Reading Log #1: When Was Canada?

In my opinion, the main arguments presented by the author is that the retelling of history is not a fluid or straightforward process. There are different factors that come into play such as ideology, what approach is taken when historians retell history. Historians create history and they decide what is deemed an important fact in history. History also depends on which point of view we are telling history from and how that can influence and change history as a whole. This sheds a light on our understanding of the Canadian past because it shows that in society, those who had more power or as the author used “literate” are the ones who write history. In the past, history is also unfavorable to minorities, women, people that did not conform to mainstream society because most times, their voices aren’t being heard. This relates to the history of Canada and Aboriginal peoples.

One passage in the reading that stuck out to me was the fact that historians write history and they, to some extent, decide what is deemed important and what goes into the books. An example of this was when the writer mentioned Caesar crossing the Rubicon stream a part of history but the stream being crossed by others had no impact or interest at all. This made me realize that those who tell them (stories) shape history.

Questions:

Questions that I asked myself while reading this chapter include: How do you decide which individuals story is important and should be retold? Taking into account how history is told from an individuals perspective doesn’t that mean history could be changed if you tell it from the perspective of another, how do you know which person’s story is more important?