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PREFACE

In early 2010 I was thinking about how the History Department might celebrate UVic and the department’s 50th anniversary, and the question came to me: what could be more appropriate than writing a history of ourselves? Dr. Patricia Roy, who since I arrived in the department twenty years ago has always been a source of revealing and entertaining stories about the department’s past, was clearly the colleague for the job. Pat graciously accepted the task, which along with mining her own memories of nearly forty years in the department involved considerable slogging through departmental minutes, reviews and reports.

The history you find here does not include all the entertaining stories I recall (one must be cognizant of legal issues, after all). But it includes a fair sampling of important and intriguing detail about the department’s history, sprinkled with insight from one of our long-standing members. As chair, I have found it reassuring and at times disturbing to learn how often what we view as new concerns have actually reared their head multiple times over the years – concerns ranging from student representation in department governance to the role of the chair. Pat’s history gives us a clear sense of the most important elements of the department – the students, both graduate and undergraduate; the staff, without whom we could not function; and of course, the sessional instructors and faculty members.

We see in these pages the evolution of UVic and of the History Department from a primarily undergraduate teaching role to one where we can be justly proud of our record as undergraduate and graduate teachers and productive researchers. The story also underscores our commitment to the scholarly and broader community, here in Victoria, in British Columbia, nationally, and internationally.

We are very fortunate indeed to have one of our most distinguished emeritus faculty members as chronicler of our history. Patricia Roy is the author of several influential monographs in Canadian history (the most recent published just this fall) and a Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada. Our history is in good hands. I hope you enjoy learning more about it through these pages.

Lynne Marks
Chair, Department of History
December 2012
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CHAPTER I
The Pettit Years – Victoria College

In September 1925 one of the students entering Craigdarroch Castle, the home of Victoria College, was Sydney G. Pettit, who completed his second year in 1927. A decade later, after receiving a B.A. from the University of British Columbia (UBC) and teaching in the province’s public schools, he returned to the College. When he retired in 1972, he had overseen the department’s transition from a one-man show (himself) to a full-fledged department in the University of Victoria.¹

When Pettit entered the College it had only existed for five years.² Until 1963 when the University of Victoria received its charter it was a branch plant of UBC. Although it taught UBC courses, the History department operated independently in its day-to-day activities. The most important course was History 1 (later 101), “Main Currents in Modern History”; later “Main Currents in Twentieth Century History.” A more accurate title would have been “Mainly Currents in Twentieth Century European History” with some emphasis on current events. It was a lecture course but beginning in 1946, students attended weekly group discussions during a fourth hour of class. Until the late 1950s, the College offered a limited number of other courses, mainly in Canadian history. For their third year, students had to leave Victoria.

The Cornett Building, which housed the History Department when it moved to the Gordon Head campus in 1966, was named after T.W. Cornett, B.A. (University of Toronto), the first recorded instructor of History. Cornett began teaching in September 1922 but drowned in August 1924. His replacement, as instructor in History and Economics, was E. Stanley Farr, a law graduate of the University of Toronto, who became assistant to the principal but remained a member of the History Department until 1944.³

Sydney Pettit returned to the College in 1937 as Librarian and Instructor in History and Psychology! He sometimes dropped Psychology but remained as librarian until 1942. As well as teaching Sociology from time to time until 1956 Pettit was the only instructor offering 101 (20th century) and 102 (Canada) and, occasionally, Canada West of the Lakes. Later, he taught 304, Medieval History, which UBC required of its Honours students. In 1947-48, he spent a profitable leave at UBC and earned an MA. When he returned one of his students was Reginald H. Roy, one of the many veterans who attended the College in the immediate post-war years. Roy won the Kathleen Agnew Scholarship for Canadian History in his second year. This $100 award was significant; tuition for a full year was $155.00.

Victoria College was so small in 1947 that the yearbook could publish individual photographs of faculty members who, like S.G. Pettit, sometimes taught in more than one discipline.

Victoria College was small. In 1953, 292 full-time students enrolled in the first two years and another 702 were registered as part-timers in the Evening Division. In the regular program, men outnumbered women by a ratio of approximately two to one. The Normal School, that had shared a campus on Lansdowne Road with the College since 1946, closed in 1956 to be replaced by a Faculty of Education. Students who desired to teach in the elementary schools had to complete a course in Canadian history. The large number of these students gave the Department a base for growth. With the help of several part-time instructors, the department expanded its upper year offerings. In 1957-58 Anthony (Tony) Emery, an Oxford M.A., taught British and European history as well as courses in the English department. A former student remembered him as “a charming dilettante,” an amusing lecturer “with a fine sense of humour, an equally good sense of timing, and a disarming self-deprecatory chuckle.”⁴ To honour the first of British Columbia’s centennials, in 1958, Pettit asked his former student R.H. Roy to teach a course in British Columbia history. Since receiving a B.A. and M.A. from UBC, Roy had worked as a historian for the Department of National Defence and as an archivist in Ottawa and Victoria. He was then teaching at
Royal Roads Military College. When Pettit invited him to become a full-time member of the department, Roy became the first member of the department who, apart from Pettit, "was a fully-fledged historian." His first assignment was teaching two sections of the Canadian survey with an average enrolment of 100 each and a section of the European survey.

Rising enrolment in the early 1960s as the first baby boomers came of university age and the desire to offer sufficient upper year offerings to allow students to complete UBC degrees in Victoria meant several new appointments. John Oglesby, an American specialist on the Expansion of Europe especially into Latin America, joined the department in 1961; the following year, W. George Shelton, an European historian, arrived. Shelton had the distinction of being the only faculty member with a Ph.D. in hand although Roy and Oglesby were completing their dissertations. In 1960-61, Pettit introduced History 400, the Intellectual History of Modern Europe. It became his specialty and a requirement in the new Honours program. Some students thought Pettit was a fine lecturer with a good sense of humour. The College's 1946 yearbook commented, "International affairs, medieval history, sociological concepts, the development of Canada – if you have difficulty with any of these matters you will find Mr. Pettit more than helpful." Yet, Michiel Horn, who became a distinguished Canadian historian, thought Pettit "combined the manner of a Trollopian archdeacon with the method of a Dickensian schoolmaster. Woe betide those who took notes while he lectured, and those who failed to copy down his dictated summary!" David Alexander, a former student who became a distinguished economic historian, however, dedicated his first book to Pettit.

The department encouraged good senior students to expand their historical knowledge through the co-educational Creighton Club, named after Donald G. Creighton, a prominent Canadian historian. At its meetings, also attended by faculty, students read specially prepared papers. In the early 1960s the College principal suspended the Club for serving sherry and wine at its annual dinner in the cafeteria where a professor of historical geography spoke on prohibition in nineteenth century New Brunswick! The next year, students proposed to toast the Queen with tomato juice.

Some students, over Pettit's strong opposition, prepared an anti-calendar, a rating of professors. Pettit generally got good ratings but many students suggested that he not dictate his lectures. Greatly angered, he refused to supervise the Honours Essay of one editor, refused to let another take his Medieval History course, and snubbed another when they met in the Snug, a popular pub. Pettit, however, knew that fighting the anti-calendar was useless. When students organized another one in 1967, he advised faculty to act "in a manner that is suitable to their own interests."

Dictating information to students was necessary. It perhaps began with the limitations of the College library when Pettit lost a battle with the head of the English department over a special grant of $1,000 for new acquisitions. Moreover, there were few qualified instructors for the multiple sections of introductory History courses and too few large classrooms to permit large sections. Each instructor of History 101 was given a set of typed, single-spaced, lecture notes. If an instructor did not dictate the notes exactly, students suffered; Pettit set the exam which included such factual questions such as "How many dollars did the First World War cost?"

By 1960, the College had 44 third year students and one in fourth year. Overall, there were 568 students in Arts and 1061 in Education. In 1961-62, 45 students graduated from UBC and most had done all of their work at Victoria College. Their degrees read B.C. (UBC- Vic. Coll.). A year later, with the College transformed into the University of Victoria, their degrees were from UVic.
CHAPTER II
The College Becomes a University

In 1963, following a study of higher education in the province by Dr. John B. Macdonald, the president of UBC, the W.A.C. Bennett government ended UBC's monopoly on the granting of degrees (except in theology) in the province, created Simon Fraser University in Burnaby, turned Victoria College into the University of Victoria, and established a number of regional colleges. The baby boomers were of university age and new universities were popping up throughout North America. Moreover, British Columbia, like much of Canada, was prospering and attracting new immigrants.

For the historians the transition from college to university meant not only that their students received UVic degrees but also that they were part of a real department with its own secretary, letterhead, and, for some, their own telephones. It also meant growth. Emery moved to Fine Arts, but in 1964, the department gained several new members. Alfred E. Loft moved from the Faculty of Education to the History department. Loft had no graduate degrees but was a superb teacher much beloved by students in introductory courses. Pettit had not completed doctoral studies but knew that the Ph.D. was becoming the basic qualification for university instructors and that research and publications were also expected.

One of the 1964 appointees, S.W. (Toby) Jackman, had grown up in Victoria. He returned after earning a Harvard Ph.D. and teaching for a decade in New England. His penchant for speaking his mind and wearing a flowing academic gown in class made him stand out on the campus. A colleague recalled him as "Victoria's answer to Benjamin Disraeli, the tight-rope ballerina of late Victorian politics." The other new members, Charlotte Girard, a French historian, and James E. (Jim) Hendrickson, an American historian, were completing doctorates from Bryn Mawr and the University of Oregon respectively.

In 1964, the department had nine full-time members; by 1969-70 it had nineteen, of whom three were lecturers on two-year contracts and six were lecturers eligible for tenure on completing their doctorates. An influx of younger scholars with new ideas about pedagogy stimulated long discussions about policies and procedures. Newcomers, for example, questioned Pettit's prescription that final exams should be worth 50% of the mark with 30% for Christmas exams and 20% for essays. Pettit did not want to change but Jackman, who apart from Pettit was the department's only full professor until R.H. Roy was promoted in 1971, warned that "this is the age of change and emphasis on individual autonomy." He reminded Pettit that he had the upper hand since he could recommend for or against tenure. Jackman wanted to allocate 60% of the total mark to the final exam because some students who did well during the year stopped working, wrote "outrageously bad finals," and got a better mark than they deserved. Nevertheless, recognizing that some colleagues wanted to direct their courses in their own fashion, he accepted a compromise that final exams in second year courses should count for 60% of the total mark.

The young Canadian historians were unhappy with a common examination, set jointly by the instructors of the multiple sections of the survey. To demonstrate the problem, they contributed such questions as "Discuss the problems of any one province on entering Confederation" and "Referring to one particular instance discuss how questions of race and religion affected Canadian politics." The permutations of these questions gave students dozens of choices. Some students complained about the time needed to choose questions. After the exam, a student betrayed his ignorance of larger themes by regretting that there were no questions on Louis Riel. When it was pointed out that Riel could be discussed in the context of Manitoba's entry into Confederation and in the racial and religious controversy over his fate after the Northwest Rebellion, the blushing student went away.
While dealing with faculty desire for more autonomy, Pettit also planned the expansion of the curriculum. Given the importance of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics during the Cold War, he suggested adding Russia to the Department’s offerings. He prepared a detailed curriculum for an “Institute of Soviet Studies” that would draw on courses from other departments. Early in 1969, the Department created courses in Russian and Soviet History. In September Donald Senese, who was completing a dissertation at Harvard, began teaching Russian and Soviet History.

An informal survey of students provided no consensus about future areas of expansion. Some expressed interest in decolonization which was rapidly happening in Africa but others thought the department should build on existing areas, which was what the Department did. New courses in British history reflected the appointment of John Money. At the same time Christopher Rowe replaced Oglesby, who had moved to the University of Western Ontario. Rowe, a doctoral student at the University of Liverpool, also taught some Latin American history and the Canadian survey even though his knowledge of Canada rapidly petered out after Europeans explored it. He was a quick study and a talented actor; students thought him an expert on Canadian history. Ernest Forbes and Patricia Roy, who were Canadian historians, had joined the department the year before but Forbes had only a M.A. and Roy was still researching her Ph.D. thesis.

To cope with the growing number of Education students who were required to take the Canadian survey, the beginning of graduate studies, R.H. Roy’s move into military history, and the departure of Forbes to pursue doctoral studies, the department appointed five new Canadian historians in 1968-69. Three were two-year term appointees with M.A.’s but no further graduate work who each taught three sections of the Canadian survey. One was Don Chard whom Forbes had recommended as his replacement.20

In 1967 R.H. Roy had learned that the Department of National Defence was establishing chairs in military and strategic studies which would supply funds for library purchases, contribute to the salary of the incumbent and his secretary, and support travel by the incumbent and visiting speakers. The holder of the chair and his university would establish courses in military and strategic studies. After Roy secured the support of Pettit, the other historians agreed with his plan to create a course, “War in the Modern World.” This, however, was the time of the Vietnam War. In the Faculty of Arts and Science, which had to approve all curriculum changes, some professors argued that the money should be spent on the study of peace, order, and good government. Nevertheless, the Faculty approved and so too did the Department of National Defence. “Praise be,” Roy recalled, “we won.” In the fall of 1968, he began teaching “War in the Modern World.” A graduate course in Military History and other undergraduate courses that were usually oversubscribed followed. Through the DND grant Roy brought in speakers, mainly senior military officers, to share their knowledge with students. Unfortunately, a bureaucratic error in the President’s Office meant that the application for renewal was not submitted and the grant ended in 1981.21 Given the success of the courses, they remained part of the department’s regular offerings.
The department’s other great coup in 1968 was attracting J.M.S. Careless as a visitor to teach senior undergraduates and especially, graduate students. Careless had chaired the History Department at the University of Toronto, and had written an acclaimed biography of George Brown, a Father of Confederation, and a popular textbook. He had also been president of the Canadian Historical Association. The department was disappointed that he did not stay although he returned several times to teach in the Summer School.

The fifth appointee of 1968 was Jan Kupp. A native of the Netherlands, as a professional soldier he had been a commando in the East Indies. After the war, he taught in rural Manitoba and attended Summer School at the University of Manitoba where he was encouraged to pursue a Ph.D. on the history of New France. New France was not an obvious draw for students in Victoria but Kupp’s course was popular. There was no suitable English language textbook so he had his lecture notes mimeographed and sold at the bookstore. To pass the course students needed only to study this text. When they went to class, it was mainly to hear war stories. Kupp was always friendly but not necessarily aware of what the department was doing. One September he saw a young man in the corridor outside his office. To make conversation he asked the man what area of history interested him. When the man replied, “Russia,” the avuncular Kupp replied, “That’s fortunate; we have just hired a Russian historian.” The young man was Don Senese, the new Russian historian.

Additional faculty and an expanded curriculum were but two markers of the university’s growth. In 1964-65 the calendar included a rather blank map of the Gordon Head campus to which the University was in the process of moving from its Lansdowne campus (now Camosun College). For two years faculty and students commuted as most offices were at Lansdowne but classrooms were on both campuses and the Library was at Gordon Head. In 1966-67, when all classes and services were at Gordon Head, the historians shared the third floor of one wing of the Cornett Building with the psychologists. Noted for its dead-end corridors, the building housed all of the Humanities and Social Sciences. It was joked that people who found where they wanted to go on the first attempt deserved a degree in Geography while those who didn’t were subjects for the psychologists. Despite the new buildings on campus which permitted the end of Saturday morning classes in September 1967, space was at a premium. Preliminary registration figures had revealed that History enrolment was up by 25% over the previous year with 974 registrations in first and second year courses and 415 in third and fourth year courses. The increased first year enrolment was attributed to the abolition of a compulsory mathematics and science requirement and “the department’s reputation for good teaching.”
Expansion also included the formal introduction of graduate studies. Through “special arrangements,” History awarded an MA in 1963 to Timothy Trousdell, an Honours graduate, for a thesis on Canadian defence policy but his was a unique case. The only historians among the 49 graduate students registered in the Faculty of Graduate Studies in 1966-67 were doing a “make-up” year to bring them up to the level of Honours graduates. The next year the department offered seven full-time and five part-time students a menu of graduate courses including British, British Columbia, and Intellectual History, as well as a thesis, but warned that not all courses would be offered every year. All candidates were required “to demonstrate a reading knowledge of one foreign language,” “foreign” including French. That gaffe was corrected and the requirement rephrased to be a “reading knowledge of French or a foreign language.” Members of the first graduate class began to receive degrees in 1968.

Initially, the department as a whole acted as a graduate committee to admit students and to award scholarships and other financial aid. The nascent Faculty of Graduate Studies offered some fellowships of $3600 for 12 months and $2400 for 8 months or bursaries of $1800. Recipients could accept up to $800 for paid work. Annual tuition for a full graduate program was a maximum of $635.

Most early students were local residents including UVic graduates who were using the M.A. to prepare for Ph.D. studies elsewhere, local teachers or public servants seeking to upgrade their credentials, a few retirees who studied history as a hobby and some who, defining themselves as “housewives,” found that with their children in school they had time on their hands. One used some of her scholarship money to buy a dishwasher since this gave her time for study. Of the outsiders, several came from Notre Dame University, a small private institution in Nelson, B.C. and the few international students included Yuko Ohara, a founder of Canadian Studies in Japan, and Rabbie Langanai Namaliu, a Commonwealth scholar who later served as prime minister of Papua New Guinea, 1988-1992. The number of graduate students varied from year to year but the Faculty of Graduate Studies set the maximum number at 23 full-time equivalents. Many students were part-timers.

Meanwhile, the department continued to tweak the elite Honours program and its compulsory seminars. Partly conceived as a feeder for the M.A. program, it required Honours students to take 18 units (6 full-year courses) rather than 15 in each of their third and fourth years, special seminars in both third and fourth years, and History 400, the Intellectual History of Europe taught by Mr. Pettit. Students also had to demonstrate a reading knowledge of a language other than English and write a graduating essay of approximately one hundred pages. The finale was a 1½ hour oral examination conducted by five members of the department. The first hour was devoted to all the History courses the student had taken and the remainder to the area of the graduating essay. Critics of the program complained it was a mini-M.A.; it looked more like a mini-Ph.D. The department soon dropped the comprehensive part of the examination but the rigor of the program discouraged students. Only five students were admitted to third year in 1967 and only two in fourth year. To attract students, the department invited prospective students to a reception and opened the seminar room as a study room for Honours students when it was not required for classes or meetings. Coffee, cookies, and study space did not increase enrolment. For several years the department as a whole admitted students, determined their graduation standing, and assigned supervisors. Once, a professor refused to supervise a named student “under any circumstances.”

When Pettit was the only member of the department, he did not need department meetings. As the department grew, they became necessary but initially he did not believe in having minutes. In the spring of 1965, he informed the department that henceforth it would have a Policy Committee consisting of himself and the Associate and Full Professors. It would also have committees on Graduate Studies, Appointments, Honours, and Military History. The department was scheduled to meet on the third Thursday of every month with minutes to be distributed to its members and the Dean of Arts and Science.
The first minutes are dated Thursday, 7 October 1965 but future meetings were not held monthly or necessarily on a Thursday. Some went overtime. One meeting started on a Thursday afternoon, about 1:30, adjourned for an hour at 2:25 presumably for classes, reconvened at 3:30, and adjourned at 4:45 p.m. to be reconvened on Friday evening at 7:30 p.m. No minutes appear to have been kept of the evening meeting but graduate studies were on the agenda. A few months later a meeting began at 7:30 p.m. and adjourned at 11:16 p.m. although there was a brief coffee break. The controversy may have been over opening 200 level courses to first year students since a special meeting to discuss that issue was held the following week. Not surprisingly, someone suggested polling the department to select the “least objectionable time for future meetings” and limiting them to one hour. Finding a suitable meeting time and deciding on who could attend the meetings remained a problem.

The idea of admitting students to meetings caused some consternation. When the department invited students to serve on the Curriculum Committee, Alf Loft and Toby Jackman had their negative votes recorded. After a long discussion and agreeing that the Committee was only concerned with undergraduate courses, the department asked the Creighton Club, the undergraduate History society, to elect one Majors and one Honour student and agreed to let a representative of the graduate students attend meetings of the Graduate Committee when it discussed curriculum. Some faculty members feared that the students would elect a radical; one of the first undergraduates elected was a retired naval officer with conservative views.

The department was Pettit’s creation. R.H. Roy recalled that in the matter of new appointments “there was no consulting with the other members of the department at the time regarding qualification, approval, or what not.” As the university evolved, it required departments to establish appointments committees. It was said, perhaps apocryphally, that Pettit received all of the applications, went through them, selected the candidate he wanted, and then distributed that file and only the files of the obvious non-starters to his committee. As he planned, the committee chose his favoured candidate.

