Public History Dialogue: Effective Museum Education Programs for Audiences with Special Needs.” PhD diss., Middle Tennessee State University, 2013.

\_\_\_\_ Doyle, Nora. “Bodies at Odds: The Maternal Body as Lived Experience and Cultural Expression in America, 1750-1850.” PhD diss., University of North Carolina, 2013; winner, Allen Nevins Prize, Society of American Historians. **AND** Bivar, Venus. “The Ground beneath Their Feet: Agricultural Industrialization and the Remapping of Rural France, 1945-1976.” PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2010; winner, Gilbert C. Fite Dissertation Award, Agricultural History Society. **AND** Taylor, Jennifer W. “Rebirth of the House Museum: Commemorating Reconstruction at the Woodrow Wilson Family House.” PhD diss., University of South Carolina, 2017. **AND** Stout, Jenna D., “Infected Houses & Sanitized Spaces: Architecture, Adaptive Reuse, & Tourism of the Early 20<sup>th</sup> Century Tubercular Era.” PhD diss., Middle Tennessee State University, 2017.

\_\_\_\_ Audain, Mekala. “Mexican Canaan: Fugitive Slaves and Free Blacks on the American Frontier, 1804-1867.” PhD diss., Rutgers The State University of New Jersey—New Brunswick, 2014; winner, Huggins-Quarles Award, Organization of American Historians. **AND** Kelly, Patrick. “Sovereignty and Salvation: Transnational Human Rights Activism in the Americas in the Long 1970s.” PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2015; winner, WHA Dissertation Prize, World History Association. **AND** Mau, Heidi A. “Communicating Legacy: Media, Memory, and Harvey Milk.” PhD diss., Temple University, 2017. **AND** Beck, Kathryn M. “Fort Griffin Fandangle: Three Perspectives on Performing History on the Texas Plains.” PhD diss., University of Texas at Dallas, 2017.

\_\_\_\_ Beemer, Bryce. “The Creole City in Mainland Southeast Asia: Slave Gathering Warfare and Cultural Exchange in Burma, Thailand and Manipur, 18<sup>th</sup>-19<sup>th</sup> c.” PhD diss., University of Hawai’i at Manoa, 2013; winner, WHA Dissertation Prize, World History Association. **AND** Wilkerson, Jessica. “Where Movements Meet: From the War on Poverty to Grassroots Feminism in the Appalachian South.” PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2014; winner, Lerner-Scott Prize, Organization of American Historians. **AND** Knowles, Benjamin. “Re-enacting the Second World War: History, Memory, and the UK Homefront.” PhD diss., University of Manchester, 2017. **AND** Worley, Elizabeth D. “A Certain Kind of Southern: Authenticity at Public History Sites in Florida and Georgia.” PhD diss., Florida State University, 2016.

Read the framing chapter of each dissertation and discern:

 What

- the topic, and the research question being asked of it;
- why the topic and the question are important;
- the answer to the question—the thesis;

 Why

- the literature that already exists on this research question (this may be in another chapter, so you may have to look for it);
- the historiographical intervention. In other words, what does the author propose to be adding to the historiography. This is a question you eventually will have to ask of your own work.

 How

- the methodology/ies proposed to tackle the question.

Then skim the rest of the dissertation in order to discern (a) its structure—the overall purpose and strategy of the dissertation; (b) what consists the originality or genius of the dissertation—how much inspiration and how much perspiration; and (c) backwards engineering—if you were to undertake this research project from scratch, what your strategy be.

