

History	Question	Commenter	Response to Question	Responder	Source/Link
Arguments and Evidence	Are all research papers argumentative?		I say "YES" However, there are people who will try to say that there are argumentative, explanatory/informative, and narrative (maybe more) essays. I don't think that is true. I think that a narrative essay is not a history essay. I think that an explanatory essay is just a narrative essay, and therefore, that history cannot be done without an argument.	Cunningham	Lydia Seong
Arguments and Evidence	How does being able to recognize "what history as an academic discipline actually is," help with being able to separate the evidence and the argument in a secondary source?		It is because many of my students have never thought about or been introduced to history as an argumentative discipline creating knowledge about the past. Instead, they have the illusion that history is a static collection of facts. Therefore, when one reads a single secondary source on a topic, one is conditioned to accept the facts as they are laid out as the only possible option. When, in fact, there are numerous options available in laying out the facts. One's choice of laying out the facts is driven by the argument that one wishes to make (the emphasis on the significance one is trying to prove). When we recognize the nature of academic history we read the secondary sources with an eye toward active question asking rather than passive information gathering and therefore we are leaving behind doing history ourselves.	Cunningham	Amanda U.C.
Arguments and Evidence	Are new lenses made through the reevaluation of primary sources? If not what cause new lenses to be created/used?		Personally, I don't believe that new lenses are created through the revelation of primary sources, but rather the changes in culture that result in new perspectives. Primary sources provide new sources of evidence and information, but that does not create a new lens through which to view the evidence.	Alexandra C.	Alexander P.
Arguments and Evidence	If history is built on arguments then to what extent does history get limited by the bad bias of historians?		Our understanding of the past can certainly be hindered by poor theories (e.g. "revisionism") or weak evidence or a desire by the historian to influence the future rather than understand the past. But since history is an academic discipline any new idea (or old idea) that attempts to explain the past is put up against the scrutiny of higher peers.	Cunningham	Kaylin Wu
Arguments and Evidence	How does a Historian determine the validity and usefulness of a source?		"validity" is not a term that would use in this sense because it can miss the point of source evaluation. However, "usefulness" can work as a term to show what we are doing, but we need to think about the usefulness of the source for the historical problem we are investigating. In this sense, a source can be very useful for one investigation, somewhat useful for another investigation, minimally useful for another investigation, and not useful for another investigation. In this case we will call the process of determining the "values" and the "limits of those values" for the historian investigating a particular historical problem, "source evaluation" or "source criticism." We do source criticism by asking questions of the source. We want to know the source's "origin" - "What kind of source is it (notebook, diary, essay, autobiography, etc...) - Who wrote it? When was it written? Who was the intended audience?" - We also want to ask questions about the purpose of the source - why was it produced? - We then want to use the information to articulate - which I think is a better term than "determine" - the values of this source for a historian studying the topic, and determine the limits of those values.		Darius T.
Evaluating Evidence	How do you prevent cherry-picking?		By sourcing sources with fidelity. By being true to the sources, true to the evidence you find rather than true to your initial assumptions, your initial thesis, your desire for history to work a certain way.	Cunningham	Lydia Seong
Evaluating Evidence	So is any evidence good evidence?		I would say that all factual information can be valid, but is neither "good" nor "bad" in and of itself.	Cunningham	Lydia Seong
Evaluating Evidence	What is the difference and why would historians use facts as evidence? Why aren't facts regarded as suitable evidence?		There is a difference between facts and evidence because facts are pieces of information, but evidence are pieces of information used in an argument. Facts come from sources, and they definitely can be used as evidence, but it requires the work of a historian that asks questions and makes proper connections in order to transform the information into usable evidence. Therefore, facts can be evidence when evaluated and analyzed in the context of proving a historical argument.	Mason, Zhongxue, Madeline	Amanda U.C.