Several appointees in the mid-1960s had their only contact with the department through Pettit. Relying on referees, he appointed individuals sight unseen. Ernest Forbes, who joined the department in 1966 when he was completing an M.A. at Dalhousie, recalled that at a social event, the wife of the chair, Peter Waite, took him aside and warned him to be sure to wear a jacket and tie since in his correspondence with Waite, Pettit’s main concern seemed to be how Forbes cut his hair. Long hair was then a symbol of radicalism; Pettit must have been pleased with Forbes’ brush cut. Patricia Roy, a Ph.D. student at UBC who was not related to R.H. Roy, also came in 1966. Since she only had to come from Vancouver, Pettit immediately told her that the job was hers but the Dean insisted on an interview. It consisted of a friendly chat about the state of British Columbia history. Robert (Bob) McCue wanted to see the city before accepting the job. The Board of Governors had already approved his appointment. After Pettit retired, only one tenure-track appointee was hired without an interview. That was David Stafford. A graduate of the London School of Economics, he served in the British Foreign Service before deciding he would prefer an academic career. Bringing him from England for an interview would be expensive, so he was hired but only after the department did some sleuthing to determine if the brevity of his Foreign Service career and his LSE background might mean that he had strongly left-wing political views. One interview was very informal. Charles Cowan, who had been recently hired to teach twentieth century British history, wangled an interview for his friend and former classmate at the University of Alberta, Brian Dippie, a historian of the American West. After Dippie had lunch with several members of the department and coffee and pastries with others, Hendrickson drove him back to the airport. En route he asked if Dippie would accept a job but the question was phrased, if offered.
Hendrickson himself had been hired without an interview. When he learned that UVic was looking for an American historian, he sent a letter applying for the job. He got an “enthusiastic response” from Pettit whom he met for the first time when he came to Victoria the following summer to look for a house.31

By 1967 Pettit was beginning a process of devolution. He gave some trusted members an opportunity to help select a colleague in their area. While a visiting fellow at Clare College, Cambridge, Jackman had been favourably impressed by John Money, then a student, and certainly nominated him as the second British historian. Money joined the department in September 1967. That December, when the American Historical Association marked Canada’s Centennial by meeting in Toronto, Hendrickson was authorized to interview candidates for a new position in American History. He found two that he liked: W. T. (Ted) Wooley, who was completing a Ph.D. at the University of Chicago, and Wm. (Bill) Leary, who had a Ph.D. from Princeton, several publications and teaching experience. Wooley joined the department in September 1968. Leary, who was already committed for the 1968-69 academic year, came in the next year but left a few years later.32

In the fall of 1967, the department agreed that all tenured members should be the committee on appointments, re-appointments, and tenure. Committee members looked at the application files, drew up a short list of interviewees, and spent some time with the candidate. “It was,” R.H. Roy recalled, “group discussion on a democratic basis” and generally worked well.33 Times were changing. Following university-wide regulations, the department established an elected committee to deal with Appointments, Re-appointments, Promotion and Tenure (ARPT). The university’s adoption of a Tenure Document caused what Jim Hendrickson, one of its drafters, recalled “a sea-change in the way appointments were made thereafter.”34 Possibly uncomfortable with this new democracy, in November 1968 Pettit announced his retirement from the headship effective 30 June 1969 although he taught until he reached retirement age in 1972.
CHAPTER III

More Transitions

An early responsibility of the Appointments, Re-appointments, Promotion and Tenure committee was choosing Pettit’s successor. Early in 1969 it unanimously agreed to submit the name of James E. Hendrickson to the Dean and Board of Governors as the “next head of the department.” Hendrickson seldom spoke in department meetings but, when he did, people listened. Outside the department, he had been president of the Faculty Association and had been on the faculty committee that wrote and negotiated the tenure document with the Board of Governors.

During his time, the department underwent rapid change and growth but not without problems. As part of his concern for replacing a college or branch plant atmosphere with a distinctly university one, Hendrickson introduced several reforms that, with minor variations, have served the department ever since. He replaced the course numbering system inherited from UBC and gave each geographic area its own set of numbers, and provided for the easy expansion of course offerings by creating “Special Topics” and seminar courses in each of the major fields. The distinction between first and second year courses was dropped confirming that first year students could enroll in 200 level courses and vice versa. In anticipation of adding new courses, he had the curriculum committee devise generic descriptions for them such as “An Introduction to the economic, political, and social history of XXXX” and created History 205, “An Introduction to History.” It was designed as a methodology course but was rarely offered and then as an experimental course or as an opportunity for visitors to teach a special course. The curriculum committee’s work could be time-consuming. One morning, the grounds outside were a barren landscape. When the meeting ended, there was a small forest. The university had planted mature trees that day! However, Hendrickson solved the problem of finding a time for department meetings by taking advantage of a new university timetable to choose two consecutive sequences in which no History courses would be taught. Evening department meetings became a thing of the past.

The History Department at Mr. Pettit’s retirement party, 1972.
Front Row: Reg Roy, S.G. Pettit, Toby Jackman, Alf Loft, George Shelton
Absent: Jim Hendrickson

Under Hendrickson, the trend towards instructors having autonomy within their courses accelerated. The department decided that “normally” (Hendrickson’s favourite word since it permitted flexibility) it would not require pre-requisites for senior courses but, as a compromise, “strongly recommended” them and required pre-requisites or “the instructor’s permission” for some courses.
Moreover, instead of a standard formula for allocating marks between essays and exams, Hendrickson merely asked colleagues to put this information on course outlines and file them in the office. When several of the “old guard” feared that some instructors might base more than half the final grade on other than written work, the department conceded the chair should consult the instructor if there were gross discrepancies in grades.

New faculty also brought fresh ideas about existing courses. Over some objections, the department added a few 1.5 unit or single term courses for example, by dividing the Renaissance and Reformation course. Once Pettit retired, History 101 was re-incarnated as History 242. While retaining a European emphasis it added some North American content and on paper, though not in practice, it seemed to focus on the years after 1945. In a large classroom, five instructors in turn lectured on their special fields of knowledge but also sat in on their colleagues’ lectures. In addition, they led tutorials for smaller groups of students. Nevertheless, some faculty members worried about continuity with a succession of instructors; others wondered if years after 1945 were history! Alas, this pedagogically exciting experiment in team-teaching was labour-intensive and could not be continued.

The curriculum and plans for new appointments were inter-related. Given the numbers in their survey and the popularity of their upper year courses, the Canadian historians resented the fact that they seemed to be doing the major portion of the department’s teaching. For many years their vigorous arguments for new appointments and replacements produced a sense of “the Canadians” versus “the rest.” In the late 1960s and early 1970s, Canadian historians with completed Ph.D.’s were rare; the department hired Harry Bridgman, who was writing a dissertation at Queen’s and Ken Dewar, who was writing a Ph.D. dissertation on 20th century Ontario history at the University of Toronto. The department still needed a senior Canadian historian to teach graduate students. One year, Bruce Hutchison, a well-known journalist and biographer of Mackenzie King, taught the graduate seminar. Given his excellent political contacts in Ottawa it was expected that his talks would have long-term historical interest so they were tape recorded. Hutchison told some insider’s stories but only when the recorder was off. After some of the Canadian historians acquired Ph.D.s, they taught the Canadian graduate seminar. In addition, because of enrolment demands and talk of Quebec separatism, the dean authorized the appointment of a historian of French Canada. Phyllis Sherrin (later Senese), who was then writing her dissertation at York University, won the competition and arrived in the fall of 1972.

Other members of the department wanted new appointments in Europe, a revival of Latin American studies after Christopher Rowe returned to England, or expansion into the “Far East.” When the department moved into Asian history it could not decide if China or Japan should be a priority so advertised generally and appointed the best applicant. That was E. Patricia (Paddy) Tsurumi, a native of British Columbia with a doctorate from Harvard in Japanese studies, who arrived in the fall of 1972. Although Pettit had proposed to add China, “a second Communist Great Power,” to the curriculum the department relied on Harry Hsiao of “P&A” to teach Chinese history and cross-listed courses in Chinese and Japanese history with Pacific and Asian Studies.

Planning the curriculum was also an exercise in departmental governance. In the spring of 1969 the department established an Academic Planning Committee composed of the chairman (a significant change in nomenclature, instigated at the departmental level by Hendrickson even though the university administration used the terms chair and head interchangeably), as well as elected representatives of the faculty and students. Although its name and exact responsibilities have changed over time – it has also been known as the Steering Committee and the Student-Faculty Committee -- the department has never been without some committee that regularly reviews curriculum and programme requirements and recommends areas for expansion and plans for faculty renewal. The Student-Faculty Committee also had a mandate that included student discipline. Its responsibilities included devising the information...

Phyllis Senese retired in 2005
Students could be invited to department meetings and participate in discussions but could not vote. They also had a “traditional” right to petition the department directly or through their elected representatives. By 1972, as ideas of student power reached Victoria they were no longer satisfied with this limited role. They asked that their elected representatives be allowed to attend all department meetings but did not demand a vote. The department did not immediately accept this – some older members strongly opposed it – but the following year after Jim Hendrickson returned from leave, it agreed that student representatives should have full debating and voting rights in meetings.

In the meantime, students could request a hearing. In the spring of 1972 two Honours students wrote a “Minority Report: Two Students’ Opinion on Revision of Honours Program.” Unfortunately, the minutes reflect the sense of some faculty members that students, like well-behaved Victorian children, should be seen but not heard. The minutes do not record the Minority report but recite the Honours Committee’s report in some detail. After declaring that the Honours program was designed “to offer interested and talented students in history an excellent education in the liberal arts” and an opportunity for independent and intensive study, the Honours Committee tinkered with the program. It suggested that the graduating essay could be broadly interpretive or “orthodox narrative history” but, in a nod to interdisciplinarity, proposed that students be “encouraged to borrow techniques or utilize information from disciplines other than history.” The essay should range in length from 12,000 to 25,000 words. The topics of recent essays had ranged from a study of the American journalist, Walter Lipman, to the “Condition of England,” and to the rise and fall of the town of Phoenix, B.C. The Department returned the report to the Honours Committee for further consideration. At the next meeting, John Duder, an Honours student, suggested reducing the course work for Honours students since it distracted from the graduating essay but the Department approved the Committee’s original report.

That fall, about 30-35 Honours and Major students complained that they had no priority in registration so non-History students without pre-requisites often occupied the seats they desired. Moreover, some professors taught to students who lacked background and not to the level expected in a senior course. Reflecting an elitist view, they believed that once students were clearly informed of a course’s demands, it was up to them to meet those standards and no professor should feel guilty if students failed. The Creighton Club had faded away and the students were interested in organizing a historical society that could sponsor field trips, promote seminars, and apply for grants through Opportunities for Youth, a federal government initiative that invited young people to develop projects.

The late 1960s and early 1970s were a time of unrest in universities. Students in France demanded reforms, Americans protested the Vietnam War, and in Canada, the implementation of the War Measures Act during the October Crisis in Quebec raised questions about civil rights. At Simon Fraser students and some faculty staged demonstrations to challenge the status quo while at UBC, Jerry Rubin, the American radical, led students into the Faculty Club for a sit-in to demand greater participation in university governance. In Victoria, the university lacked stable leadership. In 1968, Malcolm G. Taylor, the first president, suddenly resigned. R.T. Wallace, who had held every position at Victoria College and the University from student to chancellor, acted as president until Bruce Partridge arrived in the fall of 1969. Partridge’s misfortune was to arrive at a time of unrest and to encounter some faculty (not historians) who seemed keen to make life difficult for administrators. His confirmation of decisions to deny tenure did not endear him to campus “radicals.” In 1972, The Martlet, the student newspaper, reported that Partridge’s doctorate, a J.D., (a degree conferred by many American law schools that is the equivalent of a Canadian LL.B.) was from the Blackstone School of Law, a correspondence school. To underscore its lack of prestige, The Martlet reproduced a page from Popular Mechanics advertising Blackstone next to an ad for toilets designed to work in basements. Partridge’s own tenure soon ended. Once again, the university was under an acting president.

Traditionally, the historians agreed to disagree on contentious issues. The senior administration, anxious to demonstrate that UVic was a university and not a college, insisted on a completed Ph.D. for tenure in most fields. That added to professionalism but meant the loss of some fine teachers although a
cynical dean once commented that the quickest way to create an excellent teacher was to deny tenure. Denying tenure also meant the loss of good friends.

In the History department, the Appointments, Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure (ARPT) Committee was the focus of discontent. Phyllis Senese, who arrived while the controversy was in progress, recalled that the “young upstarts” such as herself saw the key issue as the idea that the Head/Chair was “our flunky and not theirs.” In the spring of 1972, in a handwritten memorandum, eight department members, including a visitor, had called for a special meeting to consider the department’s role “in university governance” particularly relating to ARPT procedures. They declared that the chair and committees were responsible to the department and that “in certain circumstances” the department as a whole could instruct the ARPT. The resolution carried with 14 in favour, 1 against and 4 abstentions including the acting chair.

The following September, three original signatories and a newcomer proposed to modify the resolution by requiring the chair to report to the department only in matters of substance and that the ARPT inform the Department of its recommendations only if the affected member so requested. A few days later the department, by one vote, rescinded the resolution of the previous spring. It also approved the amended motion. An expected hot debate was cut short; the meeting coincided with the final game of the 1972 Canada-Russia hockey series.

What remained controversial was a suggestion that an individual who received a negative recommendation could appear before the ARPT and see all the information being sent to the Committee which advised the Dean. The ARPT had recommended promoting a member of the department who was having trouble completing his Ph.D. dissertation to the rank of assistant professor which would make him eligible for tenure. The candidate, a feisty chap, told the department that Hendrickson had refused to support the ARPT’s recommendation. When J.-P. Vinay, the Dean of Arts of Science, came to a department meeting, a junior member of the department argued that the department “as a corporate body” should make decisions which the chairman should transmit to the administration. As an 18th-century British historian well acquainted with the art of governing, John Money wisely observed that a chairman had to transmit messages to and from the administration and “could act regally only by maintaining his political support within the department.”

The departure of some dissidents who had not completed their dissertations and the return of the visitor to his home university helped to restore harmony. Even at the most divisive times, however, colleagues were proud of not letting students suffer from any conflicts. The department briefly revived a practice that Charlotte Girard had begun of having the second most recent Ph.D. graduate host a party for the newest one to complete the degree. After a surfeit of parties in 1970, there was a gap because changed market conditions meant that most appointees came with degrees in hand. In 1975 Ted Wooley held a party to celebrate Phyllis Senese’s completion of her degree.

Some social behaviours caused problems. The staff in the History office made coffee and tea for department members. Drinkers were expected to pay a monthly fee to cover costs. A tempest in a coffee pot arose over the amount of the fee since some individuals drank little while others needed frequent doses of caffeine. Moreover, not everybody remembered to pay or to wash their cups. Thus, effective 1 May 1973, Hendrickson, who did not think secretaries should be servants, announced that the coffee fund was not recovering costs and took secretarial time. Henceforth, the secretaries would only make hot water available and individuals must provide their own tea and coffee. Smoking was another problem. Large “No Smoking” signs in classrooms were designed for fire prevention not public health and did not apply to meeting rooms. At department meetings, several faculty members smoked cigarettes and some, pipes. In 1973 the department narrowly rejected a motion to ban smoking at meetings but required the smokers to sit at one end of the room.

Hendrickson’s term as head was due to expire. In the summer of 1973, a search committee surveyed department members about ideas for a new chair. A majority favoured an internal appointee but some suggested specific external candidates to whom the committee sent letters inviting them to apply formally. A question about the future role of the chairman produced unanimous approval of a three
year term and support for the idea that the chair’s secretary should act as an executive assistant if asked to do so. Not surprisingly, the relationship of the chair to the department and to the administration drew two main responses: that he had a dual capacity to speak for both the department and the administration or that he was the “department’s direct and bound delegate to the administration.”

The Chair Search Committee presented its stipulations to Dean Vinay, a distinguished linguist, who launched into a scholarly account of the typographical symbol the committee had used to separate the clauses of their manifesto. As John Money recalled, the committee was “so bewildered by his erudition” and an interview technique reminiscent of Louis XIV, that it lost whatever collective will it had had. Before the committee could speak, Vinay dismissed it to make way for his next appointment.42

In the meantime, the department advertised for a new chair. It received 36 applications but only 15 had the required Canadian experience. In the end, no candidate was deemed suitable and John Money was appointed chair for what was originally announced as a two year term. Money had already had considerable influence in the department. His complaints that the department focused too much on short term problems to the detriment of its long term future had led the department to form an ad hoc committee on long-range planning. Shortly thereafter, the search committee for the new chair asked department members individually if they thought Canadian history should be the core of the offerings or if Asian and Pacific Rim studies should be expanded even if that harmed other areas, and if the department should continue to limit its courses to geo-political areas. The consensus was Canadian history was “bread and butter” and attracted “the natives” but students should be encouraged to broaden out. In the meantime, the return of Hendrickson to full-time teaching would strengthen the Canadian offerings since he was researching colonial British Columbia history. Despite some support for expanding into Asia, especially China, Latin America, or possibly adding a Medievalist, the survey suggested a need for a greater variety in offerings. In any case, the era of rapid growth was over. By the early 1970s, most new tenure-track appointees were replacements for people who left.
CHAPTER IV
The Faculty and Their Areas of Interest

John Money inherited a department in a state of flux. Politically, the department was settling down although it was still making replacement appointments. Money's administrative style was patience. He knew that issues that might seem critical often, if left alone, resolved themselves or disappeared. He also had a unique way of dealing with complainants who visited his office, at least in the winter. Having been raised in England when central heating was rare, he was accustomed to working in cold quarters. In winter, he often had his windows open. Few complainants stayed long!

Money's initial two year appointment was extended to five. As chair, and he was chair not head, he had to represent the department to the Dean and his advisors and to the Dean and the other chairs who decided on salary matters. He recalled that he sometimes felt:

like Inspector Maigret being carpeted by the Minister of the Interior at the Quai D'Orsay. But such times apart, and likewise being called to defend ARPT recommendations before the Dean's Advisory Committee, my other memory is of the end of year meetings of Department Chairs in the Dean's office, at which in those days the Faculty's share of merit-pay increments were allocated in a horse-trading process a bit like a cross between a Dutch auction and a trading day on the Chicago commodities exchange about 1900.43

Despite feeling that he was on the carpet, Money impressed the senior administration and was invited to become acting Dean of Arts and Science as it began its devolution into three separate faculties: Humanities, Social Sciences, and Science.

Growth and change continued under a succession of excellent chairs who also dealt with difficult issues in a diplomatic and sensitive way: Ted Wooley, Ian MacPherson, Peter Baskerville, Eric Sager, and Tom Saunders. Like Money they had to deal with the higher administration and keep the department reasonably content. Their styles varied. While Wooley tended to be cautious and would have preferred to see the department focus on undergraduate teaching, he recognized that the majority of his colleagues favoured an expanded graduate programme. MacPherson, Baskerville, and Sager, in contrast, were keen to introduce a Ph.D. programme and to expand the department's research interests. Through the Canadian Families Project and its successor, the Canadian Century Research Infrastructure Project, Baskerville and Sager worked with statistics, co-operated with scholars across the country, and provided research opportunities for some colleagues and employment for graduate students. Saunders had to preserve harmony in a department that was busy making replacement appointments while simultaneously coping with declining enrolment.

The election of three Canadian historians as chairs was a tribute to their leadership skills and to the maturing of the department. Changed circumstances, including relatively stable enrolments in the Canadian survey and new personnel had slowly eased the “Canadian problem.” The department, however, was sorry to lose several junior members. Ernest Forbes, a specialist in Maritime history who had returned after doing doctoral studies at Queen's, got a
call to the University of New Brunswick. Ken Dewar and Harry Bridgman had not completed their theses and changed careers. The Canadians briefly relied on sessional instructors, usually individuals with Ph.D. in progress. Then, in the mid-1970s, new jobs for Canadian historians almost dried up and the department could choose from a number of excellent applicants with completed Ph.D.s, publications, and teaching experience. The initial search for a replacement for Forbes, the first to leave, failed because the department could not agree on which short-listed candidate best suited its needs. After re-opening the competition in 1975, the department appointed both Alan Artibise and Ian MacPherson. Given student and faculty interest and growth in the historiography it was time to divide the History of the Canadian West into separate courses on the prairies and British Columbia. Jim Hendrickson was working on colonial British Columbia and Patricia Roy, on the provincial period. With Artibise’s interest in prairie cities and MacPherson’s on the rural economy, they made a strong and complementary pair, but Artibise remained only a few years,

Another experienced Canadian historian, Peter Baskerville, arrived in 1978 to fill a gap in the department’s offerings. After completing a Ph.D. at Queen’s, Baskerville, a specialist in pre-Confederation Canada, Ontario, and Business History, taught in several places, most recently in Vermont. Others came as replacements. Although hired as a historian of New France in 1979 Chad Gaffield, a graduate of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, had wide ranging interests including collaborative research and the computer as a tool for historical analysis. The addition of Eric Sager, who replaced Artibise in 1983, rounded out the strong Canadian contingent. After completing a doctorate in British history at UBC, Sager spent several years at Memorial University of Newfoundland doing a computer analysis of Atlantic shipping. He had also taught at the University of Toronto’s Erindale campus.