**EXPLORATORY ESSAY:** A three-page exploratory think piece (not a formal prospectus) about your potential topic or general area of interest, addressing issues such as how to approach your project, what challenges you might face in turning your ideas and interests into a research paper (including logistical ones), what sources/archives are available and what questions you are interested in answering or historiographical problems you want to address. Begin with your topic, and then your research question—in no more than two sentences. In formulating the research question, it is important to go beyond simply pointing to a general area of interest or a set of broadly connected themes. You need to try and formulate a clear and specific question for the topic that your dissertation addresses. For example, framed at the broadest level, your research question might be:

- 👉 How and why do historic preservation efforts in white communities differ from those in black communities? (topic: historic preservation)
- 👉 How and why did historic interpretation at national parks evolve between the 1920s and 1950s? (topic: public interpretation)
- 👉 How and why has public history interpretations at museums and historic sites and parks been employed by politicians during the Cultural Wars? (topic: museum studies)
- 👉 How does the content of the History Channel reflect contemporary ideas about history, and why do these ideas persist? (topic: public memory)

Of course, in order to be adequately answered, each of these research questions would be broken down into a range of sub-questions. But thinking of the task as oriented to answering a broad and general question in this way will help you to narrow your focus and to formulate a more precise plan for attacking the topic. In presenting your research question, you will want to explain in clear and jargon-free prose why it is an interesting and meaningful topic. This can be hard to do early in the dissertation process, but it is important to try to be accessible and easy to follow—if nothing else, it will help you organize your thoughts. Also, in explaining why the topic is interesting and important, it is not enough merely to offer some citations to other scholars who have written about it before—you need to make the case yourself. For example, in approaching the History Channel question above, I might point out that the success of historical documentaries like Ken Burns's *Civil War* evidenced a consumer pool for historical television content. I might also note that history-oriented television has been significantly understudied, both for its accuracy and its impact. I might then frame sub-questions that will frame each of my chapters: how has televised history-content weighed historical content against entertainment? How has the tension between academic history and public history played out through history-oriented television? How has television's commercial orientation undermined public history? Why has history-oriented television played a central role in the Cultural Wars? Collectively, these questions would help me demonstrate the relevance of my study—that investigating the History Channel can help us to understand difficult problems in public history more generally.

**ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY:** So, now that you have a general topic, you need to develop a preliminary bibliography. This assignment is an eight-to-ten-page bibliography with annotations. You should begin with a short paragraph that explains:

- 👉 What is your topic, and what is the general question that you are asking of it?
- 👉 Why is the topic and the question important?
- 👉 At this moment, what do you think is the answer to your question?

Then develop your bibliography of secondary sources that are related to your topic. In general, you want the historians you cite to have written fairly recently (within the last three decades)—but it’s not a bad idea to take a look at an older book or two so that you can figure out where the historiography was half a century ago. A mixture of articles and books can be useful, and public historiography is dominated by articles—the trick is to discern the wheat from the chaff. Each listing should have no more than two sentences following that relate the book’s or article’s topic, research question, thesis, and significance. Book reviews are an excellent way to determine the topics, research questions, and theses of your books. Reviews also provide insight in how reviewers responded to the books and their topics and theses.

**HISTORIOGRAPHY ASSIGNMENT:** A thirty-page paper based upon the secondary sources of your annotated bibliography, plus new sources that you may have found. Footnotes or endnotes are included in the page count; requisite bibliography is **NOT** included in page count. The 50 percent accorded this project depends upon the completion of two assignments: 1) two copies of a draft—one for the professor and another for a peer reviewer; and 2) the final manuscript. Failure to meet the deadlines for these two assignments will result in forfeiture of the manuscript grade. *PLEASE NOTE THAT A DRAFT IS AN UNREFINED, COMPLETE VERSION OF THE PAPER*; it is a draft because it requires rewriting, revision of organization, or a bibliography—**NOT** because it is a small, incomplete part of the larger project. *YOUR DRAFT MUST BE COMPLETE.*

