Readings

Reading #1: Sunrise on Methodology and Radical Transparency of Sources in Historical Writing by Trever Owen

I found this article particularly interesting because I feel as if historians should give more recognition to the fact that linked citations is an clean, manageable feature. However, let's recall the fact that all physical books are peer reviewed and judged by a panel of people to see if the information presented is valid enough to get published. There are many, many articles, pieces of writing and so on that it is scrambled all throughout the online databases. Some are valid enough to get published, however some companies reject them. Some are not peer-reviewed, yet end up on public databases such as Jstor, which I use as a Carleton University student. What Owen is explaining here is the two sides of the new era of digital publication, despite the easy access to secondary sources, we are also exposed to many sources that aren't entirely accurate, correct or proved enough to be cited. Owen's position as Head of Digital Content Management for Library Services at the Library of Congress gives him credibility for this article, and I believe is not bias towards the concept of open access. He leaves his audience with an open ended question, leading us to understand what is best for academia.

Reading #2: Open Notebook History by W. Caleb McDaniel

Reading this article gave me more insight into the idea of 'open source'

and 'open access' to articles, academic papers, and personal notes of scholars, professors with a primary focus on historians (due to their extensive research in their careers). I agree with McDaniel's argument that "they hold out tremendous potential to create a rich back-channel of information about the work historians do." (paragraph 32, McDaniel). This statement can relate to the whole concept of what Owen's was focusing on in the previous article. Open access was created because of limited availability and accessibility these research articles had; therefore this concept is accessible to a great audience on the World Wide Web.

Reading #3: SSHRC'S Research Data Archiving Policy and Historians by Ian Milligan

Personally, I agree with SSHRC's policy about research data being collected and accessible to only a certain group within a reasonable period of time. They give enough time for researchers to use the source and benefit from it, as well as giving this information to those who won't taint the source with links to their different un-reviewed sources and it will be accessible to those who need it. Researchers use this specific information to conduct their research and to develop ideas, opinions and arguments that will be useful to conduct more research and find facts amongst their research (and find proof). So, there isn't any reason why this information should be presented to a public platform such as the internet. Historians have every right to defend their data- because its their data, they spent time, money and their effort into collecting it, and if a group or an individual wants access, go after the data yourselves just as the historians have.

Reading #4: Why Canada's Open Data Initiative Matters to Historians by Ian Milligan

The imperfect data presented, explained by Ian, is a "treasure trove of information". Data in a numerical sense is incredibly important in understanding, researching and developing solid information based on a collective. I feel because these statistics aren't mathematical, they aren't deterministic, they are in fact probabilistic. We can't land on a determined conclusion on an experiment or study, however, we can use pieces of the data collected to research further, or develop a thesis depending on the stats you have collected. This type of data should be accessible by the public and easily accessed on the internet because this type of data should be public information. These types of data is important in understanding where we live, and who we are as a collective, and I believe if you are apart of the collective and group of the population in which the stats are about, you have the right to access it.

Reading #5: Writing in Public by Michelle Moravec

I believe that Moravec's point about Academic writing practices mystify the labor of the process of writing is an exaggeration and I get the feeling she is jabbing at men in the academic writing practices whether they are editors, writers or publishers. I respect her work as a feminist, and I believe her focus on women being overshadowed is an entirely relevant subject; however, I believe certain work should remain between academic writers, and some should be available to the public. It all

depends. However, the way things are now, with information being scrambled across databases, it is difficult to differentiate reality and falsified documents. I wish to further understand Moravec's opinions on this.

Reading #6: Generous Thinking: Introduction by Kathleen Fitzpatrick

This was a very interesting article to read. I enjoyed Fitzpatrick's personal experiences as a way to introduce her argument. She validates certain points that I myself thought about many times before, sitting in my lectures as a student, and wondering why other colleagues were not taking away the main message of an article instead of easily rejecting all of it. If we dissect what we read and take away certain ideas, and highlight its thesis, we can develop our own argument for and/or against it. However, hashing Fitzpatrick's main point (I believe) about certain reading, thinking, conversational, and writing skills are necessary in today's conflict-filled world, this could not be more true. These skills should be used by those involved with academics because this is how we truly learn the meaning of a concept. These skills are what help us develop questions, thoughts, opinions and facts. Unlike Mr. Trump, who tweets and reject ultimately any statement he has ever heard, true or otherwise, we should dissect information instead of immediately rejecting and criticizing.