The Canadians gained another new member when David Zimmerman replaced R.H. Roy who retired. The department was not totally committed to military history and the advertisement for Roy’s replacement referred to both military history and science and technology. To the department’s pleasure, David Zimmerman, who specialized in the science and technology of warfare, won the competition. Soon after arriving Zimmerman asked the department to endorse his application for a DND chair in military history. After considerable debate, the department agreed to support it with a number of conditions including one that the ARPT and the department must approve the appointment of any visitors or part-timers hired under the grant. That proviso reflected an experience with a visitor under the earlier grant who had difficulties working with students.

While not all faculty members were enthusiastic about military history, many students were. After Zimmerman introduced a second-year course on the Second World War, the department often had to open extra sections. Fortunately, several Ph.D. students were well qualified to teach it. To provide some continuity, in 2005 Shawn Cafferky was hired on a half-time three year renewable contract with the other half being with the extension programme of the Royal Military College at Kingston. Royal Roads College was no longer a military college but the armed forces wanted officers to have university degrees. Cafferky, who had done his B.A. and M.A. at UVic, had recently completed a Ph.D. at Carleton University. Sadly, he died suddenly in 2008. A scholarship in military history honours his memory.

Given growing interest in First Nations studies, the department was fortunate that several new appointees had backgrounds in indigenous studies. After Gaffield moved to the University of Ottawa, Ken Coates, a UBC graduate and a specialist in Northern Canada and indigenous history, came to UVic from Brandon University in 1986. He went to the new University of Northern British Columbia and was
succeeded in 1993 by Elizabeth Vibert. After studies at Dalhousie and East Anglia, at Oxford she specialized in African history and the history of indigenous peoples. When Jim Hendrickson retired in 1994, the university had budgetary problems so two years passed before John Lutz filled his place. Lutz was hardly a newcomer. He had done his B.A. and M.A. in the department before earning a Ph.D. at the University of Ottawa for a thesis that evolved into his prize-winning book, *Makuk: A New History of Aboriginal-White Relations*. In the meantime, Wendy Wickwire, an ethnologist who uses oral history to record and analyse First Nations history and also teaches in Environmental Studies, became a part-time member of the department in 1995. In 2007 when the university appointed Christine O’Bonsawin to head a one-person Indigenous Studies programme, the History Department became her very appropriate home since her Ph.D. from the University of Western Ontario is in History. Her presence adds to the department’s reputation as a leading centre for First Nations Studies in Canada.

Adding to that reputation is a unique course, the Stó:lō ethnographic field school. In the spring of 1997, Keith Carlson, a UVic M.A. graduate who was a researcher for the Stó:lō nation of the eastern Fraser Valley and Fraser Canyon, before moving to the University of Saskatchewan, suggested to Lutz that the two universities co-sponsor a field school. The department agreed to participate on a trial basis; the administration provided some funding; and the first field school was held in the spring of 1998. Every second spring, eight to ten students, mostly graduate students from UVic and the University of Saskatchewan, spend a month with the Stó:lō people and live in a longhouse. Under the guidance of Stó:lō mentors, elders, and staff, the students undertake a research project while learning historical and ethnohistorical methods. Attention to First Nations history illustrates the department’s adaptation to new fields of historical inquiry; a few decades earlier, the Native Peoples rarely appeared in the curriculum.

The department also recognized rising interest in women’s history. The first hint of feminist ideas occurred in 1972 when several women asked that the minutes, with their very formal honorifics, use the title “Ms.” rather than “Miss” or “Mrs.” That was done but coincidentally at the same meeting, the chair’s secretary, “Miss” Elaine Daniels, asked to be relieved of the responsibility of recording the minutes. In 1974 Paddy Tsurumi and Phyllis Senese proposed to teach “The History of Women in Japan and Canada” under the umbrella heading, History 205. The department approved the idea but could not find the resources to teach it without impairing its existing offerings. Later, Tsurumi began teaching a course on Women in Japan and Phyllis Senese began teaching the History of Women in Canada under the catch-all title, History 358, Topics in Canadian History. The popular course soon became a regular offering. Senese’s interests, however, were shifting to “Racism and Antisemitism”. In 1992, as part of the preparations for the new Ph.D. programme, the department appointed Lynne Marks, who had won the Governor-General’s medal for the best Ph.D. dissertation at York University.

While Canadian history remained the department’s largest single component, other areas also benefitted from growth and changes in the market for historians. In the fall of 1975 the department advertised for a specialist in Modern European social and economic history. It selected a senior professor of European History, Cedric Lowe of the University of Alberta but unfortunately shortly thereafter, he died in a car accident. To replace him, the department brought in Angus McLaren, a
French historian who had a first degree from UBC and a Harvard Ph.D. and was then a Senior Associate Fellow at Oxford. McLaren’s visiting position was soon converted to a regular one. He remained at UVic until retirement in 2007 after a distinguished career as the author of a number of books relating to human reproduction and sexuality.

Although China had been on the wish list since Pettit’s time, Ralph Croizier was not hired until 1977. Like McLaren, he had his first degree from UBC and was an established scholar with extensive experience teaching at the University of Rochester and at the State University of New York at Brockport where he chaired the department. Croizier continued to work on the history of China, particularly its art, and also became internationally known for his pioneering work on teaching World History.

Given the success of World History, it was on the list of areas for expansion as part of the doctoral programme. Finding a world historian was difficult because there were relatively few practitioners and it was not a field in graduate programmes. That gave UVic an opportunity to do something unique. When no Canadian interviewee proved suitable, Department of Immigration regulations allowed the department to consider non-Canadians. Given the expense of bringing in people, the Dean only allowed the department to bring in two more interviewees. By April undergraduate classes were over, so the candidates were told to pretend that the faculty and graduate students in the classroom were first year students. The first candidate’s lecture would have baffled first year students. Fingers crossed, the department welcomed Greg Blue, a recent graduate of Cambridge University where he was a research associate of the famous sinologist, Joseph Needham. Though it was pitched at a level appropriate for first year students, at the end of the hour the “class” enjoyed his informative and well-presented talk on the long history of relations between China and the West. Blue came in 1990.

While increasingly focussing on World History, Ralph Croizier continued to teach Chinese history. After his retirement, Zhongping Chen, a graduate of Nanjing University and the University of Hawaii who had taught at McGill and Trent, came to Victoria in 2002 to teach Chinese history. Meanwhile, Paddy Tsurumi took early retirement in 1997. John Price, a UBC graduate who studied the labour movement in post-war Japan, replaced her.

The department also moved into Middle Eastern studies. Andrew Rippin joined the department in 2000 but his duties as Dean of the Faculty of Humanities gave him little time for undergraduate teaching. Fortunately, Martin Bunton, an Oxford D.Phil. in Middle Eastern studies, lived in Victoria and for several years taught courses on the Middle East. In 2003 when the department was able to hire a full-time historian of the Middle East, he won the competition.

Both the British and European sections enjoyed renewal as faculty members retired and increased enrollment made new appointments necessary. In the spring of 1988, Charlotte Girard retired. Her replacement, Rob Alexander, a native of Ontario, had recently completed doctoral studies at Cambridge. His lecture to a class demonstrated his talent for teaching and he soon showed that he was also a fine scholar. After Jackman celebrated his 65th birthday in 1990, the British section had a major renewal when Mariel Grant, a graduate of Trent University and Oxford, and a specialist in 19th and 20th century British history, replaced him and also filled a long-standing gap in 20th century British history.

Courses in 20th century Europe are always popular. After several leaves of absence, David Stafford resigned. Thomas Saunders, a graduate of the University of Toronto and historian of Germany, replaced him in 1986. To prepare for the doctoral programme, in 1991 the department hired Perry Biddiscombe, a New Brunswick native and graduate of the University of London, who focuses on Germany and points east.

In the meantime, the department replaced George Shelton, who had taken early retirement, with a medieval specialist. Elizabeth Ewan, who worked in Scottish medieval history, joined the department but three years later she went to the University of Guelph, the place in Canada to do Scottish studies.
Meanwhile, Scotland was not forgotten because Paul Wood, a specialist in the Scottish enlightenment and graduate of the University of Leeds, came in the fall of 1991. In 2006, a bequest to the university led to his appointment as Faculty Fellow in Scottish Studies which allowed him to teach a new course on the Scottish Enlightenment. As for medieval history, in September 1989 Tim Haskett and Michèle Mulcahey, who shared the position, replaced Ewan. After Mulcahey left in 2000, Haskett, a graduate of the University of Toronto, became the full-time medievalist and continued his association with the Medieval Studies Program. In these years too, the department added to its complement by working with other departments and centres and, as discussed in Chapter 8, several members came via this route.

While the department welcomed many new initiatives on campus, in 1980 it voted 11 to 1 against plans to establish a faculty of engineering partly to protest the administration’s failure to consult the faculty. Seeing an opportunity, however, it applied for a Lansdowne Chair in Science and Technology. Funds secured from the sale of the former Lansdowne campus to Camosun College supported these chairs. The application succeeded, the department drew up courses on the History of Science, and Morris Berman arrived in September 1982. Berman had a fine publications record but was more interested in the philosophy of science than in the nuts and bolts of technology. Preferring writing to teaching, he resigned in 1987. In 1989, the department secured another Lansdowne Chair, David Wooton, who also directed a new Humanities Centre. He soon returned to England. The Faculty of Humanities chose not to replace the Lansdowne chair but to use the funds to bring in more visiting speakers.

Whereas the department expanded in the early 1990s, in the late 1990s restraint was in effect. After Bob McCue, who taught popular courses in Renaissance and Reformation, retired in 1997, the department did not have a specialist in Early Modern Europe. Ian MacPherson, as Dean of Humanities, was sympathetic but a tight budget meant he could only offer a shared appointment whereby the appointee would teach part time in History and part-time in another department such as English. This did not appeal to the historians and an appointment in Early Modern Europe remained high on the "wish list." The external review in the fall of 1999 agreed; so too did the administration.

Over the next decade, the department made up for lost time and developed a strong nucleus of Early Modern European scholars. The first to come was Sara Beam, a graduate of McGill and the University of California, Berkeley, who arrived in January 2002. Mitchell Lewis Hammond, a graduate of the University of Virginia with broad interests in Renaissance culture and in medical history, briefly taught as a sessional lecturer. The popularity of his courses on Europeans and Aboriginal Peoples of the Americas and on Health and Epidemics allowed the department to convert his position to a regular part-time one. The arrival of Jill Walshaw, who holds a D.Phil. from the University of York in England and has a special interest in popular political culture and peasants in early modern France, enhanced the department’s strength in the area.

Although their main foci are slightly later chronologically, two other appointees have specialities that overlap with Early Modern Europe. Among those responding to the advertisement for an 18th century British historian to replace John Money were Andrea McKenzie and Simon Devereaux who, after graduating from the University of Toronto, were teaching in Australia. Both were hired as part-timers on the understanding that both positions would become full-time in a few years. Devereaux’s speciality is criminal administration, politics and culture in 18th- and 19th-century (Hanoverian) England while McKenzie focuses on religion, print culture and execution in the 17th and 18th centuries.

After the early retirement of Ted Wooley because of health problems, the American history section experienced considerable turnover. His immediate replacement, Andrew Preston, a Canadian, was soon called back to Cambridge where he had done his doctorate. He resigned late in the year so Jason Colby, a graduate of Cornell University who studies American expansionism in Latin America and the Caribbean, only arrived in September 2007. The American section underwent another change when Brian Dippie retired in 2009. Dippie’s successor, Rachel Cleves, a graduate of Berkeley, works mainly on the years before 1850 with special interests in gender, sexuality, and violence.
The area to experience the largest change in personnel between 2005 and 2010 was Canadian. Ian MacPherson, Patricia Roy, and Phyllis Senese retired in 2005 and Peter Baskerville in 2008. While most of their courses were retained, their successors' interests complemented existing areas of specialization and opened new ones. In the fall of 2005, Penny Bryden, Richard Rajala, and Jordan Stanger-Ross became members of the department. Bryden, a graduate of York University and a political and constitutional historian, taught at Mount Allison University before coming to UVic. After receiving a BA and MA from UVic, Rick Rajala did a doctorate at York University. For several years he taught sessionally and wrote extensively on the British Columbia forest industry and the environment Stanger-Ross, who also teaches American history, moved from undergraduate studies at McGill to the University of Pennsylvania for his doctorate. His interests are in ethnic and urban histories. The fourth addition to the Canadian contingent, Peter Cook, a McGill graduate, filled Baskerville’s pre-Confederation slot. Cook’s interests, especially in indigenous-settler relations in the 16th to 18th centuries, add to the department’s strength in First Nations studies.

The external evaluation of 2008 endorsed the department’s boast of an “enviable record” for “teaching effectiveness.” Teaching effectiveness has always been a concern in hiring faculty, giving them tenure, and promoting them. To evaluate current faculty the department tends to rely on classroom visits by one or two senior members, usually the chair and someone in the field, who sit as inconspicuously as possible, observe the class, and report to the ARPT committee. Through questionnaires some historians asked students about the course and their effectiveness but there was no uniformity in the questions or in their use. The department rejected a compulsory questionnaire but sought to devise a voluntary one. Work on it began in 1987, was distracted by a questionnaire proposed by the dean’s office, and was finally completed in 1993 when the department created its own compulsory questionnaire that allowed faculty to add their own questions and students to write anonymous comments. As the university became more concerned about teaching it introduced a campus-wide “course experience survey” in 2009 that replaced the department’s questionnaire. The framework agreement that replaced the tenure document had already required all faculty to prepare a dossier outlining their philosophy of teaching and including course outlines and other relevant material.

UVic’s physical plant has helped improve student satisfaction. The campus has relatively few classrooms that hold hundreds of students but many that hold fifty or sixty. Classes of modest size increase the odds of students being able to interact with their classmates and instructors and of receiving some individual attention. When large sections exist, tutorial classes usually accompany them.

Although most classes were of manageable size, when faculty members were expected to teach three courses each term and take on honours and graduate supervisions as extras some individuals had heavy loads. In 1974, the department commended R.H. Roy’s observation that the historians bore “a disproportionate teaching load in the university.” If the department did not get additional faculty, he
suggested it limit enrolment. It did not but tried to keep classes at a reasonable size by such means as setting a maximum of 45 students in each section of the Canadian survey (which attracted over 500 students in total).

At UBC and SFU the normal teaching load was three classes in one term and two in the other (the 7.5 unit load). In 1993-94, by slightly raising maximum class sizes, UVic adopted this formula for a five course load without reducing the number of students taught. Given increasing demands for research, external reviewers in 2008 recommended a four course load. The student-faculty ratio in History was 35% above the level for the Humanities and 5% above the university-wide ratio.\(^4\) Effective in 2012, the administration, to encourage research, allowed the department to adopt this schedule if it can maintain enrollments.

The department was built around tenured or tenure-track faculty but has relied on sessional lecturers to help with multi-section introductory courses, replace faculty on leave, or fill in gaps. For many years most sessionals were appointed to full-time positions for a limited time of one or two years. Most were good teachers; some were excellent. In 1996, the university announced that long-term sessional lecturers should be considered for longer-term renewable appointments as senior instructors who would receive greater security, a better salary, and benefits. They would do more teaching than tenure-track or tenured faculty but would not be expected to do research. John Duder, a part-time lecturer, had taught 129 units over 17 years -- over twice as many units as required for conversion to senior instructor. The department was keen to retain Duder, a popular lecturer with a fine sense of humour, who could teach most British and European courses as well as courses on Africa. Despite fears of creating a two-tier system of faculty, the Department appointed him as a half-time senior instructor.

After establishing a doctoral program, the Department needed to find teaching positions to give its advanced students experience and an income. In most cases, they were hired as part-timers while working on their dissertations. The department had also relied on its own graduates, post-doctoral fellows, other recent graduates, and retirees from elsewhere such as Gordon Martel and Stuart Robson, who taught the ever popular courses in twentieth century Europe, especially relating to military matters, and Timothy Travers who introduced a course on piracy.

Whereas in 1999, the department boasted that it had not been forced to use “legions of sessionals,” statistics belied that. In 2003, sessionals taught 42% of all registrants in History courses. That was a high point but over the next few years, the percentage was usually in the high thirties. The number of sessionals created problems in finding office space and raised matters of equity as the poorly paid sessionals had few benefits. In 2000, sessional lecturers across the campus formed a local of the Canadian Union of Public Employees. They negotiated an arrangement whereby after teaching a certain number of units they would become “continuing sessionals” who would be guaranteed a certain number of courses each year. This gave them some job security but, unfortunately, not higher pay.

**Current Continuing Sessionals:**

![David Dolf](image1)

![Norm Fennema](image2)

![Matthew Koch](image3)

![Christian Lieb](image4)

![Kristin Semmens](image5)

![Georgia Sitara](image6)

![Andrew Wender](image7)

When the question of fairness for sessionals arose in 2005, the department referred the matter to its Equity Committee which it had created in 1995, five years after declaring its desire to increase the proportion of female faculty members and to be sensitive to career patterns that were influenced by family responsibilities. Once drawn up, the Vice-President Academic approved the department's Equity Plan which received a number of compliments. While concern for the proportion of women remained a major thrust, it was extended to cover others, especially First Nations, what were then known as “visible minorities,” and the physically challenged. A federal government initiative on equity led to a discussion of racism but to no consensus about the extent of its presence on campus.
As far as the employment of women was concerned – a matter that extended beyond the academy -- the department met its short term goals. Between 1989 and 1995, it appointed five women to tenure track positions: Mariel Grant, Lynne Marks, Elizabeth Vibert, Michèle Mulchahey, and Wendy Wickwire, although the latter two were part-timers. Overall, UVic ranked fourth among 39 Canadian history departments in the proportion of female faculty members. Since 1995 three women retired and one left but the department hired six others in tenure-track positions.

External reviewers in 1999 found no complaints about equity among women and First Nations although it suggested the Department should seek to hire more women. In 2003, when the President’s office inquired about the status of equity, the department reported that it wanted to hire more women but none had applied for the positions in Chinese and Middle Eastern History and the few who applied for an American position might not have met immigration requirements. Nevertheless, the department reported at least one woman served on all major committees, that it arranged for reduced loads or leaves because of family responsibilities, had a good gender balance in Graduate Studies, and had expanded the curriculum to include World History, the Middle East, a course on racism and antisemitism, and the Sto:lo field school. The department accommodates students with disabilities but observed the lack of accessible washrooms on the second floor of the Clearihue Building. Despite the worries of some faculty members that equity could drive the curriculum, the department considers diversity in creating hiring short lists “where reasonable.”

Members of the department did not always agree on the need for formal equity policies or almost anything else but are proud of their ability to agree to disagree and get on with their primary jobs of teaching and research. When the faculty had a retreat late in 2007 to prepare for an external review, they listed “collegiality” as a strength. The reviewers who came in 2008 found the department “stunningly congenial” with no evidence of a “chilly climate” but puzzled the department by hinting that the esprit de corps resulted in a reluctance to make difficult decisions, especially about equity.

As always, the primary considerations in hiring new faculty were their ability to teach and their scholarship. Most new appointees were relatively young but, given the scholarly accomplishments expected, young was a relative term and most newcomers hired in the 1980s and beyond were in their thirties. It was so unusual to have all of the candidates on a short list in their twenties, that when the ARPT reported the names of the short-listed candidates in the competition for a 20th century British historian, won by Mariel Grant, the minutes included their ages. Attesting to the fact that few faculty were hired in their twenties, in 2004, when Andrew Preston had a birthday, the secretaries provided a cake because they couldn’t remember the last time anyone in the department had celebrated a 30th birthday! Such occasions, of course, contributed to the department’s collegiality and to its appreciation of the staff.
Chapter V

The Office: The Staff and Technology

By the early 21st century, the Department had a national reputation for the work of some of its members in computer-based projects and their "striking intellectual entrepreneurship." Technology had come a long way. In 1963, the computer tended to be used only for scientific research and the huge mainframe required a specially built room. History secretaries and faculty dealt with a series of new technologies that did not always save labour but ultimately changed their work.