The historiography is based on your *TOPIC*, not your research question. Of course, you will want to turn the historiographic discussion toward your research question, but that is not the foremost emphasis at this stage of writing. A historiographical essay is one which analyzes the ways in which your topic has been treated by a number of authors. It is usually problem-centered, unlike a book review, which is centered on a single publication (even though a book review does normally make some reference to other works related to the book being discussed). Where possible, your secondary sources should include a representative sample of works written about your topic over a fairly broad period of time. For example, a historiographical essay on American memory studies might begin in a primary source: Jean Jacques Rousseau’s *The Social Contract* (1762) in which Rousseau argued the need for civic religion in lieu of a state church, to provide collective memory and morality for a nation. This might lead you into a discussion of Benedict Anderson, Maurice Halbwachs, and then Peirre Nora—all scholars who

## What is “New” about Your Research?

It is not easy to find new topics to research, but the last thing you want to do is replicate others’ research and contribute nothing to the historiography. There are four ways in which you can create an original contribution:

- *New Topic: Asking a New Question.* No one has written about my topic. As a result of this scholarly neglect, my paper explains the significance of my research topic and offers a provisional interpretation of this new material.
- *New Evidence: Filling a Gap.* A few scholars have written about my topic, but gaps and deficiencies in the literature still exist. My paper examines new or different evidence to correct these shortcomings.
- *New Interpretation: Making a Counterclaim.* Other scholars have written about my topic, but I am dissatisfied with the interpretations and/or methodologies. My paper calls for a reassessment of the existing literature based on recent findings, new methodologies, and/or original questions.
- *New Interpretation: Carrying on a Tradition.* Other scholars have written about a similar topic, and I think their interpretations and/or methodologies may be useful in reassessing my topic. My paper builds upon a common historiographical tradition to enlighten understanding of a previously explored topic.

discussed intersections of memory with nation-building and identity. Note that none of this so far has much to do with the “American” context; you are merely building the intellectual foundations for the discussion of your subject.

Then you might turn to a foundational text for the American topic—Robert Belluh’s “Civil Religion in America.” Use the more important pieces to anchor discussions about themes. For example, Belluh raises questions about the definition of civil religion, the belief in providentialism, the critical role of the Civil War in consolidating American collective memory. Each of these themes could then develop into separate paragraphs or sections in which multiple books and articles are discussed that address each theme specifically. The critical goal in all historiography is to lay out the ways in which the ideas/themes that you plan to use in your own scholarship have evolved . . . and *WHY*. In addition to pointing out areas of agreement and disagreement among historians and other scholars, a good historiographical essay should discuss the *REASONS* for these differences and their *IMPLICATIONS* for the understanding of the subject. Whereas book reviews usually deal with full-length books, historiographical essays are more flexible and often discuss articles as well as books.

There are different strategies for preparing a historiographical essay. Again, book reviews are an excellent way to determine the topics, research questions, and theses of your books. Reviews also provide insight in how reviewers respond to the topic and thesis. Still, you *MUST* also engage the books themselves: explore their structures to consider how the authors build their arguments, and search for thematic relationships to other scholarship that will focus your attention on the important themes of the field.

There is no single formula for organizing a historiographical essay. Like all interpretive and argumentative essays, a historiographical essay should have an introduction defining its subject, suggesting a thesis for the historiography about the major trends (patterns) or schools in historical interpretation of your topic (that’s right—a thesis separate from that for your topic and research question), and it should end with a conclusion in which you look back over what you have said, summarize your most important findings, and leave the reader with a significant thought to carry away from the piece. The introduction and conclusion should be separate paragraphs or sequences of paragraphs; if you combine them with paragraphs that are really part of the body of your paper, you have probably not devoted enough time and effort to them.