For students in the 1960s, the introduction to UVic was lining up in September outside the "Old Gym," a relic of Gordon Head's days as a military base. Registration was first come, first served, so students wanting a place in a popular course or at a certain time lined up overnight. Inside, each department had a table staffed by several faculty members and perhaps a student assistant. Each registrant had a copy of the master schedule and a blank timetable. At the department table students indicated the desired course and section. The faculty counselled against registering in advanced courses without background or suggested that students specializing in Canadian history, for example, might include some American or British history in their programme. To even out the numbers in multi-sectioned courses, the faculty gave pep talks on sections or courses that were not filling and discouraged students from popular ones. Once students chose courses and sections they were given a clip board with a lined sheet of paper and numbers up to the capacity of the class. On it, they printed their names. Under the top sheet was carbon paper and a second sheet. The carbon copies served as class lists until clerks in the Registrar's office alphabetized them and produced a typed copy. Students were discouraged from adding or dropping courses but they did. For several weeks instructors did not know who was in the class. Roll calls were not practical in larger classes.

A few years later, students lined up in the gym but approached the department desk with a personalized punch card. After they selected courses and sections, the person at the desk gave them a punch card keyed to show the name of the course and the section number. As they left the gym, the students handed in the cards. The mainframe computer then produced printed alphabetized class lists. Students who did not check to ensure that they were registered in the proper courses might fail a first term course because they thought they had registered for the second term.

As technology improved, students no longer had to line up. Beginning in the summer of 1988, at scheduled times which gave priority to senior students and to those with high marks, they could register by telephone. In its first year Telereg so overloaded the 721 exchange that calling in was impossible. In 2008, the new Banner system supposedly simplified registration. Alas, it did not recognize full year courses, of which History has many, and had difficulty with wait lists. The staff rescued confused students and faculty.

One procedure has not changed although its medium has. At the first class students receive a hand-out with the course outline, lists of required texts, and instructions about assignments. In the early years, in large classes, mimeographed hand-outs were carefully typed in the History Office. The master was made by removing the ribbon from the typewriter and cutting the image on to a special kind of flimsy paper. Because the paper was cut, correcting an error was difficult. Moreover, the stencils had to be sent to a central office for duplication where a machine applied ink to the cut-out areas. A mimeograph stencil could yield several hundred clear copies and, if carefully handled, could be used again. Wrinkles produced random lines that were a problem if, for example, a map was involved. This cheap way of producing multiple copies was still being used in the mid-1970s.

For smaller classes hand-outs were produced by a ditto machine. This involved typing on a two-part form. The top sheet was solidly backed with ink, usually purple; the second sheet was protection. Faculty who could type, particularly those who prepared hand-outs at the last minute, made the ditto
masters themselves. Making corrections was messy. The error had to be scraped off the back of the sheet with a razor blade and then a piece of the inked paper, usually cut from the margins, inserted and the correction made. Even the most careful stained their fingers purple; the office had a jar of special hand cleaner. Once the typing was complete the stencil was run through a machine which used alcohol to transfer the ink to the page. A stencil could produce about fifty clear copies. Relatively cheap and easy to operate, the ditto machine was in use until at least 1985 when concerns were expressed about the health hazards of the odors it produced.

Although Xeroxing had been invented and the university had at least one machine by 1970, they were large and expensive. Less bulky and expensive photocopiers worked by a heat process. In the fall of 1968, R.H. Roy, who had grants for various projects, described the “photocopying machine” about to be placed in his secretary’s office. A bit later the department acquired a primitive photocopier which caused a lot of grief. The minutes in January 1970 record: “The behaviour of the ‘Machine’ has improved.” The copies, produced on special paper, were of poor quality, were not permanent, and the paper was expensive. Faculty members were reminded that it was “draining the supplies budget” and should be used only for department memos and course work when fewer than fifteen copies were required. For research, faculty were told to seek grants to cover photocopying costs. However, the Toshibafax photocopier could transfer material photographically to a ditto stencil. If they needed high quality reproductions, the department’s secretary loaned faculty members a key to a Xerox machine that served a number of departments but the cost was approximately 8 cents per page. Several years passed before the department got its own dry photocopier. As costs for photocopying fell, the mimeograph and ditto machines became relics. Heavy usage and the desire to take advantage of improved features meant that photocopiers had to be replaced every few years. By 2009, the photocopier included a scanner that lets users scan material and send it to their own computers.

Mrs. Jean Reid, the department’s first secretary and for several years its only one, used an IBM Selectric typewriter to type stencils and department minutes and correspondence. Unlike the old manual typewriters which had only fonts of either 10 or 12 spaces per inch, the Selectric had interchangeable balls, about the size of a golf ball, which allowed the typist to change fonts and their sizes. It also had a dual ribbon. One, on a single use film-like material, provided a clear black imprint; the second, a white correction tape, allowed the typist to cover up mistakes and type over them. Several additional copies could be made on thinner paper with carbon paper. Some faculty members had typewriters in their offices but they were usually of the manual variety. In 1973 the department acquired three used electric typewriters, an automatic electric collator, and an electric stapler. These typewriters were probably assigned to the general office as the department often had several part-time secretaries. Faculty who used the secretary’s electric typewriters after hours created a problem much to the consternation of the secretaries who often found that margins and tabs had been changed. To solve the problem, one machine was set aside for faculty who were told not to use any other one.

While instructors preferred to read typewritten student essays, they had to accept handwritten ones but could refuse to read them if they were not legible. In the case of the final copies of graduating essays and theses, students usually hired a typist who charged a set fee per page to produce the final version. Additional copies were produced with carbon paper. If the thesis required major revisions, some or all of it had to be re-typed. Examining committees tended to ignore minor errors since the library, the custodian of theses, would not accept theses that had been corrected with pen and ink.

To assist in faculty research by 1973 the department had a microfilm reader-printer but it was little used so it was suggested that it be exchanged for other more needed equipment. Fortunately, that was not done. As department members became more focussed on research and the number of graduate students increased, so too did demand on the machine. Because of extensive use, it has had to be repaired or replaced on several occasions.

The University has had a reputation as a good place to work. Given their respect for the support staff, the department decided in 1994 that a member of the staff should be on the chair search committee. The external reviewers in 1999 remarked on the mutual respect among faculty, staff, and students and particularly the “impressive open and friendly character of the Department’s support staff.” When that was reported at a department meeting, the response was “Hear, hear.”
Many secretaries and receptionists have served the department over the years. Like Mrs. Reid, the original secretary, many of them retired. Among them were Mary Adamson, who became the chair's secretary after working for R.H. Roy, Karen Mclvor, and part-timers such as Joan Whitfield, and Gloria Orr. Others, like Elaine Daniels, Shelley Henuset, Alice Lee, Kathie Merriam, and Judy Nixon, moved to more senior positions within the university. A few left for personal reasons.

The department has been so blessed with an excellent support staff that the exceptions are unusual. One receptionist/typist did not pass probation for spending more time organizing her artistic career than on departmental business. Another, who left of her own accord, was not popular with junior colleagues, then the overwhelming majority in the department, as she seemed willing only to work with the chair, her primary responsibility, and the two full professors. By then, a receptionist/typist was looking after the outer office and the secretarial needs of the faculty. Access to the office became an issue. Deciding that by gathering and chatting around the mail boxes the faculty distracted the receptionist/typist, the secretary decreed that the receptionist/typist would deliver mail and messages to faculty offices twice a day. Since not every office had a telephone and there was no voice mail, faculty might not receive urgent messages for several hours. Fortunately, the secretary seemed bored and found another job. Her assistant left shortly after. Much to the disdain of successive staff in the outer office, the faculty returned to treating the mail boxes as a gathering point and had to be reminded that the secretaries “would appreciate as little traffic as possible in the desk area.”

By 1976, the size of the staff had grown along with the number of students and faculty and a distinction was made among their duties. A memo advised department members that Mary Adamson was the chair’s secretary and that faculty should take their tasks to June Belton (later Bull) who was generally responsible for “the clerical needs of faculty members: correspondence, preparation of stencils, typing of examinations and manuscripts and other similar duties. She is also in charge of telephone, mail, audio-visual material, and routine stationery supplies.” Dinah Dickie looked after correspondence and other duties relating to Honours and Graduate students and was private secretary to Toby Jackman who preferred to dictate letters rather than submitting written drafts. The D.N.D. grant provided R.H. Roy with Gloria Orr as a part-time secretary who, when not occupied with his work, helped the other secretaries.

Several long-time secretaries -- “June” and the “Karens,” as they were known to everyone -- deserve special mention. When she moved to the Centre for Studies in Religion and Society in 1996, June Bull had served the department for 21 years as senior secretary in the outer office and for several years, the chair’s secretary. During her time, the department experienced great technological changes from typewriter, to “the machine,” and finally to individual computers at each secretary’s desk. Karen Mclvor, who succeeded June as the chair’s secretary in 1988, presided over major renovations in 2005 which meant a temporary move to the ground floor. Noted for her friendliness and her skill in counselling
students, she won the University’s Distinguished Service Award in 2002. Among her many contributions to the university was initiating what became an annual competition among departments to collect the most pennies for the United Way. While she retired, Karen Hickton, who had joined the department in 1995 as a general secretary in the outer office and had been promoted to graduate secretary, replaced her as the chair’s secretary. Heather Waterlander took over the duties of dealing with graduate students and their supervisors.

By then, the office staff had greatly expanded with Leslie Laird as part-time administrative officer. Theresa Gallant, who had been part-time secretary-receptionist, took over when Leslie Laird retired. Andrea Feary then joined the department on the front desk, the place that people first visit when they come on departmental business or to ask questions such as “Where is A wing?” Throughout these changes, the one constant since 2004 has been Eileen Zapshala who, though her main responsibility is dealing with matters affecting undergraduates such as explaining complicated registration procedures, has always cheerfully and graciously volunteered to help students, staff, and faculty.

When June Bull arrived she impressed faculty with her fast and accurate typing and her willingness to tackle the transcription of their manuscripts from hen scratches to typescripts. At the time of his retirement, Angus McLaren recalled that if June didn’t type the draft of his first book, she “certainly expertly typed subsequent manuscripts.” The typewriter, however, was soon obsolete. In September 1972 Jim Hendrickson asked “if anyone in the department was interested in using the computer.” This was presumably the university’s mainframe but it is unlikely that anyone was interested or wanted to learn the necessary mathematics. A decade later, however, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences proposed to provide five or six micro-computers to be used as word processors by the Humanities. Chad Gaffield was justifiably concerned that the people investigating them had little knowledge of computers. He taught a course on Computing for the Historian in which students learned statistical methods and did projects in which holes were punched in special cards that were put through the mainframe computer that spewed out pages of data for analysis. Since some faculty members would likely secure their own micro-computers (later known as PCs) he advised that the machine should be compatible with them. The committee recommended that the department have its own printer. Not everyone was enthusiastic about the new technology because they feared that the administration would soon use the machine’s increased productivity as an excuse to reduce the secretarial staff. The answer was that once they mastered the machine the secretaries would take on work that was not then being done. Only in the short run were the doomsayers right.

The “Alphaplus” word processor arrived in September 1983. It was a monster that looked somewhat like an individual study carrel. The operator sat under a sort of hood with a keyboard on a shelf at waist level and a screen ahead at eye level. The software was complex and the operator had to memorize many commands. Data was stored on the mainframe and on large floppy disks which could hold little more than an article of average length. June enthusiastically mastered the commands but some of her colleagues were less enthusiastic. Each secretary had a time slot during the day to use it. Faculty were instructed that it was “necessary that the person on the word processor not be disturbed” but, if they took some training, faculty could use it after hours and on Friday afternoons. Few did. Moreover, because of the changes the MACHINE wrought, instead of giving verbal instructions to the secretaries, faculty had to fill out a form with details of their typing requests.
Because the word processor meant that minor changes in a manuscript did not require the complete retyping of a page or more, faculty tended to have the secretaries process early drafts of manuscripts. The author then made changes with pen or pencil and had another draft produced. Because of budget cuts in 1984, however, the number of hours of secretarial time was reduced. Consequently, the chair informed the faculty that correspondence and course work had priority and they should neither expect prompt typing of manuscripts nor make more than one or two revisions to them. Despite one faculty member calling the word processor a health hazard, the faculty favoured enhancing it with updates, another terminal, and another printer. Jim Hendrickson, an early user of computers, urged help for graduate students to learn about word processors.

The “machine” remained in operation until September 1989 to allow for the completion of existing work and the transfer of material to a new system of microcomputers. In reporting this, Karen McIvor explained that the department had about $13,000 for computer equipment that would be wholly or partially replaced in three years. This was good news but faculty members asked for software to give PC users access to the laser printers centrally located in Computing Services. Following the precedent of the electric typewriter, a computer in the general office was designated for faculty use. So popular was it that by 2000, more than 20,000 problem files had to be removed.

As computers became more user-friendly most members of the department acquired one and typed their own manuscripts and handouts for students which could then be easily and economically photocopied. Most computers were attached to dot matrix printers which used paper with perforated margins. Technology, however, was changing quickly and it was noted that laser printing could cost less than the 6 cents a page for photocopying.

By the time most historians acquired their own computers (often with research grants) software was more user-friendly. Yet, using one required some basic instruction. Peter Baskerville, who later became a leading practitioner of quantitative history, was not one of the first users but eventually secured one. One day his desk top computer, keyboard, and monitor arrived. Carefully, he removed them from their boxes and neatly stacked the packing material and smaller boxes in the large one and put it outside his office for disposal. After putting the various cords and cables in the appropriate slots, he sat down and touched the keyboard. Nothing happened. He tried different keys. Again, nothing. Finally, he asked a secretary for assistance. Pointing to a switch on the machine’s side, she gently suggested that he turn it to “on”. He did so and a new career was launched.

Contrary to the fear that the computer would replace secretaries, it simply changed the nature of their work. Instead of copy typing, they took on increasing administrative responsibilities such as collating course evaluations, organizing meetings and conferences, designing posters and brochures, and, of course, advising students. Recognizing this changed role, they now have the more appropriate title of administrative assistants. Although it was first mentioned in 1973, it was not until 2004 that the department acquired an administrative officer with the appointment of Leslie Laird to a half-time position to assist the chair with such tasks as preparing the time-table, evaluating transfer credits, and arranging the selection of students for scholarships and prizes. Theresa Gallant, her successor, also has responsibilities for recruiting students.
While staff and faculty began to use the computer, some recognized that students should have an opportunity to exploit its abilities to analyse quantitative material. After Gaffield left, Eric Sager proposed a course on Quantitative Methods which would require computer time. When he sought departmental approval for History 482 “Historians and the Computer,” only Toby Jackman opposed it for reasons that are not recorded. The course was offered regularly but the external review in 1999 suggested that the department should provide more instruction on the use of the computer and other high-tech equipment.

The university’s administration was interested in computers and in the spring of 1986 circulated a questionnaire about the “possible use” of computers for students and faculty. Sam Scully, the Dean of Arts and Science, was keen to see departments use the computer as much as possible, including students using word processors to write essays and theses. One member of the Department looked forward to using the computer to check students’ factual knowledge. When the department learned of a plan to create a Humanities Learning Resource Centre using CD-ROM and the internet, some colleagues suspected an excuse to increase class sizes. Twenty-one years later, Mitchell Lewis Hammond introduced the first History course that is taught completely on line. The subject, epidemic disease, draws both History students and students in other faculties who are interested in health.

Increasingly, the computer became a research tool. Early in the 1980s, for example, Peter Baskerville and Chad Gaffield undertook to create a machine-readable online inventory of archival records held on Vancouver Island. Yet a decade later Baskerville, then the department’s chair, complained the department lacked a computer consultant, a computing lab, and instructional software. Penelope Codding, a scientist and a new vice-president academic, visited the department in November 1996 and asked about the use of technology for historians. One senior colleague said that a search of the internet two years earlier for information about Isaac Newton had only yielded a few book titles but junior scholars disagreed. They were concerned about student access to the internet since not all students had their own computers and, in any case, only had 15 minutes a day of free access.

The university did provide students and faculty with e-mail access. Possibly the first historian to use e-mail was Ken Coates who corresponded with his co-author Bill Morrison at Brandon University. Gradually, others adopted e-mail. One who said he did not want it secretly used it at home. The department’s phone list of faculty and staff added e-mail addresses in 1997. All but a handful of the faculty had addresses though not all had their own computers. This changed. In 2000, Eric Sager, the chair, used e-mail to distribute memos and agendas and minutes of meetings. In the summer of 2009 the department surveyed opinions about priorities by e-mail.
In preparing for the 1999 external review, the department admitted that generally it had good office equipment but would like more computers for graduate students, technical support for the course on using the computer, and experiments with computer assisted learning. The background paper noted that Baskerville and Sager were the lead investigators in the Canadian Families Project which had a five year $672,000 grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. This project, which included several other members of the department, analysed a 5% sample of the 1901 Canadian Census to explore the nature of Canadian families and created a data base. It was the precursor of a larger initiative, the Canadian Century Research Infrastructure Project in which Baskerville and Sager represented the University of Victoria in a five university consortium that links data from 1911 to 1951 with earlier and later censuses to create a data base that is a “new foundation for the study of social, economic, cultural, and political change” in Canada. It is not just the Canadian historians who are enhancing their research and contributing to knowledge through the use of the computer. Simon Devereaux, for example, is preparing a data base of the approximately 10,000 individuals who were sentenced to death at the Old Bailey in London, England between 1689 and 1837 while Mitch Lewis Hammond is analysing the medical histories of over a thousand poor people in a sixteenth century German town.

Another high profile use of the computer and collaborative research is the Great Canadian Mysteries Project. In 1997 John Lutz in co-operation with researchers from two other universities launched a project that has won many prizes including the MERLOT award for the best history educational resource on the internet and the Pierre Berton Award of the National History Society for the dissemination of Canadian History. Funded by a variety of sources including Heritage Canada, it has produced a dozen web-based mysteries and thirty smaller “quests” designed to be solved by students in elementary, secondary, and introductory level university courses. A selection of documents and secondary sources and a teacher’s guide accompany each mystery. Playing detective is an appealing way of learning historical methods and challenging the intellect.

The department also produces its own web page with basic information about the department, its courses, its faculty, and resources including links to archives, museums, databases, and bibliographic tools. In one month in 1999, it recorded 500 such users. Once, it inadvertently included a link to a site that sold essays! In addition, often with the help of work-study students, some faculty created their own web pages with material for students including links to on-line journal articles and discussion forums. When enrolments declined, the university redesigned its website to focus on recruiting students. The department followed.

The department’s website also hosts “Victoria’s Victoria,” a website created by students in Lutz’s local history course in which each student or team of students creates a vignette illustrating an aspect of the history of Victoria. Other department-based or assisted digital enterprises with links on the web page include VIhistory, the E. Herbert Norman Archives, and the digitized version of the Victoria Daily Colonist from its beginning in 1858 to 1910. Digitization has also made the colonial despatches accessible to the public. When Jim Hendrickson undertook his project in the 1970s and 1980s, the transcripts had to be stored on the mainframe and were not generally accessible. Many years later, at the initiative of Lutz with the technical assistance of the university’s computer specialists and the co-operation of the Library, the material was digitized and is gradually being posted on the web.
The computer went to the classroom as PowerPoint gradually replaced older technologies. When the department came into being, the main audio-visual aids were chalk and blackboards and wall maps which often disappeared from classrooms. In 1972, the department's Audio-Visual Committee sought advice about acquiring slide and overhead projectors. Slide projectors were useful in presenting images such as photographs, charts, and cartoons and the department acquired some packaged slide sets but making original slides could only be economically done in units of 24 or 36, the number of images on a standard roll of film. Moreover, processing could take several weeks. Although the department acquired several slide projectors, instructors had to book them in advance and transport these heavy machines to the classroom. Film projectors could be borrowed from a central office on the campus which delivered them to classrooms. At times funds were available to hire students to operate them. When VCRs and cassettes became available, the department acquired a VCR. On one occasion, an instructor who had back-to-back classes set up the VCR in advance so he could show an appropriate film to the second class. While he was teaching the first class, a colleague replaced the cassette with a Star Wars film much to the delight of the students and the consternation of the instructor.

Initially, the department made little use of overhead projectors but newer photocopiers made it possible to transfer an image to a transparency in seconds. Gradually, the university installed overhead projectors in most classrooms. In 2001 it began offering short courses on using the computer in the classroom and PowerPoint became the preferred method of showing illustrations particularly since it permitted showing moving images that incorporated sound. Until it acquired its own projector in 2003 the department had to share one video data projector with other users of the Clearihue building. At that time, David Zimmerman suggested PowerPoint was easy to use although faculty must take special care of the machine as it was expensive and attractive to thieves. Not everyone thought using PowerPoint was easy but like most technologies it was simplified and projectors appeared in every classroom. After the campus became wireless, PowerPoint allowed instructors to draw on the internet in class. Wireless technology has a downside; during class, uninterested students can exchange messages with friends, watch movies, play games, or read material other than that prescribed for the course. Such options replaced letter writing, pencil and paper games, and newspapers, the diversions of earlier generations.