In between the introduction and conclusion, however, there are several different ways to organize your material. The best approach will depend on the nature of the issue discussed in your readings and the nature of the readings themselves. Some of the various approaches that are possible are:

1. the “**HISTORIOGRAPHICAL-EVOLUTION**” approach: This usually works best if you are comparing a series of more or less comparable works that deal with closely related questions and that show a clear evolution of viewpoints over time. Such essays usually begin by discussing a fundamental book that set forth important theses on a historical topic and then looking at subsequent publications that challenged those theses, perhaps substituting a new general interpretation that was subsequently revised in its turn. Thus, if you were reviewing the historiographical literature on what frontier historians call the “frontier thesis” (what was the process of trans-Appalachian settlement and what were its consequences for the democratic evolution of the United States?), you might begin with Turner’s thesis that the frontier served as a safety valve for social and economic disfranchisement, and as white settlers moved westward, their institutions were broken down by the wilderness forcing more egalitarian and democratic remedies to the problems that they faced, proceed through the works of historians like White who proposed alternative theses like the “middle ground,” turn to Aron’s and Cayton’s counterarguments that the frontier failed to offer democratic opportunity, and perhaps conclude with Friend and Cashin on the role of gender in defining frontier settlement and complicating egalitarianism. In an essay of this sort, you tend to treat each successive publication as a response to the earlier ones; your job as historiographical analyst is to show how this

conversation among historians proceeded and what ending point it finally reached. In such an essay, you would usually discuss each book in turn, normally in chronological order.

2. The “**RIVAL-SCHOOLS**” approach: You may find that your readings reflect differing approaches to a subject, but that they do not fall into the pattern of assertion—challenge—synthesis—new challenge that is characteristic of the “historiographical evolution” essay. In this case, it may make more sense to present the major interpretations of a problem as examples of competing historiographical or ideological approaches. The chronological order in which works appeared may be less important, since you may be suggesting that different interpretations have co-existed with each other over time, rather than one replacing the other. One might, for example, contrast the “middle ground” approach found in White’s work with the “cultural persistence” interpretation offered by Elizabeth Perkins and the “terror as strengthening patriarchy” explanation offered in Friend. Here your emphasis would be on explaining the logic of each explanation and its strengths and weaknesses.
3. The “**DIFFERENT ASPECTS OF THE PROBLEM**” approach: Sometimes one constructs a historiographical essay by treating the different works you read, not as competing attempts to explain a single central problem, but as different perspectives that add up to a larger whole. This is essentially what you do in a research paper based on primary sources: you examine different types of sources and then talk about the different kinds of information one can extract from each of source and how they complement or undermine each other. While such an approach is natural in dealing with primary sources, it may also be used in discussing secondary literature. An essay on the early American frontiers might cover two books on Kentucky by Friend and Aron, along with Cayton’s monograph on Ohio, and Ed Baptist’s study of frontier Florida; in this case, you would be looking at the similarities and differences of the early American frontiers in three different places that shared some common features, and suggesting a general picture of the situation in early America that could be constructed from these more limited studies.
4. The “**THEMATIC**” approach: in the three schemes of organization discussed above, the essay would normally be organized as a succession of sections, each discussing a particular book, held together by an introduction explaining why you are discussing these books and a conclusion recapitulating the argument you have made about how they are related. A completely different approach would start by defining several issues or themes that are found in all the books you have read, and then discussing each issue in turn, comparing and contrasting what each of your authors says about it. In an essay on the early American frontiers, for example, rather than proceeding book-by-book, you might decide that the important issues are the way in which different authors define settlement and colonialism, the motives they attribute to white migration, and the way in which they measure the success or failure of frontier settlement. In this case, your discussion of any one book will be broken up into sections dealing with the way your themes are treated in it.

A historiographical essay can easily devolve to look somewhat like a series of separate book reviews strung together (or, in the case of the thematically organized review, several book reviews combined in a blender). Try not to think of your historiographical essay in these ways, however. The success of a historiographical essay depends on showing how the materials you are discussing *RELATE TO EACH OTHER*, rather than just evaluating each one on its individual merits. A good historiographical essay is driven by themes, not books. While a historiographical essay may, and often does, include comments on the sources used in each book discussed, the organization of the book, and each author’s style, these issues, which are often central in book reviews, should be subordinated to the more general thematic arguments that link the books. A book review is often trying to answer questions such as “Is this particular book worth reading? What does it say that is new? Does it make its point clearly?” In a historiographical essay, we usually take it for granted that the books being discussed have already proved their worth (or else, why would you include them in a historiographical conversation?), and the bigger question is “How does what we read in this book compare with what we find in other, related

works? What is the significance of the differences and of the things the books have in common? How does their collective findings lay a foundation for my topic of inquiry?” As you read:

- ☞ keep very careful bibliographic records on your sources.
- ☞ be sure that you take careful notes on the author's thesis, the types of sources the author uses, the relationship between the author's argument and other historical interpretations, etc. Be sure that your notes indicate the exact page numbers for key quotations, etc.
- ☞ take notes on the relative strengths and weaknesses of each work.
- ☞ think about how these historians' questions and interpretations have changed over time and try to fit the authors' interpretations fit into “groups” or “schools.” often you will find that historians have formed very clear “schools” of thought on your topic, which are discussed overtly in your secondary sources.

**CRITIQUE:** A three-page evaluation of another student's draft historiography, as well as a thoroughly marked-up critique of the draft. Each student will have primary responsibility for evaluating one particular manuscript and submitting two copies of his/her critique (including specific suggestions for improvement). The paper you are to critique should have the following features:

### ***An introduction***

- ☞ Does it give relevant context/background information?
- ☞ Were you comfortable as you finished the intro that you knew what is being studied (topic) and why (significance)?
- ☞ Did you know the main themes of the narrative?
- ☞ Is the historiographical importance clearly stated?

### ***An argument***

- ☞ What point is the author making about the historiography?
- ☞ Is it clearly stated, and does it relate to the topic?
- ☞ Is it evident why this is important?

### ***The body***

- ☞ Was the narrative well-written? Was it a good read? If so, how and why? If not, what impeded understanding or enjoyment?
- ☞ How is the historiography organized: Book-by-book? Thematically? Chronologically? Is it effective?
- ☞ What sources were used, and why? Were the sources used wisely—were conclusions logical?

### ***Conclusion***

- ☞ Was the conclusion expected?
- ☞ Did the totality of the paper support or refute the author's intent?
- ☞ Do you agree with the conclusions?

Since you are critiquing a draft, it is imperative that you be as constructively critical as possible. “The author clearly has no grasp of his topic” is not constructive for it provides no guidance. “The author would benefit from making an argument for the relevance of her topic” is constructive because it gives some sense of what you see as a partial solution. Or even further, “The author would benefit from drawing a stronger contrast between book A and book B, which draw different conclusions about the topic but whose differences are understated by the author.”