While staff and technology changed over time, so too did the physical office space. Within weeks of moving into the Cornett Building in 1966, the department complained of a shortage of space. By 1974, the faculty complement had almost doubled in size and there was a glimmer of hope for easing the problem when the Dean of Arts and Sciences announced that a wing for the Humanities was to be added to the Clearihue Building which then only housed classrooms and the university's heating plant. The department was unsure about the Clearihue. Some liked the idea of being close to other departments in the Humanities, notably English, others wanted to stay with the Social Sciences, and still others were concerned about the quality of the new building. A motion expressing the Department's “grave doubts” about the new building and its desire to stay in the Cornett Building passed with 7 in favour, 6 abstaining, and one opposed. When asked to express their opinions on options, the department split exactly three ways with four votes for each option: moving into the first Humanities phase, not accepting the move, and abstaining. The chair correctly surmised that this gave him freedom of action in jockeying with other departments for space but agreed that the department must be on the users' committee.
In September 1975, the department learned that it was scheduled to move into Phase 4 in 1977-78. By February 1979 construction was well underway. Expecting a summertime move, the department met to assign offices. John Money, as chair, knew that unilaterally assigning offices would likely please no one. Wisely, after distributing the floor plans for the 19 available offices to the 18 regular faculty members, he had them draw numbers from 1 to 19 from a box. Drawing #1 gave first choice and so on. In the meantime, department members studied the floor plan and ascertained that some offices are marginally wider than others and that the way the door opens can affect the amount of useful space. Others worried about the afternoon sun or lack of it. As well, some of the polarization survived and the Canadian historians tended to stick together. The draw was held and by incredible good luck (or great sleight of hand by Money) Toby Jackman and R.H. Roy, the most senior members of the department who expected seniority to give them early choices, drew numbers 1 and 2. Once they chose their offices, the Canadians tended to gravitate towards the end of the hall where R.H. Roy had his office. The only unclaimed office, next to the ladies’ washroom, was assigned to Chad Gaffield who did not arrive until the summer. Vestiges of the settlement pattern survive.

In September 1979 the department was in new quarters. Though larger, the new general office was soon crowded. The chair’s office was only large enough for small committee meetings; his secretary’s office was tiny. Next to the general office was a seminar/reading room for students. Across the hall from the secretary’s office was a small lounge which could be used for committee meetings or as a coffee room but was little used for the latter purpose. The acquisition of the word processor and photocopier made the general office even more crowded and people complained of the odors emanating from the photocopier. Thus, the chair moved his office across the hall to the lounge, his secretary took over his office, and the photocopier was moved into what had been her office. This was not very efficient. In 2005, the office staff moved to temporary quarters elsewhere before moving back to a completely renovated office suite that included small rooms off the Reading Room for the faculty computers and microfilm printer-reader.

The departure of Computer Science, which had shared the second floor of B-wing of Clearihue, to a new building created more office space. At the beginning of the 2002-03 term, the department had 25 full-time faculty plus 13 or 14 sessional lecturers or advanced graduate students who were teaching undergraduate courses but had only 28 offices in Clearihue. When Mathematics left the building, space was shuffled and some historians, mostly sessional lecturers, graduate students, and individuals with joint appointments with other departments found themselves on the third floor. Fortunately, the office staff kept the faculty in good cheer and well-informed and extended their friendly smiles to the students, the raison d’être of the History department.
Chapter VI

Undergraduates – The Raison d’être of the Department

The department’s basic goal has always “been to describe and interpret the histories of our own and other societies; to help students appreciate the importance of historical context in understanding human behavior, to encourage intellectual curiosity and good critical thought, and to develop skills in oral and written communication.” The 2008 evaluators commented on the department’s “enviable record in teaching effectiveness.” More significantly, students concurred. A survey of the class of 2002 found that 98% were satisfied or very satisfied with their instruction. Over fifty years, enrolment in the History department increased exponentially but a graph would not show a straight line. In a report for distribution at the Learned Societies meeting in Victoria in June 1990, Peter Baskerville, the chair, described History as “booming” in Victoria; all courses were full and had wait lists. Almost fifteen years later, Eric Sager calculated that between 1998-99 and 2004 enrolment grew more rapidly than at any time since the 1970s. By 2010, however, the department was concerned about flat or declining enrolments as the “echo” of the baby boom finished university studies and the expansion of the provincial university system and the popularity of more vocationally-focused disciplines created competition for students. When Lynne Marks became chair in 2010, she formed a Recruitment and Retention Committee to continue work initiated by Eric Sager in 2008 to develop a better liaison with local high schools. The programme included a History Fair that invited high school students to campus to hear mini-lectures. Not surprisingly, the great hit was Rachel Cleves’ lecture on sexuality. Recognizing that sex “sells,” in 2012 the department introduced a new introductory or “gateway” course on “Sex and Violence: A Social and Cultural history from Medieval Times to the Present.” John Lutz and other members of the department had already co-operated with “Ten Days that Shook the World,” which introduces students to the discipline through a study of major historical events. Other courses introduced about this time were Greg Blue’s “A Multilayered World: Global Society since 1500,” Eric Sager’s “Hockey Night in Canada: Sport and Canadian Identity” and Tim Haskett’s “The Created Medieval History of J.R. Tolkien’s Middle Earth.” While such courses are designed to attract students they also teach critical thinking and clear writing, the hallmarks of traditional history courses.

This was not the first time that the department had had to deal with declining enrolments. In the mid-1980s, the Planning Committee suggested advertising in The Martlet, and preparing an attractive brochure describing the available courses. The enrolment problem inspired “long and frank” discussions on the curriculum and plans for future appointments. In making new appointments should the department continue its traditional geographic and chronological focus or seek candidates whose interests were thematic or methodological? There was a slight precedent. Ralph Crozier’s course on “Art and Revolution” appeared under a new Calendar heading, “Comparative Studies,” in 1979. In the mid-1980s, the department added some thematic courses but students had to be educated about their value; many had low registrations. And, while giving lip service to thematic or methodological interests in advertising positions, most appointees of the next few years were typecast by geography and chronology. In any case, a return to rising enrolments removed an impetus for major change.

Poster advertising Eric Sager’s new course on Canadian Sports History
The interest in methodologies arose in part from a request from Majors students for a research methods course. Although Sager revived the course on the historian and the computer, the computer is only one of many tools in the historians’ tool box and could not alone solve the problem. Another tool is historiography which, in this context, meant historical theory. In 1995 a group of undergraduate and graduate students formed a committee to discuss the content of their respective historiography courses, History 480 and History 500. Complaining that they and non-Honours undergraduates were not being properly prepared, they called for a compulsory course at the 300 level to encourage History students “to develop philosophical and theoretical thinking skills” and to serve as a prerequisite for History 480 and 500 which could become more advanced courses. History 500 would include feminist and gender theories, race and racialization, psychohistory, post-structuralist theorization, schools of historical thought, anthropological, ethnohistorical and literary theories and methodologies. The department considered the proposal but thought a compulsory undergraduate historiography course impractical since it would have to be a seminar rather than a lecture course and the department did not have the resources to serve about a hundred students each year. External reviewers in 1999 and in 2008 also suggested an undergraduate historiography course but the department still lacked the necessary faculty resources. Eventually, at a time of declining enrolments, Jordan Stanger-Ross offered to teach such a course and History 201, “Studying the Past” came into being in 2010. It is not compulsory.

Through most of the past half century the problem was coping with growth. When it seemed acute in the late 1980s, the Planning Committee warned that limiting class sizes and reducing enrolment from about 2500 students to approximately 1600 would produce a strong reaction. Moreover, there was no way to give Majors and Honours students priority in registration. Suggested solutions included increasing class sizes and having graduate students teach courses. Although its classes on average have been larger than most in the Humanities, the department has tried to keep them at manageable sizes. The external reviewers in 2008 commented favourably on the limits in class sizes, a factor which undoubtedly contributed to a 94% satisfaction rate from students surveyed at that time.

At times, however, an influx of students created problems. In September 1990, students found long waiting lists, inadequate offerings, and insufficient classroom space. The department urged the university to admit no more students than it could place in classes. Applications for admission were rising dramatically. It was expected that in September 1992, 2,000 graduates of Camosun College would seek 800 places. When some departments proposed to admit only students with a C+ or better in introductory courses to their upper year ones, History feared becoming a “dumping ground” for weaker students. The administration, however, told departments to increase class sizes. That “broad axe,” remarked Peter Baskerville, would “cripple” departments including History. In fact, increased entrance requirements and reduced admissions to the Faculty of Education partially resolved the problem but smaller incoming classes meant smaller upper level classes in succeeding years. In the next few years lower level registration bounced back slightly before declining again.

One way in which the department has coped with fluctuations in enrolment, particularly of first year students, has been the cosmetic device of changing course numbers. The Canadian survey provides many examples. Initially known as History 102 or 130, it became History 230 in 1971 when it was heavily subscribed. Then in 1998, because of the expansion of the options by which Education students could gain “Canadian content,” enrolment in the Canadian survey dropped in 1985 from an annual average of over 500 to 391 although overall registration in the department rose. To attract more first year students, the department renumbered it as 130; ironically, before the change took effect, History 230 saw a surge in registration but the new number had already been approved. When overall enrolment began declining in 2008, the department renumbered some other 200 level courses at the 100 level. These were bookkeeping changes, not pedagogical ones. The courses and the expectations of students remained the same. With few exceptions, the 200 level courses had long been open to first year students.

Mainly to serve students who transferred from regional colleges who had only taken the equivalent of half the course, in 1995 the department divided the Canadian survey at 1867. The semesterized version has become the standard offering. The creation of one-term courses, especially at the upper level, was once controversial because some faculty believed that one term gave students insufficient time for significant research or reflection on their studies. Semesterized courses, however,
were a boon to students in the Co-operative programme. This was an idea that Howard Petch brought from the University of Waterloo when he came to Victoria in 1975. It allows students with good standing to add work terms to their programme to gain experience in a field appropriate to their area of study and provide some income. As chair of the department, John Money warned that Co-op might not be suitable for historians but could affect the department since departments such as Geography, which encouraged their students to take History electives, were actively pursuing the co-op. Since work terms could take place during the usual fall or winter terms, this could deleteriously affect registrations in History which then had few one-term courses. Despite the co-op’s success, some historians were cautious. When the matter was raised again in 1986 Phyllis Senese thought the programme narrow and wondered if there would be suitable placements for History students. She later changed her mind and for several years served as the department’s liaison with the programme. History students who have participated in co-op have worked in museums and archives, government offices, and with newspapers and magazines. These positions have sometimes led to full-time employment after graduation.

While many courses introduced in recent years are quite specialized, students majoring in History have traditionally been offered what Ian MacPherson called a smorgasbord when Richard Rajala, a graduate student, interviewed him for a student magazine. With limited restrictions, students can focus on a particular era, geographic region or theme or partake of a tasting menu. Two separate external evaluations remarked on this “rather loose undergraduate program structure” which makes courses widely available to the department’s own students and to those who choose History as an elective. Reviewers also noted the lack of pre-requisites. With limited exceptions, the department had abandoned pre-requisites in 1969. From time to time, it considered imposing them, possibly to limit the number of students in upper level courses, or adopting a more formal structure for the Majors programme but did not do so lest it lose students and flexibility. Moreover, when the registration system was first computerized, it had no provision for pre-requisites.

In 2004, with the presence of several specialists in History before 1800 the department discussed requiring Honours and Majors to include at least 1.5 units of pre-1800 courses in their programmes. Since many students already did so, the department only added a note in the calendar strongly encouraging it. This was more a practical than a pedagogical decision. The department could not ensure that spaces in these courses would be available for its students since the Registrar’s office could not give History students priority and the pre-1800 courses attracted students of literature.

In contrast to the Majors programme, the Honours programme was always quite structured with required courses on historiography/methodology and a graduating essay, including an oral defence, as the culmination of the programme. An informal survey of honours students in 1983 indicated that they liked the idea of the oral exam. The Honours Committee revisited the programme from time to time but made no major changes apart from slightly tightening the requirements for entry and graduation. Although the language requirement discouraged many excellent students, the department retained it as a special feature of the programme and preparation for graduate studies. That may explain why the external reviewers in 2008 praised it for retaining “a rigour that has been abandoned in many universities.” They called the thesis and its defence “a marvellous strike for excellence.” No doubt they would be pleased by the introduction in 2009 of a very successful special event that requires students to present the proposals for their graduating essays. This has encouraged students to start writing and gives them practice in presenting papers.

Enrolment in the Honours programme fluctuates. Sometimes it had fewer than a half dozen students. An all-time peak occurred in 2005 when nineteen students defended graduating essays as a
result of active recruiting and some flexibility in admitting students to Honours at the beginning of their fourth year. Because that number stretched the department’s resources, it had to limit enrolment and turn away some late applicants with high marks.

The Honours students were usually considered as their own constituency among the department’s students. In 1972 during the sometimes turbulent years of transition, students gained the right to be represented at department meetings, to participate in its discussions, to vote, and to serve on certain committees. As the revolutionary ethos of that era waned so too did student interest in governance. Gradually, they stopped attending meetings but in 1993 elected representatives of the Majors, Honours, and Graduate students again began to come. Believing that they had limited rights to speak and no right to vote, they asked for the franchise because, as the Honours representative wrote, “without a vote the students’ voices have either been dismissed or spoken over.” Together, the Majors, Honours, and Graduate representatives gave notice of motions to give the graduate representative a vote and a shared vote to the Honours and Majors representative at department meetings. They also asked that a student chosen by the History Course Union and the Graduate History Student Union should be an ex officio member on all department committees except Salary and ARPT and should be kept informed of the activities of the Planning, Library, and Graduate committees. The requests were redundant. Ted Wooley recalled that the department had not repealed the decision it made in 1972. By a vote of 12 to 3, the department reaffirmed this and agreed to have a student representative on all department committees, other than the ARPT, except when matters of salary, graduate admissions, scholarships, or a student’s standing were being discussed.

While the student representatives were concerned with broad policies, the department had to deal with individual students and grading policies. Whereas once a student’s final mark was based entirely, or almost entirely so, on written work, by the early 1980s, many instructors based part of the final grade on class participation. That was no problem but the faculty disagreed on a proposal that students must be informed regularly of their class participation mark. Students could inquire about their standing at any time but some professors argued that some students might not ask because they mistakenly thought they were doing well. The Majors and Honours representatives jointly asked that the minutes record their regret at the faculty’s failure to resolve the matter and its reluctance to implement guidelines which, they contended, would “lead to further confrontation in this area.”

While students participated in that debate, they do not appear to have been involved in discussions of grading policies. As early as 1986 some faculty members wondered if History’s reputation for hard marking, especially the scarcity of A+ grades, did a disservice when students competed for scholarships or admission to graduate and professional schools. An external review in 1999 cited the department’s boast that despite its stinginess with high marks students sought “rigour and challenge” as evidence of a “very successful undergraduate programme” and praised the department’s “heavy emphasis on essay writing in all classes.”

As one of his first acts as chair, Tom Saunders drew attention to the question of consistency in marking, particularly the tendency of sessional and visiting instructors in intersession and summer sessions to be more generous with marks than the regular faculty. Saunders was also concerned about the stinginess of regular faculty. History gave the fewest A+ grades in the Humanities and some good students had GPA’s too low to be admissible to its own graduate programme. On the other hand, the number of B+ and A- grades was rising, and C and C+ had almost disappeared. The department drew up a formula setting out a range of percentages of the various grades to be allotted in each class. For example, in classes of more than 25 students 10-30% of the students should receive marks in the “A” range. Curiously, there was no mention of D or failing grades.

Most students are honest but a few, often through ignorance or sloppiness, and occasionally as out-and-out cheating, plagiarize essays despite frequent warnings against such a crime. Depending on circumstances the penalty could range from a mild reprimand, a “zero” on the assignment, denial of permission to write the final exam, or possibly suspension from the university. The instructor assessed the penalty and might report the incident to the “head.” A student could appeal the penalty. These appeals revealed inconsistency in definitions of plagiarism and in penalties. In the mid-1990s and again in 2001-02 when some instructors complained of an increasing incidence of plagiarism the department
considered having an official policy. Historians do not always have good memories; the department had adopted such a policy in 1970. The university's adoption in 2009 of a policy on Academic Integrity now provides clarity and consistency.

On the whole, students are honest, co-operative, hard-working and a pleasure to teach. There are always some outstanding students; in 1984, the entire group was singled out when a number of faculty members volunteered “that the quality of students had been improving significantly in recent years and in fact students today may be the best they have ever taught.” Occasionally, students tried the patience of professors. A student with a phobia about germs jumped and moved to another seat whenever a nearby student sneezed or coughed. These disruptions went on for several days. Finally, the student ended up in the front row. The exasperated instructor, normally a perfect gentleman, deliberately coughed. It is not clear if the student or the professor was more embarrassed but that student did not return to that class.66

Student accomplishments garner fine publicity for the department. A striking example was in the early 1970s when Alf Loft coached the team of Glen Paruk, Robert McDougall, Denis Johnston, and Bruce Izard to an eight-week winning streak on “Reach for the Top,” a national television quiz show. Their talents also brought $8,500 to UVic's scholarship funds.67

Student organizations generally reflect the common sense and fresh ideas of students. Alas, an organization may languish after its leaders graduate but such organizations revive whenever a new nucleus of enthusiastic students appears. The Creighton Club died of natural causes in the late 1960s. In 1973, a group of students produced a Journal which published six undergraduate essays but vol. 1, no. 1 appears to have been the last issue. There’s little record of students being organized until 1980 when some students, mainly but not exclusively in the Honours Programme, formed the History Students Course Union. In 1983, they produced the first issue of a peer-reviewed annual magazine, the Ascendant Historian which published a selection of the best undergraduate essays of the year. After several years no students appeared to take it over but in 1993, a new cohort, including several graduate students published Blurred Genres for several years until it too lost momentum. Then, as the editor Jeremy Weijerman, excitedly announced, in 2003, “we’re alive again” and once more the Ascendant Historian appeared. The excitement was premature; there was a gap until 2006/07 when THUGS produced This Old Coast. Meanwhile, the graduate students began their own journal, Preteritus in 2009.
The Course Union, in collaboration with its Graduate Student contemporary, in 1990 initiated the idea of having a book auction as part of a Christmas party to raise funds to subsidize student registration fees at the Qualicum conference. The auction continued but for several years the Course Union was quiet until in 1994-95 some energetic students revived it as the History Undergraduate Society which soon adopted a new name, The History Under Graduate Society (THUGS). THUGS drew up a constitution making members of all students taking a history course in the fall or spring term and specifying procedures for electing representatives to attend department meetings. The students designed a History T-shirt to demonstrate pride in their discipline and to raise funds. After those students graduated, THUGS was so quiet that the external reviewers in 1999 thought there was no undergraduate society. A new cohort of students, however, sponsored a series of workshops and seminars on current events. THUGS was especially active beginning in 2006 when it began sponsoring bake sales (with the proceeds to various charities), organizing movie nights and pub crawls, selling THUGS T-shirts and coffee mugs, and honouring faculty with a coffee and cake reception, and an award to the “Most Valuable Professor.” Mariel Grant, who teaches 20th century British history, was the first winner. In addition, THUGS in 2009 “mugged” several professors by ambushing them in class and presenting them with a coffee mug filled with candy, stationery, or some treat. It also sponsored panel discussions on what students might do with a History degree, and a lecture series on “Mythbusters and the Forgotten Histories.” Not surprisingly, in 2008, the department boasted that THUGS was “a vibrant element in student life.” Of course, the department also believed that excellent teaching and a flexible curriculum were factors in student satisfaction.
CHAPTER VII

Graduate Studies

Although the department established a modest graduate programme soon after the College became a University, it was confined to M.A. studies. The programme grew and eventually the department inaugurated a Ph.D. programme. By the spring of 2012, 28 Ph.D. graduates had joined the 359 who had earned M.A.'s. Some Ph.D. graduates had carried on from the M.A., a few returned to take advantage of the Ph.D. programme, and many students came from elsewhere.

The initial M.A. programme included a thesis and also required considerable course work. In the spring of 1971, two British-educated members of the graduate committee, John Money and David Stafford, criticized an apparent emphasis on the acquisition of "factual knowledge" through courses. It was a valid objection. Most non-Honours graduates were required to do a year of undergraduate work; often taking courses in which they had little interest before they could take graduate courses. That, said one committee member, invited "shoddy work." The graduate committee suggested letting such students take some graduate seminars simultaneously with undergraduate work, requiring fewer courses, and increasing the emphasis on the thesis while stressing that it must not be a mini-Ph.D. Unimpressed by a thesis writers' seminar which imposed "artificial rigor," they suggested a seminar for all students. Its nature was not specified but it was likely the precursor of History 500, the compulsory Historiography course. The committee's report provoked discussions ranging from the desirability of maintaining a graduate program, to the number of students in seminars, and the need for seminars for students on the thesis program. The committee also proposed a course work option. It envisioned that many Honours graduates might choose to prepare for a Ph.D. by doing more course work and writing an Extended Research Paper instead of a thesis. After some minor revisions, the department approved and, apart from some tweaking, the revised programme allowed students to choose between an option that stressed a thesis combined with some courses or one that emphasized course work and required only the writing of an extended essay. The course work option, however, had had problems. Students believed it required more work than the thesis option. While it was useful for part-time students, it sometimes became the refuge of weaker students and so lost prestige and popularity. In 1993 the department dropped it.

From the beginning, graduate students acted as teaching assistants. Pettit's plans for a graduate program may have been inspired by a desire for help in dealing with a rising number of students and his proposal declared that "Students will be given instruction in the principles of university teaching." Teaching assistantships could also fund graduate students. That may explain why in 1971 the graduate advisor reported that all full-time students had received financial aid. In fact, the department had limited resources for funding students. The Faculty of Graduate Studies usually awarded one or two scholarships to History students but the department had only a few small scholarships of its own.

Most teaching assistants were capable and conscientious markers but a proposal to have them assist with tutorials in introductory courses stimulated much debate. Some feared it would slow their progress, reduce the need for faculty, or compromise the university's role as an undergraduate institution with regular faculty doing all marking and teaching. In 1972, the department agreed that "nothing ventured, nothing gained," and agreed to the occasional use of graduate students as tutors.
Undergraduates, however, were not happy. On behalf of the History Course Union, John Lutz, its president, complained in 1981 that students did not like having graduate students mark their papers. The Union wanted professors to indicate in the course outline if they used graduate students, that they review samples of markers’ work, and indicate their own comments separately. In addition, the students sought the right (which they already had) to appeal the grade. The department agreed that students should be informed but few faculty members were willing to give up the assistance of graduate students.

When the department began planning a Ph.D. programme, it revisited the M.A. programme in which much of the instruction was through directed studies. Students complained of little contact with other students. It was also an uneconomic use of faculty time. Thus, in 1993, among other ideas, the department drew up a list of “topical” or thematic courses which could cut across the traditional geographically-based courses. It eliminated possible “excessive specialization” in the thesis option by requiring M.A. students to take at least 1.5 units outside their area of specialization. In a 1999 survey, the department ascertained that students who received their M.A.’s after 1990 were more satisfied than their predecessors, probably a reflection on the new programme.

There was, however, a problem. On average, students took three years rather than two to complete their theses and most Canadian universities were offering the choice of a thesis or non-thesis option. After much discussion, in 2002 the department revived the non-thesis option with the clear understanding that it was designed for potential Ph.D. students. It was an “instant” success. Five students who began in September 2004 had completed by the following September. By 2008 most thesis writers completed in two years and those in the non-thesis option required 12-16 months.

All M.A. students and Ph.D. students who had not done it as part of an M.A. programme were required to take History 500. Initially, a year-long course, it became a “rite of passage”; students tended to love it or hate it. In one of its early years almost all the faculty participated in teaching it. Not surprisingly, the course lacked continuity and possibly, substance. Within short order it was assigned to one, or possibly two, instructors who expressed interest in teaching it. The content depended on the interests of the instructor and it took some years to work out a curriculum that emphasizes the history of history and historical trends over the last half century or so.

Another problem was the uneven backgrounds of the students. Students with no background in historiography or without a philosophical bent often floundered when they encountered Foucault, Derrida and other theorists. Others, however, found it valuable and one group, based on their experience in marking first year essays, proposed a historiography course for first year students! Because almost every student had to take it, the course also helped to create some cohesion among students. Compressing the course into one term and usually offering students the choice of taking it in the fall or the spring may have meant a loss of some cohesion in the student body but it also let some students gain an appreciation of historiography in their other courses before embarking on History 500. The attention given to historiography favourably impressed the external evaluators in 2008.

In the early days, the teaching assistants were treated more as students than as instructors; they could only use the faculty lounge if invited and accompanied by a faculty member. The move to the Clearihue, which did not have such a lounge, made that a non-issue. As with the undergraduates, graduate student involvement in shaping the department varied depending on the enthusiasm of the students of the time. In 1988, students asked for representation on the graduate committee. Because it frequently dealt with personnel matters such as admitting new students, awarding scholarships, and the occasional problems of individual students, the department tabled the idea. Several years later the department agreed that subject to space limitations any graduate student could attend department meetings. It also reaffirmed that a non-voting graduate representative should attend meetings of the department and of committees other than the ARPT, the Salary Committees and the Graduate Committee when it dealt with personnel matters. Given the nature of the Graduate Committee’s work, the graduate students rarely attended its meetings.

At department meetings few graduate students spoke but they could express complaints such as inconsistency in the content and administration of the language exams which then were set and marked by the appropriate language department. Unless excused because they had completed a 200 level
language course with a satisfactory grade, had passed Reading Knowledge courses offered by the French and German departments, or had been educated in a language appropriate to their research, students had to demonstrate a reading knowledge of a second language. Many students completed this formality in an hour or so but the requirement delayed completion of the degree for those who had not previously studied a second language. The department would not remove the language requirement and could do little about reform since the French department, which handled most exams, seemed to consider the exam to be its responsibility. As the number of exam writers rose, the French department withdrew its services. Several historians were fluent in French and thereafter administered the French exams.

Almost from its beginnings, the M.A. programme attracted students from elsewhere in Canada and a few from other countries including Japan, England, Papua New Guinea, and the United States. 72 Graduates of the programme published books and scholarly articles, and were accepted into Ph.D. programmes at York, Ottawa, UBC, SFU, Manitoba, Carleton, and in Britain and the United States. Many went with Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) and other major scholarships. 73 While it was good for students to experience a different learning experience and there was pride in their successes elsewhere, the department also desired to retain good students.

In the spring of 1984, the department began thinking of offering a Ph.D. programme under the Faculty of Graduate Studies provision known as Special Arrangement, which allowed the admission of a limited number of doctoral students who had special reasons, such as family obligations, for studying in Victoria. The M.A. programme was well-established, the size of the faculty and its publishing activities had grown, and a few students met the unique qualifications for admission. Some members of the department thought the idea premature; others wondered about the lack of interaction with other doctoral students. Others saw an “excellent opportunity” since the department was strong and, they claimed, other Ph.D. programmes in Canada were generally weak. After a discussion of the principle, admission requirements, and scholarships, only two department members expressed dissent. Eleven accepted the principle of a limited Ph.D. programme but cautiously insisted that the department as a whole approve admissions after the Graduate Committee determined the student’s programme and identified the necessary resources including research costs. Meanwhile, the department discussed such details as major and minor fields, the language requirement, the form and timing of the comprehensive oral exam, and the time for completion. That spring, the department announced the admission and awarding of a fellowship to Margaret Whitehead, a mature student who had previously earned an Honours B.A. and a M.A. from UVic. 74 A few other students came in under special arrangement but left for personal reasons. Only one, Michiko Midge Ayukawa, completed the doctorate. Dr. Ayukawa retired to Victoria after raising a family and working as a chemist. Curious about her Japanese background, she took courses on Japanese history, and earned a B.A. and M.A. Her Ph.D. thesis became a book, Hiroshima Immigrants in Canada, 1891-1941. 75

By 1988 the department was considering a regular but “modest” Ph.D. programme that would admit two or three students annually. In promoting it, Ian MacPherson, the department chair, pointed to the faculty’s strength but several colleagues observed library limitations, the scarcity of research travel and scholarship funds, and the need for more support for the M.A. programme. Conceding the requirement of at least 2.5 or three additional faculty, enhanced library resources, and more scholarships, MacPherson believed that the university would support the programme. He observed an improving
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“market situation” for Ph.D.s, the department’s excellent reputation, the keenness of many faculty members to teach doctoral students, and the larger pool of teaching assistants the programme would provide. He presented a possible curriculum and urged serious consideration of making World History a field. After a long discussion, all but two members voted for a motion introduced by Peter Baskerville and seconded by Eric Sager declaring its desire to implement “a Ph.D. programme of the highest quality” once “the necessary resources as defined by the department are in place.” As a follow-up, after stressing that the Ph.D. programme must not be at a cost to the undergraduate programme, MacPherson proposed that the department annually admit 20-22 M.A. students rather than 12-14 and up to three Ph.D. students. Like Pettit, he would incorporate training in teaching methods into the programme.76

To prepare for the doctoral programme, the department underwent an external evaluation. The most memorable feature of the report was a recommendation that the department needed another senior British historian and one who specialized in the Irish diaspora. Coincidentally, those areas matched the research interests of the two evaluators! The department had other ideas. As for adding to the faculty, it decided that the new appointees be a 20th Century European historian, a Canadian historian, and a World historian. Ralph Crozier who had introduced World History to UVic, was delighted. His report on a workshop on teaching World History observed that a course in World History would give UVic graduates “a competitive edge.”77 All three new appointees would also teach undergraduates.78

Negotiations with the administration continued. The Ph.D. programme would be costly. The three new faculty would cost approximately $40,000 each per year and there was a need for additional secretarial support, scholarships, teaching assistantships, and membership in the Center for Research Libraries. Much of that, of course, would also benefit existing programmes. As a first step, though not necessarily a commitment to the Ph.D. programme, Sam Scully, the academic vice-president, approved the appointment of a world historian.

In the meantime, Peter Baskerville, who had succeeded MacPherson as chair, forwarded a proposal for the Ph.D. programme to the history departments at the University of British Columbia and Simon Fraser University. Their comments were guarded but favourable. In the meantime, Scully and Dean Ed Berry were supportive; the Library liked the ideas of subscribing to the Centre for Research Libraries and upgrading its collections. Unfortunately, the Dean of Graduate Studies was vague about financing Ph.D. students. Finding good students would not be a problem; two students who were doing the Ph.D. by special arrangement won SSHRC doctoral fellowships and the department expected about 20 new M.A. students in September 1990.

Discussions on the Ph.D. programme continued. Some members thought it premature until all teaching areas of the department were brought up to strength; others still feared it would impair the undergraduate programme. Despite the limitations of the library European historians Tom Saunders and Angus McLaren and Japanese historian Paddy Tsurumi indicated that they could supervise theses and offer courses within certain narrow fields. The consensus was not to define fields precisely but to tailor them to match the student’s interests and the department’s resources and to make History 500 “a core graduate course devoted to the philosophy of history.”

In the end, the department narrowly approved the programme provided it did not harm the undergraduate programme. In the spring of 1991, the administration approved the introduction of a regular Ph.D. programme effective September 1992. In the meantime, the department admitted the maximum number of students under Special Arrangements. As the result of a typographical error, when they and a late registrant arrived in September 1991 they were in a full-fledged programme. The University had just changed the way of producing the calendar. The proof copy of the undergraduate History curriculum, which had undergone some changes, was so riddled with errors that the chair and his secretary had no time to proofread the graduate section of the calendar which was supposed to be the
same as in the previous calendar. When asked to submit calendar material, the graduate secretary, however, assumed that the new programme was wanted. Within hours of the calendar’s publication, the phone rang with inquiries about the Ph.D. programme. What was to be done?

Because the calendar is a legal document the Dean of Graduate Studies ruled that the revised programme, which included changes in the M.A. programme, should take effect immediately. Despite problems in immediately reducing History 500 to a half-year course and working out the details of the comprehensive exams, the department was pleasantly surprised. Nevertheless, recognizing that it still had not secured all the required funding or membership in the Center for Research Libraries, it declared that it would only continue the Ph.D. programme if the administration met its needs.

The programme quickly became known across the country. In the spring of 1992 Midge Ayukawa had her SSHRC scholarship renewed and two other students, Brenda Schorb, a British historian, and Kori Street, who worked in Canadian history, also received SSHRC awards. By the time the first Ph.D. class prepared to do their comprehensive exams in the fall of 1992, another six full-time Ph.D. students and one part-timer had been admitted. Another five did not come presumably because they had better offers of scholarships. The committee also rejected nine applicants.

The Ph.D. students had interests in a variety of fields. The size of the entry class in 1992 reflected a built-in backlog; throughout the remainder of the 1990s, the department usually admitted only two or three candidates a year. The early theses covered topics ranging from funeral customs in Cumbria to the plywood industry in British Columbia. In April 1996, Chris Madsen successfully defended his thesis on “The Royal Navy and German Naval Disarmament 1942 – 1947” and became the department’s first Ph.D. graduate. He was not one of the first students admitted; the timely manner in which he completed his studies was exceptional.

The department became concerned about the time that many students took to complete their comprehensives and their theses. To reduce the preparation time for comprehensives and to provide flexibility in courses where there were few students, it reduced the programme by 1.5 units and set out a strict time line for preparing comprehensive reading lists. The external reviewers in 1999 agreed that comprehensives were a bottleneck that helped explain why most full-time students took six or seven years to earn their degrees.

Preparing students to teach was also a consideration. By 1997 after a number of students completed their comprehensives, the department gave them full charge of undergraduate courses rather than just serving as tutors or markers. That also gave them an income since many had exhausted scholarship and fellowship funds. Others had completed degrees but had not found positions in a tight job market.

The formation of a campus-wide union in 1998 changed the relationship of teaching assistants to the faculty. Previously, instructors and teaching assistants had individually negotiated how much work the TA should do in the allotted time following a formula indicating the average time required to mark assignments of various kinds and lengths. Unionization made it necessary to firm up these guidelines and to record them. The department recognized the value of teaching assistants but could only offer moral support when the union sought to raise their maximum wage.

The department agreed with the 1999 review that the graduate programme had probably reached its optimum size to allow for careful supervision without overburdening the faculty. When President David Turpin visited in February 2005, the department told him that it was “being flooded” with new applications and had had 80 applications for 20 spaces in the previous year. Agreeing that “support for graduate students” was a major problem, he was pressing the provincial government for more funding. In 2007, the provincial government provided funds that allowed the admission of additional students. Whereas in previous years, most of the best students accepted did not come because other universities, chiefly in Ontario, offered significantly more generous funding, in 2007 all ten top-ranked students were among the 22 new students. While the department was pleased to accept such fine students, growth was not without its worries because the new money depended on accepting more students. Could the department handle more graduates without impairing the undergraduate programme? Would admitting
more sacrifice quality for quantity? The problem became very real when the Faculty of Graduate Studies suggested the Department should have a minimum of 62 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) students when it had only 56. A year later it raised that number. Maintaining quality was a problem. The pool of students with GPAs of A- or better was not large. Moreover, there was an irony that despite added funding, the department could not raise offers to the top two Ph.D. applicants and so lost them. Graduate Studies responded to the graduate advisor (now called the graduate director, to conform to SSHRC usage) by suggesting that in recruiting new students, the department stress Victoria’s advantages such as personal attention and the climate! The department came close to reaching its quota but lost some of the “additional funding” granted in 2007.

The department has always been proud of its students who have done well as many did in gaining SSHRC and other major awards. Between 2003 and 2007, for example, 29 M.A. students and 15 Ph.D. students received SSHRC grants. This was a better-than-average success rate within the university. Of the students who had entered the M.A. programme in 2003, seven went on to Ph.D. programmes elsewhere, three of them with SSHRC grants. The department took as a compliment the high interest by graduates from elsewhere in its post-doctoral placements even though limited space meant it could not accept all of them.

As expected, the implementation of a full doctoral programme positively affected the department. An interdisciplinary group of graduate students based in History and led by Pasi Ahonen, who had come from Finland, established a History of Racialization Group in the mid-1990s. The Group organized a conference “Making History, Constructing Race” in October 1998, secured SSHRC funding, and invited the prominent American scholar Ann Laura Stoler to be the keynote speaker. Their call for papers and participants was a resounding success. Three hundred people from as far away as Australia, Brazil and Israel attended. The conference was not repeated but John Lutz and Jo-Anne Lee of Women’s Studies edited a selection of the papers under the title, *Situating ‘Race’ and Racism in Space, Time, and Theory: Critical Essays for Activists and Scholars* (2003). The original group is scattered around the world but has a website. Student interest in the theme persists. Albeit on a smaller scale, in 2010 another group of graduate students organized an international conference on “Engaging and Articulating Race.”

About the same time as the *Situating ‘Race’ and Racism* conference, the GHSU initiated a joint graduate student workshop that continues to meet. Although attendance is neither mandatory nor confined to faculty and graduate students, in proposing it the GHSU rightly predicted that it would “provide an opportunity for faculty and graduate students to meet one another on a regular basis, in their mutual capacity as historians – not limited by particular fields of specialization, periodization, or by any theoretic distinction to discuss new research.” As expected, it gives graduate students “a broader sense of cohesion and structure” particularly for students who had completed course work and were “facing the otherwise solitary task of thesis research.” Not surprisingly, in preparing a submission for an external evaluation in 2008, the department described the GHSU as “a vital presence in the department.”

From a very small programme in 1968 with graduate work in a limited number of fields, the department grew so that approximately seventy graduate students, both M.A. and Ph.D. candidates, were registered in 2012. Although Canadian history, including military history, remained a popular area of study, as the department expanded to serve the Ph.D. programme and undergraduates, its students have successfully completed theses in American, Asian, British, and European history, including Early Modern, Middle Eastern, and, of course, World History.
CHAPTER VIII

Beyond Clearihue’s B-Wing

In 2008, the external evaluators who examined the department, its accomplishments and its weaknesses as a guide to future planning remarked that: “Far from representing an ivory tower, this group of scholars is well known for its social commitment and community involvement.” The department had built on a tradition going back to its first days as a university. It also recognized the importance of working with other departments and centres on the campus.

Although high enrollments kept the faculty of the new university busy they saw an obligation to share their knowledge with the community. The 1967 Canadian Centennial inspired two projects. George Shelton edited a book of essays by former students on British Columbia and Confederation. R.H. Roy secured funding and supervised the bibliographers who produced a three-volume bibliography of books and pamphlets relating to British Columbia’s history.

The department maintained contacts with local high schools by holding an annual reception for History teachers, some of whom were also its graduate students. In 1971, however, it questioned the efficacy of such a gathering and, despite a suggestion to invite instructors at Camosun and Malaspina Colleges, discontinued it. With an abundance of students there was no need to encourage teachers to direct their students to the History department. By 2008, when the problem was fewer students, the department revived its liaison with the high schools.

In the early years, members of the department visited various parts of the province as part of their professional responsibilities and learned about the province as they did. Alf Loft, for example, went to Fort St. John to give a lecture and discovered that the temperature was -50˚ F. Even for an ex-Saskatchewanian that was a shock. Another instructor whose knowledge of the interior was limited, phoned his travel agent to complain that his ticket was to Kelowna but his lecture was in Vernon. He did not know that the two cities shared an airport. Some early members of the department seldom ventured off Vancouver Island unless it was to go on holiday to England. This was of great benefit to younger faculty as it meant the travel budget often allowed them to go to a second conference in the fiscal year. One member allegedly first visited Vancouver as an adult when the UBC History Department invited their UVic counterparts to a wine and cheese party. UVic returned the hospitality but the exchange was not repeated. The ferry carrying the UBC contingent back to Vancouver encountered a storm and they spent several hours on very rough seas. Perhaps the absence of contact inspired a suggestion at an Articulation meeting that UVic, UBC, and Simon Fraser University establish closer relations.

At the same time as the provincial government created the University of Victoria in 1963, it created regional colleges to offer the first two years of university studies in various parts of the province. British Columbia took the lead in arranging for the smooth transfer of college graduates to the provincial universities. The UVic department was involved from the beginning of the History Liaison Committee which became known as the Articulation Committee. Through it, the provincial universities, after approving the courses offered by the colleges, granted equivalent or transfer credit. As part of this programme, R.H. Roy visited Cranbrook in the spring of 1966. After the 1969 meeting Jim Hendrickson asked the department to accept six units of transfer credit and waive pre-requisites for transfer students. The following September he reported that 250 of the 1975 registrants in History courses were transfer students.