# COURSE SCHEDULE

<p>January 8th</p>	<p><b>Imagining the Public History Dissertation: Theory and Historiography</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Richard Anderson, <a href="#">“What ‘counts’ as a public history dissertation? Some views from the field.”</a> <i>History@Work</i>, National Council on Public History</li> <li>• Robert Weible, <a href="#">“Defining Public History: Is It Possible? Is It Necessary?”</a> <i>Perspectives on History</i> (March 2008)</li> <li>• Thomas Andrews and Flannery Burke, <a href="#">“What Does it Mean to Think Historically?”</a> <i>Perspectives on History</i> (January 2007)</li> <li>• Turabian, <i>A Manual for Writers</i>, chaps. 1-5 &amp; 14</li> <li>• Description of historiographic assignment in this syllabus</li> <li>• Walkowitz, Judith. <a href="#">“On Taking Notes.”</a> <i>Perspectives on History</i>. January 2009.</li> <li>• Lipkowitz, Elise. <a href="#">“From Notes to Narrative: Introduction.”</a> <i>Perspectives on History</i>. January 2009.</li> <li>• Harkness, Deborah E. <a href="#">“Finding the Story.”</a> <i>Perspectives on History</i>. January 2009.</li> <li>• Lynn Hunt, <a href="#">“How Writing Leads to Thinking.”</a> <i>Perspectives on History</i> (February 2010)</li> <li>• Liena Vayzman, <a href="#">“Practical Advice for Writing Your Dissertation, Book, or Article.”</a> <i>Perspective on History</i> (December 2006)</li> <li>• Mandy Potts, <a href="#">“Ten things I wish I’d known before starting my dissertation.”</a> <i>The Guardian</i>, 18 April 2014.</li> <li>• Pinker, Steven. “Why Academics Stink at Writing.” <i>Chronicle of Higher Education</i>. 26 September 2014. (provided as pdf)</li> <li>• Limerick, Patricia Nelson. “Dancing with Professors: The Trouble with Academic Prose.” <i>New York Times Review of Books</i>. Oct./Nov. 1993. (provided as pdf)</li> <li>• Gregory, Brad. <a href="#">“Managing the Terror.”</a> <i>Perspective on History</i>. January 2009.</li> <li>• NC State. <a href="#">“Doctor of Philosophy in Public History Handbook.”</a> Pages 15-20.</li> <li>• AHA Committee for Graduate Students, <a href="#">“Guidelines for the Doctoral Dissertation Process.”</a> 7 October 2016.</li> </ul>
<p>January 15th</p>	<p><b>Model Dissertations, or Why Can’t Public History Dissertations Be Better?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Model Dissertation Assignment is due in class</b></li> <li>• Robert Anthony Soza, “Denying Genocide: ‘America’s’ Mythology of Nation, The Alamo, and the Historiography of Denial” (PhD diss., Univ. California at Berkeley, 2010). (provided as pdf)</li> </ul>
<p>January 22nd</p>	<p><b>The Basics of Historiography</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Popkin, <i>From Herodotus to H-Net</i>, all.</li> </ul>
<p>January 29th</p>	<p><b>The Basics of Public Historiography</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Winks, Robin W. “Review: A Public Historiography.” <i>Public Historian</i> 14 (summer 1992): 93-105.</li> <li>• Remer, Rosiland. “Historiography and Public History in Pennsylvania.” <i>Pennsylvania History</i> 75 (September 2008): 422-27.</li> <li>• Jeremy Black, <a href="#">“What Drives History?”</a> <i>Social Affairs Unit</i>, 25 October 2005.</li> <li>• Rebecca Conard, “Historiography of Public History: The Pragmatic Roots of Public History Education in the United States,” <i>Public Historian</i> 37 (February 2015): 105-20.</li> <li>• David Glassberg, “Public History and the Study of Memory,” <i>Public Historian</i> 18 (spring 1996): 7-23.</li> </ul>

February 5th	<p><b>Silence in the Archives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trouillot, <i>Silencing the Past</i>, all. ♥</li> </ul>
February 12th	<p><b>Imagining a Public Historiography</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meringolo, <i>Museums, Monuments, and National Parks</i>, all ♥</li> </ul>
February 17th	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Exploratory essay is due by 6 pm via email attachment.</b></li> </ul>
February 19th	<p><b>The On-Site Study: Visitor Studies, Oral Interviews, Institutional Archives</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stanton, <i>The Lowell Experiment</i>, all. ♥</li> </ul>
February 26th	<p><b>Public History as History</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bruggeman, <i>Here, George Washington Was Born</i>, all. ♥</li> </ul>
March 5th	<p><b>Are Memory Studies the Bedrock of Public Historiography?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kelman, <i>A Misplaced Massacre</i>, all. ♥</li> </ul>
March 12th	<p><b>Spring Break!</b></p>
March 19th	<p><b>Public History in the Age of Monumentalism</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upton, <i>What Can and Can't Be Said</i>, all. ♥</li> </ul>
March 26th	<p><b>Public and Popular Histories</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rymsza-Pawlowska, <i>History Comes Alive</i>, all. ♥</li> </ul>
April 2nd	<p><b>Internationalizing Public History</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sodaro, <i>Exhibiting Atrocity</i>, all. ♥</li> </ul>
April 9th	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Draft of historiography is due—two copies</b></li> </ul>
April 16th	<p><b>Critiques</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Critique is due in class—two copies</b></li> </ul>
April 23rd	<p><b>No class—work on historiographies—professor available via appointment</b></p>
April 30th	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Final assignments are due by 6 pm via email attachment</b></li> </ul>