The annual articulation meetings moved about the province as the participating institutions took turns in hosting them. Although transfer credit was the official item of business the meetings also promoted contact among the colleges and universities. UVic won considerable favour among the colleges by not raising picky questions about their courses and because it usually sent a fairly senior person to the meetings. There were exceptions. When Jim Hendrickson was on leave, Patricia Roy, who was then very junior, was delegated to represent the department at a meeting in Castlegar whose airport
had a reputation for being dangerous; she was the only member of the department without a dependent! As a historian of British Columbia she saw an opportunity to see a different part of the province for the institutions outside metropolitan Vancouver and Victoria often provided local field trips.

From their beginnings, the Articulation meetings were good recruiting grounds. Because of UVic’s reputation for friendliness to the colleges, college instructors, some of whom had studied at UVic, encouraged good students to complete their degrees at UVic. UVic also benefitted from the Provincial Normal Schools’ requirement that students from Vancouver Island and beyond Hope, B.C. attend the Victoria school in order to keep the numbers at the Vancouver and Victoria schools roughly equal. Many students from the interior and upper Vancouver Island had had teachers with happy memories of Victoria.

During a discussion of an Articulation report, some UVic historians questioned the quality of the instruction in the colleges; in fact, the colleges often sent excellent, well-prepared students who were a welcome addition to third and fourth year classes. Although the situation at the colleges varied, at the end of the 1980s, many had enrolment pressures, exceedingly limited library resources, and procedures by which administrators rather than instructors did the hiring but a government hint that some colleges might be permitted to offer upper year courses in subjects such as History raised their morale.

Although the Articulation Committee had suggested that the historians at the three provincial universities develop closer relations, and several faculty members had degrees from UBC, UVic and its contemporary, Simon Fraser University (SFU), many felt that UBC regarded them as junior partners. Thus, when SFU and UVic organized the first of what became the Qualicum Conferences in October 1975, they did not invite UBC. Deemed “a great success” with “well-focused” and “strenuous” discussions involving both students and faculty, the department enthusiastically endorsed the idea of repeating it and unanimously thanked David Stafford for organizing it. Initially, both UVic and SFU had relatively small graduate programmes so some senior undergraduates and faculty also gave papers. As the graduate programmes expanded, opportunities for faculty participation declined. In addition, graduate students usually presented polished papers and sometimes outshone faculty who tended to present early versions of their papers. Faculty did retain an active role as featured speakers at the opening plenary session and the banquet and as chairs of sessions. At the third conference, for example, Douglas Goold, a visiting professor, and Stafford were featured speakers. If SFU or UVic had a distinguished speaker coming to the campus, that person was often invited to give a keynote address. Thus, attendees of the Conference had an opportunity to meet such scholars as Margaret MacMillan, Catherine Hall, Henry Reynolds, and Peter Bailey. After the evening sessions, informal receptions allow students and faculty to visit friends and meet colleagues from other institutions.

What has come to be known as the Qualicum Conference was first held at the Island Hall Hotel in Parksville. It was planned to hold the second in February 1977 on the mainland but that plan fell through and the conference moved to the Qualicum College Inn where it remained with occasional exceptions until the Inn closed in 2007. Historically, the Qualicum College Inn was an ideal venue. Recalling its origins as a boys’ boarding school, the corridors were decorated with cricket bats and pictures of old boys; meeting rooms bore such names as the Headmaster’s Room and, until it installed new boilers, all but the earliest risers experienced the boys’ school tradition of a cold shower.

Left to right: Jeanne Drew, Karen Hickton, Peter Baskerville, unknown, Pat Roy at the Qualicum Conference
One year, the organizers invited Jean Barman, a historian from UBC’s Faculty of Education, to present the banquet speech. She had recently published a history of Boys’ Private Schools in British Columbia which included the Qualicum College. Gradually, a few UBC faculty such as Bob McDonald, who had been a sessional instructor at both UVic and SFU, were invited in their own rights. Eventually, UBC became a full participant.

Costs gradually rose. In 1978, students paid $20 and faculty paid $30. If anyone wished to bring a spouse, and some made it a family holiday, the spouse paid $55. The fee covered accommodation for two nights and meals. SFU complained about transportation costs but could not find suitable accommodation at a better price on the Mainland. The bargain hotel rates available in late January and early February explain what became the meeting time.

In 1990, to raise funds to subsidize students the History Students Course Union and the Graduate Students Association sponsored a book auction in association with the department’s Christmas party. Faculty and students donate books, articles such as home baking and garish neckties, and services such as baby-sitting, pet care, and golf lessons. Absent faculty sometimes found that a “friend” had kindly bid a high price and secured an item for them. When Peter Baskerville, several times the unwitting purchaser of joke items, asked that the date of the auction be changed because he had to be out of town, his proposal “was soundly and enthusiastically defeated.” With Baskerville’s retirement - and he sometimes bid for “absent friends” – the practice of bidding for absentees waned. Nevertheless, the auction continues to be an occasion for fun and fund-raising.

Although representatives of the other universities help plan the Conference, given geography and tradition, the primary responsibility has usually rested on the UVic organizer. The task often falls to a newer member of the department who has had the wonderful help of the departmental staff who know the continuity of activity and often go out of their way to assist by soliciting donations from off campus for the auction and, particularly in more recent years, by attending the Conference themselves.

While the three large provincial universities are the mainstays of the Qualicum Conference, the University of Northern British Columbia usually sends one or two faculty members and several students. In the mid-1980s, cadets from Royal Roads attended. As the University College of the Cariboo became Thompson Rivers University and the University College of the Fraser Valley became a full-fledged university, they too began sending students and faculty and Trinity Western University has occasionally participated. Although the expansion of graduate studies left few places on the programme for undergraduates exceptions are sometimes made for students from the newer institutions. After Malaspina College (now Vancouver Island University) began offering upper year courses, some of its students attended a few sessions and met representatives of universities where they might do graduate studies.
Despite the move to Parksville after the College Inn closed, no one has suggested renaming the conference. It has drawn students from other provinces and from Washington State and has inspired similar gatherings at other universities sometimes at the initiative of UVic students who went there for graduate studies. A Google search reveals its prestige. Some former participants, now academics, list presentations at Qualicum on their personal websites. External reviewers have praised the Conference for providing opportunities to students to present their work in a friendly but professional setting.

In the 1970s, as part of a university-wide initiative, historians occasionally offered regular UVic courses in the evening in Nanaimo. In 1989, the historians at Malaspina began teaching two third year courses under the tutelage of the UVic History department under a principle similar to that which Victoria College had operated under the supervision of the UBC. As Malaspina emerged into a university college its administration proposed to develop a Liberal Arts program focusing on Western Civilization and Great Books rather than a History major. In sympathy with their colleagues in Nanaimo the UVic historians unanimously supported their desire for a Majors programme but insisted that the college must acquire better library resources, add faculty including some who could teach in non-Western areas, expand its first year offerings beyond Canadian, and make the requirements for a Majors degree similar to that in Victoria especially in respect to UVic’s very limited requirement for breadth. In return for “supervising” the Malaspina historians, the History Department received monetary compensation which it used to buy office equipment that was not included in the regular budget.

Curiously, UVic had a much stronger formal relationship with Malaspina College than with its neighbour, Camosun College which resides on its former campus. Nevertheless, Camosun has provided many transfer students. Some were superb students who went on from their B.A.s to earn Master’s degrees; several, notably Margaret Whitehead, Paula Young, and Susan Johnston, returned to Camosun as instructors while Ross Lambertson, who was already teaching at Camosun, did his Ph.D. at UVic.

UVic briefly had a relationship with Royal Roads which was in a state of transformation after the Department of National Defence closed the Military College in the mid-1990s. UVic experimented with using the site to serve students in the western communities. Several graduate students taught introductory History courses there but registration overall was low and the programme was discontinued. It was, however, another example of the department’s willingness to co-operate with university-wide initiatives. Similarly, for several years in the early 1970s, UVic had a contract to teach university level courses to inmates of the William Head and New Westminster penitentiaries. Although each institution had a resident tutor, members of the department gave lectures from time to time. The formal tie with the penitentiaries was short-lived but as part of the University Speakers’ Bureau, members of the Department still occasionally give non-credit lectures at William Head.

Even before the university formed a Speakers Bureau in 1980, members of the department, as well as presenting papers at meetings of scholarly organizations, spoke on their areas of interest to local groups such as service clubs and seniors’ groups. Not all of their efforts have been local. Eric Sager, for example, used knowledge gained from the Canadian Families Project to participate in a “Breakfast on the Hill” lecture series which invited Members of Parliament to have breakfast while listening to a prominent researcher. It is impossible to deduce what Members thought about the importance of the family; none of them turned up! Perry Biddiscombe found himself on a larger stage. His book Werwolf! And the Last Nazis (1998) came to the attention of senior members of the George Bush administration in Washington, DC including those in the Army War College, the National Security Council, and the Department of Defence. In fact, Donald Rumsfeld, its Secretary, quoted from the book in a 2003 speech to the Veterans of Foreign Wars to argue that although totalitarian regimes might suffer defeat, they left behind a surviving underground presence. By drawing parallels that did not exist, the American military establishment used Biddiscombe’s work in an effort to justify its actions in Iraq against guerilla fighters.\textsuperscript{85}
Closer to home, department members have organized public events to share their knowledge. Phyllis Senese was a founder of the Holocaust Remembrance and Education society and David Zimmerman has been its president since 2007. The Society organizes symposia and teaching units for local schools and sponsors community remembrance events. Jordan Stanger-Ross has chaired the urban studies committee of UVic which organizes The City Talks, a lecture series by international scholars on urban matters. The World History caucus for many years has sponsored a series, World Affairs in Historical Perspective Lectures, in which its own members and visitors give lectures on current events. Although held on campus, they are open to the public and, as in the case of a presentation on “The Arab Spring” can draw full houses.

Another example of the department sharing its knowledge with the community is University 101, a non-credit course offering intellectual stimulation to people of disadvantaged backgrounds. Kristin Semmens, a sessional lecturer who had participated in a similar programme while a post-doctoral student at UBC, brought the idea to UVic. Along with Lynne Marks and Elizabeth Vibert she joined volunteer faculty and graduate students of other departments in the Humanities and Social Sciences to found the programme and provide instruction. Funding from the university and philanthropic organizations allows University 101 to offer students a meal and other assistance to make it possible for them to attend.

A high profile link with the community has been the Veterans’ Oral History Project which is partially funded by the Royal United Services Institute of Vancouver Island. The heart of the project, which began in 2004, is an undergraduate course in which students interview veterans and their families and place those interviews and the associated papers in the university library in an oral history collection named in honour of veteran and military historian, Reg Roy. By the spring of 2012 the students had recorded over 600 interviews.

While the Department has often benefitted from the support of the Department of National Defence, for several years in the late 1970s the Department of External Affairs provided visiting professors. Freeman Tovell, a historian by training and an experienced diplomat who had served Canada as its ambassador in several countries, was a great addition both from a personal point of view and from his areas of knowledge. From time to time, members of the department continue to teach the history of Canadian External Policy. The federal government also funded an experiment in bilingualism. In the late 1980s Phyllis Senese taught a section of the Canadian survey in French to allow graduates of French immersion programmes to maintain and improve their competency in the language. Unfortunately, there were few such students and the experiment ended.

History is an eclectic discipline and has co-operated with other departments to expand its offerings. It has long accepted some courses in Greek and Roman Studies (formerly Classics) for History
credit. It has cross-listed some courses with Pacific and Asian Studies, and has shared appointments with other departments. In 1991, Tom Saunders, a historian of Germany, alerted the department to the D.A.A.D. programme under which the German government funded German scholars to teach about Germany abroad. Nothing happened immediately but five years later, with the increasing popularity of twentieth century European courses and budget restraints, Ted Wooley, the department chair, suggested co-operating with Political Science and the new Centre for European Studies. The plan came to fruition in 1999 when Oliver Schmidtke arrived as a D.A.A.D. scholar. History and Political Science later combined to nominate him as a university scholar to teach in both departments and participate in the European Studies programme which the European Union generously funds. History also co-operates in the graduate programme in Cultural, Social, and Political Theory which allows outstanding students to participate in intensive, theoretically-based studies incorporating material from History, Political Science, English, and Sociology.

While co-operation with other departments could bring a bonus appointment, sometimes it was necessary to surrender part of an appointment to secure a replacement. Based on the precedent of Pacific and Asian Studies, in 1984 Slavonics Studies, a very small department, sought cross-listing with History's Russian and Soviet history courses and suggested that History cross list its course on Russian literature in translation. The historians did not think a literature course was a history course but despite administrative problems in controlling the number of students in the class and including them in the respective departments' count of students, History allowed Slavonics to cross-list History courses.

By 2000 not only was Donald Senese, the department's Russian historian, about to retire but so too were two of the three members of the Slavonics Department. Ian MacPherson, the Dean of Humanities, amalgamated it with the German department. Given budget restraints he proposed that History share the next historian of Russia with German and Slavonics. Recognizing the importance of Russian history, the historians reluctantly accepted the joint appointment on a three year trial basis with the understanding that the appointee teach imperial and Soviet history and supervise graduate students. The historians also insisted on a veto over any appointment. The result of the agreement was the arrival in the fall of 2001 of Serhy Yekelchyk, a native of Ukraine who had a Ph.D. from the University of Alberta. Most of his students are in History. History students who wanted to do Honours papers or graduate theses were pressing him to supervise their work but funds were not available to make him a full-time member of the History department. He continues to teach History while, among other things, he has chaired German and Slavonic Studies.

Despite the department's success in making new appointments by co-operating with other departments, its forty year quest for a Latin American scholar remains a work in progress. When its last Latin Americanist left in the early 1970s, he was not replaced. That disappointed the Hispanic Studies department. History put Latin America high on its wish lists but no appointment resulted. Hopes rose when the relatively new School of Business approached History and Hispanic and Italian Studies about a possible joint appointment. After the Business School lost interest, given rising interest in interdisciplinary studies and a desire to enhance offerings in World history, the historians voted 12-5 to continue discussions with Hispanic and Italian Studies. Noting that when taught, such courses were popular, the departments recommended a joint appointment in Latin American History and Culture to the dean. For the historians, however, a specialist in South Asia had a higher place on their wish list. Fortunately, Matthew Koch, a sessional lecturer, can teach courses on Latin America.

The department has also benefitted from the development of research centres on campus. Recognizing its proximity to Asia, the university created a research Centre for Asia Pacific Initiatives (CAPI) whose members also taught in a department. When CAPI required a historian, it invited History and Political Science to co-sponsor the appointment. As a result, in 2004, Wu Guoguang, a native of China and former speech writer for China's prime minister, joined the department where he teaches contemporary Chinese history.

The formation of the Centre for Studies in Religion and Society in 1991 allowed the department to expand its curriculum and offered some faculty and graduate students fellowships that provided time and space for research. Harold Coward, the centre's first director, though not primarily a historian was very knowledgeable about India. The university did not have a department of Religious Studies but he found a
home in the History Department and taught an introductory course on the history of India. Despite student interest, after Coward retired in 2002 the department could not offer courses on South Asia. It did put South Asia at the top of its wish list especially since the Library had a good collection of material on India. \(^{90} \) Coward’s successor at the Centre was a philosopher but the philosopher’s successor, Paul Bramadat, who researches ethnic diversity in Canada, was appointed to the History department.

One centre, the British Columbia Institute for Co-operative Studies, was largely the creation of Ian MacPherson who has an international reputation as an authority on co-operatives and credit unions. Formed in 2000 and funded by credit unions, co-operatives, and government grants, the Institute launched an active programme of research and publishing, hired students as researchers, and offered scholarships in the field of co-operative studies. Meanwhile, MacPherson taught a 200 level course on the international history of co-operatives. His interests in co-operatives and credit unions saw him give over 300 talks in over 60 countries. In a retirement interview he graciously admitted that this was possible because of his colleagues’ good will and especially his being “singularly blessed” by superb secretaries. \(^{91} \) Although he formally retired from the university in 2005, MacPherson remained as the volunteer director of BCICS until 2008. In the meantime and since, several History students have participated in the institute, now named the Centre for Co-operation and Community-Based Economy.

Members of the department have also contributed to the administration of the university. Almost everyone has served on faculty and university-wide standing or ad hoc committees and some have been on many such committees over the years. A few have served in senior administration. John Money, Ian MacPherson, and Andrew Rippin have been deans and thus \textit{ex officio} members of the University senate. Ted Wooley, Sara Beam, and John Money, after retiring from the deanship, had terms as elected members of the Senate and Eric Sager served on the Board of Governors.

Historians depend on many facilities provided by the university as a whole. The most important is the library. As Tom Saunders told Marnie Swanson, the university librarian in 1988, the Library is History’s “lab.” When the external reviewers in 1999 referred to “a thoroughbred History Department yoked to an ox-cart of a Library,” they exaggerated but reflected long-standing concerns about the Library’s limited resources. At Victoria College, when 200 students needed material for essays in the Canadian survey, the library was hard pressed even though instructors offered a variety of topics. One solution proposed was to acquire books on microfilm but the Library did not have a microfilm reader!\(^{92} \) Courses then relied on prescribed textbooks. A suggestion in 1967 that instructors de-emphasize textbooks and use the relatively inexpensive paperback monographs that were increasingly becoming available was sufficiently significant to be noted in the minutes. Students, however, still needed the library for research material. Fortunately, in the early years of the university, the library had a brief honeymoon and was able to build up its resources quickly. Sometimes, towards the end of the fiscal year, the department’s library representative announced that there were still unspent funds in the budget. Thus, during the 1970s, the historians were reasonably well satisfied with the Library. In addition, they had a collection of periodicals in their reading room including an almost complete run of the \textit{Canadian Historical Review} donated by Richard Saunders who had retired from the Department of History at the University of Toronto. In addition, the department had a small budget for subscriptions to such journals as the \textit{American Historical Review}. That budget began disappearing in the 1980s.

By the mid-1980s, the library had serious problems. One member described its situation as “terrible.” Another complained that many microfilm readers were out of service and others did not work
well. The worst was yet to come. In 1987, D.W. Halliwell, the Librarian, announced that because of a deficit of over $400,000 the library would cancel large-scale microform projects, tighten the profile for blanket orders, and only buy books urgently needed for courses. The department expressed its “deep concern.” The historians were not alone. Shortly thereafter the librarian resigned.

In the fall of 1988, Marnie Swanson, the new librarian, visited the department which told her of satisfaction with Interlibrary Loans after UVic adopted the University of Alberta as its main supplier but complained of the lack of subscriptions to new journals, short hours, the absence of a university archives, and the inadequacies of the microforms room. While promising little about replacing equipment soon, she noted that the library would extend the hours and services of the microforms room. Her big news was the acquisition of a super computer that, once suitable software was obtained, would replace the card catalogue with an on-line one. When a student asked if this would make it more difficult to find things, she predicted that once the card catalogue disappeared it would not be missed.

While adapting to the on-line catalogue, the historians continued to worry about the availability of library resources – chiefly books and journals – to support the Ph.D. programme. Only in Canadian history, narrow areas of European and Asian history, and Military history where the DND grant had built up a collection, could the library support a Ph.D. programme. To meet the needs of other areas, the library needed an annual budget of about $70,000 to fill in gaps and subscribe to the Center for Research Libraries, a Chicago-based consortium which stores and lends monographs, periodicals, and archival material from all over the world to scholars at its member institutions. The Library was sympathetic but lacked the financial means. President Howard Petch had already informed the department that in the previous three years, any additional funds had been assigned to salary increases. He asked, one trusts rhetorically, “Are the humanities professors now telling me that in their system of priorities the library acquisitions budget should take absolute priority over salary increases, study leaves, funds for library computerization, etc.? No answer is recorded.

Although the department implemented the Ph.D. programme, the library situation deteriorated. The library cancelled a number of newspaper subscriptions, did not keep photocopiers and microfilm readers in good repair, looked like an “inner city ghetto” because of books stored on the floors in the stacks, and did not allow the History department to subscribe to new journals after it agreed to cancel some old subscriptions. Although the librarians were sympathetic, the budget meant they could do little apart from tidying the stacks which had become a safety hazard. A fall in the value of the Canadian dollar compounded the problems. Perhaps the comments in the external review in 1999 had some effect. On 1 February 2001 the library finally joined the Center for Research Libraries and in 2003 began subscribing to e-journals, a move that some historians regarded as a mixed blessing.