## POLICIES (or, the fine print)

### **Absence Policy**

You are grown folk. Attend as you wish. Don't be surprised if your participation grade suffers because you are not in class to attend, or that your work reflects a general ignorance because you were not in class to hear valuable material or ask relevant questions. If you have any questions about University Attendance Regulations, visit <http://policies.ncsu.edu/regulation/reg-02-20-03>. Note, however, that I only teach material once! It is not my obligation to teach you should you miss class, and also note that there is no make-up policy for assignments. The onus of success lies with you, as do the consequences of failure.

### **Technology Policy**

Students may use laptops at the professor's discretion. If a student is using a laptop for anything other than course-related work, the privilege of technology may be stripped from that student. Under no conditions should a phone be seen in the classroom.

### **Writing Policy**

All papers must be neatly typed in a regular-sized font (Times New Roman, 11 or 12 point is preferred) and double-spaced. All margins must be either 1 or 1¼ inches. YOU CANNOT BE TOO THOROUGH WHEN CITING SOURCES! All citations must conform to the style found in Kate Turabian, *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers*. Points will be deducted for errors in grammar and mechanics.

### **Academic Dishonesty Policy**

Students are required to comply with the university policy on academic integrity found in the Code of Student Conduct found at <http://policies.ncsu.edu/policy/pol-11-35-01>. Severe penalties attend your using other people's words without attribution. See campus policies for the implications (<http://www.fis.ncsu.edu/ncsulegal/codeof.htm>) and the History Department's policy at [http://history.ncsu.edu/ug\\_resources/plagiarism\\_honor\\_code](http://history.ncsu.edu/ug_resources/plagiarism_honor_code). Your signature/e-name on an assignment or examination represents that you have conformed to the Honor Pledge: "I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid on this test or assignment."

### **Incomplete Grades**

If an extended deadline is not authorized by the instructor, an unfinished incomplete grade will automatically change to an F after either (a) the end of the next regular semester in which the student is enrolled (not including summer sessions), or (b) the end of 12 months if the student is not enrolled, whichever is shorter. Incompletes that change to F will count as an attempted course on transcripts. The burden of fulfilling an incomplete grade is the responsibility of the student. The university policy on incomplete grades is located at <http://policies.ncsu.edu/regulation/reg-02-50-3>.

### **Policy for Students with Disabilities**

Reasonable accommodations will be made for students with verifiable disabilities. In order to take advantage of available accommodations, student must register with the Disability Services Office (<http://www.ncsu.edu/dso>), 919-515-7653. For more information on NC State's policy on working with students with disabilities, please see the Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities Regulation at <http://policies.ncsu.edu/regulation/reg-02-20-01>.

### **Supporting Fellow Students in Distress**

Occasionally, you may come across a fellow classmate whose personal behavior concerns or worries you. When this is the case, I would encourage you to report this behavior to me and to [NC State Students of Concern](#). Although you can report anonymously, it is preferred that you share your contact information so they can follow-up.

**Evaluations**

Online class evaluations will be available for students to complete during the last two weeks of the semester, becoming unavailable at 8am on the first day of finals. Students will receive an email message directing them to a website where they can login using the Unity ID. All evaluations are confidential; instructors will not know how any one student responded to any question, and students will not know the ratings for any instructors. The evaluation website is <http://go.ncsu.edu/cesurvey>.