That did not solve the problem of monographs. When President David Turpin visited the department early in 2005, Tom Saunders cited The Economist’s recent list of the most important books of the past year of which 43 were in History. Simon Fraser, which is of a comparable size and age, had acquired 28 of the titles; UVic, only 13. Turpin could only reply that there would never be enough funds and inflation, particularly in the cost of science journals, was a problem. Perhaps the department’s plea had some effect; shortly thereafter, the monograph budget was increased and 80% of the 500 titles submitted in the previous year to fill gaps had been purchased. Nevertheless, Simon Devereaux, the chair of the library committee, described the system of purchasing monographs as “wacky” and advised colleagues to check publishers’ catalogues to fill holes in the blanket order system. Despite serious underfunding, some good news arrived with the library’s decision to broaden the areas of history to be covered under blanket orders, that the library had acquired a microform scanner, and best of all, a major new extension to the library opened in September 2008. Yet, although students who spoke to the 2008 external evaluators seemed generally satisfied with the library especially the Interlibrary Loans, the faculty listed “resource constraints with respect to [the] library” as one of the chief weaknesses of the department.

Nevertheless, department members have been active scholars. Between 1985-86 and 1988-89, for example, they produced 30 scholarly books (of which 16 were edited), 63 refereed articles, and 16 popular books and articles. Such production continued. Between 2000 and 2005, department
members produced 45 books (of which 22 were edited), 89 refereed articles, 91 chapters in books, as well as electronic publications. To celebrate its authors, the department has a biennial book launch to which it invites its friends to hear colleagues toast or roast each other’s recent books. At the first one in March 2001, seventeen titles were honoured. Many books by UVic historians have won national and international awards for their books and articles. [See Appendix 1] Some colleagues have been honoured for their overall achievements through election to such bodies as the Royal Society of Canada and Britain’s Royal Historical Society. As well, historians have served on the executives of professional associations and the editorial boards of scholarly journals. [See Appendix 2] UVic historians have also won a number of awards for research and teaching excellence as well as for their significant contributions to the wider community. [See Appendix 3] Over the years faculty and students have done well in SSHRC competitions for research grants and graduate students have won fellowships. It’s a rare year when several faculty members and graduate students do not win such awards. These fellowships and prizes awarded over the years by outside agencies are a tribute to a department that has insisted that good scholarship and good teaching go hand in hand.
APPENDIX 1

Selected Book and Article Prizes

CURRENT FACULTY

Sara Beam

Gregory Blue

Rachel Cleves

Simon Devereaux

Timothy Haskett

John Lutz
Harold Adams Innis Award (Now renamed the Canada Prize) 2010: *Makúk: A New History of Aboriginal-White Relations* (2008). The book also received the Clio Award of the Canadian Historical Association for the best book in British Columbia History and Choice Outstanding Book Award for 2009

Lynne Marks

Andrea MacKenzie

Richard Rajala
Charles A. Weyerhaeuser Award of the Forest History Society for 1999: *Clearcutting the Pacific Rain Forest* (1998)

Eric Sager
Founders’ Prize, Canadian History of Education Association 2009, for “the best English language article published on the history of education in Canada between 2006 and 2008” for Canadian Historical Review (June 2007), “Women Teachers in Canada, 1881-1901”.

Elizabeth Vibert
American Historical Association/Canadian Historical Association Corey Prize for 1999: Traders’ Tales (1997)

Wendy Wickwire
Canadian Historical Review best article in 1994: “To See Ourselves as the Other’s Other: Nlaka’pamux Contact Narratives”

Guoguang Wu

Serhy Yekelchyk

EMERITUS FACULTY

Ralph Croizier
Robert Troup Paine Prize for Best Book on History or Philosophy of Medicine, Harvard, 1970: Traditional Medicine in Modern China (1968)

Brian Dippie
Vivian A. Paladin Award for Best Article: “Photographic Allegories and Indian Destiny” Montana (1992)
Western Heritage Award, Outstanding Art Book for 1993: Charles M. Russell, Word Painter (1993)

Angus McLaren

Patricia Roy
APPENDIX 2

Societies and Professional Contributions

1. Editorial and Advisory Boards (Member of editorial board unless otherwise indicated)

CURRENT FACULTY

Sara Beam  
_French History_ (2011-present)

Gregory Blue  

Paul Bramadat  
_Studies in Religion_ (2011-present)

Penny Bryden  
_Journal of the Canadian Historical Association_ (2006-09)

Zhongping Chen  
_Review of Jiangnan Social History_ (2011-present)  
_Jiangnan shehui lishi pinglun_ (Historical Review of the Lower Yangzi society) (2009-present)

Simon Devereaux  

John Lutz  
_BC Studies_ (2011-present)  
_Digital Studies / Le champ numérique_ (2010-present)  
_Pacific Northwest Quarterly_ (2010-present)

Lynne Marks  
_Atlantis: A Women’s Studies Journal_ (1998-2001)  
Advisory board, _Canadian Historical Review_ (2008-present)

John Price  
_Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars_, (1997-present)

Richard Rajala  
_Labour/Le Travail_ (2006-present)

Andrew Rippin  
_Curzon Studies in Asian Religions_, (1997-2001)  
Series Editor, _Routledge Studies in the Qur’ân_, (1998-present)  
Associate Editor, _Encyclopaedia of the Qur’ân_ (Leiden: Brill, 1998-2006) 6 volumes.  
_Arabica: Journal of Arabic and Islamic Studies_ (Paris), (2004-present)  
_Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies_ (London), (2009-present)  
Relegere: _Studies in Religion and Reception_ (New Zealand), (2009-present)  
Mathal/Mashal: _Journal of Islamic and Judaic Multidisciplinary Studies_, (2010-present)  
_Journal of Qur’anic Studies_, (2011-present)  
Editor, _Institute for Islamic-Judaic Studies Newsletter_, (1983–1985)

**Oliver Schmidtke**
*Review of European and Russian Affairs*
*Comparative Migration Studies*
*EUROSTUDIA. Transatlantic Journal for European Studies*

**Jordan Stanger-Ross**
*Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* (2009-present)
Associate Editor, *Urban History Review* (2011-present)

**Elizabeth Vibert**
Advisory board, *Canadian Historical Review* (2009-12)

**Wendy Wickwire**
*BC Studies*, (1999, 2001-present)

**Guoguang Wu**
*China Perspectives/ Perspectives Chinoises* (1996-present)
*China: An International Journal* (2002-present)
*East Asia: An International Quarterly* (2003-present)
East Asian Policy (2009-present)
*International Journal of Politics and Good Governance* (2010-present)
*Pacific Affairs* (2010-present)

**EMERITUS FACULTY**

**Peter Baskerville**
*The Canadian Historical Review*

**Ralph Croizier**
Chair, World History Caucus, World History Organization (1996-97)
Consulting editor, *Asian Thought and Society*

**Brian Dippie**
*American Indian Quarterly* (1975-78)
*Western Historical Quarterly* (1981-83)
*Montana, the Magazine of Western History* (1991-2007)

**Toby Jackman**
*American Neptune* (1965-89)
*Press Porcépic* (1981-84)
*Canadian Journal of Irish Studies* (1984-89)

**Angus McLaren**
*Historical Papers*
*Populations et Politiques* (Paris 1997)
*Journal of the History of Sexuality* (2001)
John Money
*Albion* (1994-99)

Patricia Roy
*B.C. Historical News* (1978-81)
*Journal of the West* (1996-98)
*BC Studies* (1980-84; 1997-2008)
*Pacific North West Quarterly* (2001-2008)
*Historical Studies* (Canadian Catholic Historical Association) (2011-present)

Paddy Tsurumi
Editor *Nichibei josei janaru* (1993-1995)

2. Honorary Societies

CURRENT FACULTY

**John Lutz**
Fellow, Royal Geographical Society

**Andrew Rippin**
Fellow, Royal Society of Canada

**Paul Wood**
Fellow, Royal Historical Society

EMERITUS FACULTY

**Peter Baskerville**
Fellow, Royal Society of Canada

**Harold Coward**
Fellow, Royal Society of Canada

**Sydney Jackman**
Fellow, American Antiquarian Society
Fellow, Royal Historical Society
Fellow, Irish Society of Antiquaries (Dublin)
Fellow, Society of Antiquaries (London)
Fellow, Royal Society of Arts (London)

**Angus McLaren**
Fellow, Royal Society of Canada

**John Money**
Fellow, Royal Historical Society

**Patricia Roy**
Fellow, Royal Society of Canada
Reginald Roy
Fellow, Royal Historical Society

3. Scholarly and Professional Offices

CURRENT FACULTY

**Paul Bramadat**
Vice-President, Canadian Ethnic Studies Association (2006-present)

**Penny Bryden**
Council Member, Canadian Historical Association (2000-2003)
Chair, Department Chairs Committee of the Canadian Historical Association, (2000-2003)
President, Canadian International Council, Victoria Branch, (2011-present)

**Martin Bunton**
Board member, Canadian Middle East Studies Association, (1999-2001)

**Rachel Cleves**

**Simon Devereaux**
Secretary, Regional Organization (PCCBS) of North American Conference on British Studies (2008-2009)

**John Lutz**
Founding Director, Friends of the British Columbia Archives (2000-2001)
Director, society for the Promotion of British Columbia History (2000-2009)
Chair, B.C. Heritage Coalition (2004-2009)
Founding Director, The History Education Network (THEN/HIER) (2004-2007)

**Andrea McKenzie**
Elected Council Member, Council of the North American Conference on British Studies (2009-2012)

**Christine O'Bonsawin**
Executive Officer, International Centre for Olympic Studies, The University of Western Ontario (2003-2006)

**Eric Sager**
Member of Executive Council (1986-1992) and Vice President (1990-1992), Canadian Nautical Research Society
Executive Member, Pacific Northwest Labor History Association, (1987-1992)
Chair, Canadian Historical Association Nominations Committee, (1995-1996)

**Oliver Schmidtke**
Member of Executive Committee European Community Studies Association-Canada (2000-2002)

**Jordan Stanger-Ross**
Vice-President, Canadian committee on Migration, Ethnicity, and Transnationalism, Canadian Historical Association (2011-present)

**Paul Wood**
President, Reid Society (2004-2006)
**David Zimmerman**
Member Executive committee of International Committee for the History of Technology (2008)
Chair, Local Organizing Committee, ICOHTEC 2008 Conference, Crossing Borders in the History of Technology

**EMERITUS FACULTY**

**Ralph Croizier**
Vice-President (2000), World History Association

**Brian Dippie**
President, Western History Association (2002-03)

**Ian MacPherson**
Canadian Co-operative Association, President (1988-91)
International Co-operative Research Committee, International Co-operative Alliance, President, (2004-)
First Pacific Credit Union, Vice-President, (1983-86), President (1986-88)
Peninsula Consumers Service Co-operative, Vice-President (1977-86), President (1986-88)

**Patricia Roy**
Friends of the B.C. Archives, vice-president (2003-04); president (2004-06, 2010)
B.C. Historical Association, Vice-President (2003-06); President (2006-08); Past-President, (2008-10);
Honorary President (2010-present)

4. Senate and Board of Governors, University of Victoria

**Members of Senate**

**CURRENT FACULTY**
Sara Beam (2009-12)
Timothy Haskett (2007-09, 2010-present)

**EMERITUS FACULTY**
Brian Dippie (1984-87)
Ian MacPherson (1980-83)
John Money (1982-84, 1996-98)
Reginald Roy (1972-75, 1978-82)

**Members of Board of Governors**

**CURRENT FACULTY**
Eric Sager (2008-11)

**EMERITUS FACULTY**
Sydney (Toby) Jackman (1982-88)
John Money (1987-89)
APPENDIX 3

Selected Awards and Honours for Research, Teaching and Community Involvement

CURRENT FACULTY

**Gregory Blue**
UVic Faculty of Humanities Award for Teaching Excellence, 2001

**Penny Bryden**

**John Lutz**
Craigdarroch Award for Research Communication, University of Victoria, 2007
Craigdarroch Award for Innovation and Entrepreneurship, University of Victoria, 2012
Victoria Hallmark Society, Award of Merit for the Times-Colonist Digitization Project & Colonial Despatches Project, 2009
National History Society, Pierre Berton Award for Dissemination of Canadian History awarded to the Great Unsolved Mysteries in Canadian History Project, 2008

**Lynne Marks**
UVic Women’s Recognition Award, for leadership and service, Spring 2003
The Marion Dewar prize, National Capital Committee on the Scholarship, Preservation and Dissemination of Women’s History, 2012

**Andrea McKenzie**
Faculty of Humanities Award for Excellence in Teaching, 2011

**John Price**
Syd Thomson Community Service Award, the Vancouver and District Labour Council, 2004

**Eric Sager**
Craigdarroch Award for Research Communication, UVic 2011
Paz Buttedahl Career Achievement Award of the Confederation of University Faculty Associations of British Columbia, 2012

EMERITUS FACULTY

**Peter Baskerville**
Humanities Award for Research Excellence, 2006

**Harold Coward**
Craigdarroch Gold Medal for Career Achievement, 2005

**Brian Dippie**
Faculty of Humanities Award for Teaching Excellence, 2006

**Alfred Loft**
Distinguished Service Award, Municipality of Esquimalt, 1967

**Angus McLaren**
UVic Annual Humanities Faculty Research Award, 2001
Distinguished Professorship, UVic, 2003
Molson Prize of the Canada Council ($50,000), 2008

**Ian MacPherson**
BC Credit Union Foundation, Distinguished Service Award, 1991, 1997
BC Co-operative Council, Distinguished Service Award, 1994
Canadian Credit Union Hall of Fame, Québec, 2000
World Council of Credit Unions, Distinguished Service Award, 2000
Canadian Co-operative Achievement Award, 2001
Canadian Association for Studies in Co-operation, Merit Award for Exemplary Contributions, 2001
Association of Co-operative Educators Award for outstanding contributions to co-operative education and training, 2002
UVic Community Leadership Award, 2006
Rochdale Pioneer Prize of the International Co-operative Alliance, 2005

**Reginald Roy**
Certificate of Merit, Province of BC, Centennial Celebrations, 1958
Certificate of Merit, Canadian Confederation Centennial Committee of BC, 1967
PHOTO CREDITS

McPherson library from Elliot archway, 1966. 044-0703 Don Thorndick/UVic archives

Photo of Victoria College, 1959. 007 0301 UVic archives

Photo of Cornett building, 1967. 005.0400. Photographer: Ian McKain/UVic Archives


Sydney J. Pettit, photograph taken at his retirement party, April 11, 1972. 045.0701 UVic Archives

Guests at Sydney J. Pettit’s retirement party, April 11, 1972 045.0702 McKain, Ian/UVic Archives

Toby Jackman, 1973 073.0201 UVic archives

James Morris Careless lectures a class, 1982 i 038.091 UVic Archives

Dr. James E. Hendrickson discussing microfiche 086.0204 UVic Archives

John Money, Feb, 1980 080.1605 UVic archives

Drs. Catherine Panter, Peter Baskerville and Chad Gaffield, 1984 083.2305 UVic archives

Lynne Marks with PhD. graduate Kathryn Bridge, photo courtesy of Kathryn Bridge.

The rest of the photos can be credited to Eileen Zapshala and Theresa Gallant, and to their efforts to document the ongoing history of the department.
NOTES
1 Unless otherwise noted, this chapter draws on the annual calendars of Victoria College.
2 The history of the College goes back to 1903 when it was created as part of the McGill University College of BC. Because of budget problems and the creation of the University of British Columbia it closed in 1916. It was too small to have a history department although History was taught.
3 Presumably because of his administrative duties, Farr briefly had an assistant, Margaret Ross who had an MA from UBC. She may be the M. Ross who became the college librarian.
5 R.H. Roy, “Autobiography.” Dr. Roy’s daughter, Franklyn, kindly let me use this document.
6 Oglesby left in 1966 left to take up an appointment at the University of Western Ontario.
7 In 1961-62, Mrs. Rosa J. Haddon who had a B.A. from UBC was a “special instructor.”
8 Conversation with a student of Victoria College who did not proceed to further studies in History.
9 Tower 1946. 9 Tower was the year book published by the students.
10 Horn, Becoming Canadian, 116.
11 Horn, Becoming Canadian, 151-152.
13 Horn, Becoming Canadian, 154-155.
15 John Money to author, 6 May 2012.
16 Unless otherwise noted, all references are to the Minutes or to correspondence held in the History Department office.
17 The department also questioned whether students in first and second year courses should write one or two essays.
18 Jackman to Pettit, 25 April and 13 June 1966.
20 Forbes, The Education of an Innocent, 71.
22 J Money to author, 6 May 2012.
23 The Structure and Development of the Department of History” – A report to the Committee of Heads and Chairman of Departments. [n.d. but probably 1965 or 1966]
24 “The Structure and Development of the Department of History.”
26 Pettit and Jackman were the only full professors.
29 J. Money to author, 6 May 2012.
30 “Reminiscences Upon His Retirement by Brian Dippie,” Department of History Newsletter, 2008-09.
31 Hendrickson to author, 9 September 2012.
32 He went to the University of Georgia and had a distinguished career with a focus on aerospace. He died in 2006.
34 Hendrickson to author, 9 September 2012.
35 One year, an advisor in the Faculty of Education, thinking it was a basic course, recommended it to weaker students! They did not do well.
36 The system worked well for a number of years but as the number of faculty and courses grew, it became necessary to have some sessional and part-time instructors teach in the blocks set aside for department meetings.
37 Hendrickson to author, 24 August 2012.
38 The 2008 evaluators also reported that one of the students’ few complaints was the presence of students without adequate background who lowered the standard of discussion.
39 Department Newsletter, 2004-05.
40 The Faculty Advisory Committee was composed of representatives from various departments and convened by the Dean of Arts and Sciences who was not obliged to accept its advice.
In 1986 the Greater Victoria Regional District declared the meeting room to be a designated no smoking area. The agenda for the first department meeting of 1986-87 carried a note: “Smoking in department meetings is now illegal and the filing of a complaint by a non-smoker could very well lead to a fine for the smoker.”

For several years in the 2000s, when Haskett was seconded to the Advising office, Erik Kwakkel, a graduate of the University of Leiden, and a specialist on medieval manuscripts replaced him.

Department Equity Plan for female faculty, April 1995.
Sager to Linda Sproule-Jones, assistant to president, equity issues, 26 February 2003.
History Newsletter, 2007-08.
Computer order, January 1989: 2 –IBM –PC2 30 MB hard drives $3,537 each; one laser jet printer, 2 monochrome monitors, 2 DOS, 1 external hard drive (5.5 to 3.5), switcher box and cables 500. MSWord 4 2 @$300. 1 WP package, $400. Plus about $700 tax.
History Newsletter, 2006-07.
Canadian Century Research Infrastructure Project webpage.
History Newsletter, 2008-09.
History Newsletter, 2010.
Department Newsletter, 2005-06.
Peter Baskerville to department, 5 September 1989.
Department Newsletter, 2011.
In 1976, when it was proposed to divide History 368, a course on Ideas in Modern Europe, into two separate courses that would be split chronologically, only seven members of the department voted for the motion; two were opposed, and R.H. Roy abstained. Four years later, except for Toby Jackman who abstained on principle, the department unanimously approved Roy’s division of his seminar on Canadian Defence and External Policy into separate halves.


Providing financial aid for overseas students was a problem because the Faculty of Graduate Studies granted entrance scholarships mostly on the basis of marks. Although the department usually had one scholarship at its disposal, most scholarships were awarded directly by the Faculty which produced a list of applicants for scholarship from across the campus arranged in descending order by GPA. Usually the students with the highest GPAs got the awards. Since historians, especially those overseas, tended to mark hard, history students were at a disadvantage.

(E.P. Tsurumi to B.L. Howe, Associate Dean of Graduate Studies, 5 November 1986).

After securing a full-time teaching position at Camosun College she withdrew from the doctoral programme.
MacPherson to Department. 15 February 1989.
MacPherson to Department, 15 February 1989.
In their major field students were required to read approximately 100 books or the equivalent (five articles were the equivalent of one book) and 50 or the equivalent in both their minor field and their topical field with the student and instructor to consult on the list. (Department meeting, 9 September 1991).

Baskerville to department, 23 August 1991.

W.T. Wooley to Faculty with TAs, 17 December 1998.

History Newsletter, 2010.

Nicholas Mitchell, Draft proposal from GHISU [circa March 1998].

Private communication from one of Loft’s students.


David Zimmerman to author, 30 April 2012.

Times-Colonist, 7 June 2012.

Lloyd Howard and Tom Saunders to Dean Rippin 21 November 2005.

Saunders to Rippin, 18 November 2005.

A brief discussion late in 1996 about a proposal that would have provided outside funding for a course on the Sikh history of British Columbia came to nought.

History newsletter, 2004-05.


D.W. Halliwell, University Library, memo 4 August 1987.

David Zimmerman to Ian MacPherson, 21 June 1989 noted that the library of Royal Roads Military College could supplement the military history collection.

Howard Petch to Ian MacPherson, 28 February 1989.

Baskerville to Department, 5 September 1989.

History Newsletter, 2004-05.