Evaluating Sources	How do we know when we have good sources?		"Good" and "Bad" are not the terms I use as a historian. I use the term "value." And I say that all sources are valuable for the historian, but one of the skills we have to develop is the ability to recognize (and articulate) the values of a source for our given historical investigation, and to also recognize the limits of that source's value for our given historical investigation. (For example, a book written in 1950 for 1st graders about George Washington would not be terribly valuable if I was trying to understand the impact of the education of kids in the 1950s, then looking at the source that 1st graders were given as an introduction to our first president would have quite a bit of value.) (Disclaimer: this answer may indicate that value is on a scale, say of 1-10, with 1 being valuable and 10 being totally expensive. This is not my intention, nor the accurate way to look at it. We are not evaluating a source based on its value, what we are doing is critically considering that source's role in our particular investigation and then articulating the values of that source for our investigation.)	Cunningham	Lydia Seong
Evaluating Sources	If all sources are valuable for historians, why do some refuse to accept these sources?		Give me an example?	Alexander P.	Lydia Seong
Evaluating Sources	How do you infer what source material is quality?		I don't know if "infer" is the right word here.		
Evaluating Sources	How do you infer what source material is quality?		We do not "infer" we critically evaluate the source's usefulness to help us in our historical investigation. We articulate the source's values for the historian studying a particular historical problem as well as the limits to that source's values.	Cunningham	Lydia Seong
Evaluating Sources	What is the difference between learning to appreciate the value of a source, while not overly relying on that source, and cherry-picking?		I don't think that you can overly rely on a source. It may be reliable and trustworthy, but using a single source to defend an argument leads to lack of perspective and the acceptance of face value of the source material which is something that historians should never do.	Amanda A, Bryce A, Alexander P.	Lydia Seong
Evaluating Sources	How do we evaluate evidence? Is there a such thing as bad evidence or only evidence that is not relevant to your thesis?	Cunningham Response	You can overly rely on a source. See Katy's response.		
Evaluating Sources	Do historians collect and evaluate information from many primary sources to answer questions about historical events?		There can be misinformation that harms our analysis, but overall, I think that your second statement is the correct statement.	Cunningham	Kearsten M.
Evaluating Sources	How does the misuse of evidence weaken the argument a historian wants to make.		Yes.	Cunningham	Bryce A.
Evaluating Sources	Is there a timeline in which information can not be turned to evidence anymore?		The misuse of evidence can cause a historian's argument to fall apart. The misuse of data doesn't always mean that the evidence is wrong, and with that being said, the argument can still make sense. However, the argument might be easily debated and possibly debunked due to the fact that the information used was poorly placed. Further, the author's credibility could be tainted if the misuse of the evidence causes the argument to dissipate. The misuse of evidence can be fatal for an argument, but not always.	Darius, Mike, Ned	Alexander P.
Evaluating Sources	When you say "The Key Skill here is the ability to recognize the difference between interesting facts and important evidence," how can we tell the difference if all information can be both?		No, information does not have a point where it can no longer changed to evidence, the only exception would be if this information is disproven but, information matters what remains is still be allowed.		Alexander P.
Evaluating Sources	The illusion that in... of his craft (Maurice Natanson) are facts subjective or is the interpretation of how they are used subjective?		The thing that distinguishes between interesting facts and important evidence is not the fact of it itself, but how the fact or information is applied. When debating where the fact can be fact or evidence, one can ask oneself "Can this add to my argument? Does this correlate with the conclusion I am trying to reach?" If the answer is yes, see how it applies to your argument and apply it. If the answer is no, then you know that it is just an interesting fact.	Aisha K, Chastin M, Abigail M.	Kaylin Wu
Evaluating Sources	How does a historian know when information is important enough to then turn it into evidence?		I would say that the interpretation is subjective. Only because the nature of humans are all different and even the facts are not of "herd's story" believe that people can and will find a way to interpret it a different way also believe that historians themselves tend and actively try to interpret facts and evidence in different ways just to further analyze a certain topic.	Bryce A, Alex P, Amanda A.	Mason M.
grey areas in history	Are there any parts of history that a black and white but not grey?		The importance of the information is not strictly defined but dynamic, as the importance is dependent on the historian who utilizes the information, and how well the information can support the argument the historian is making. Historians rely on information to support their arguments and theories, and the value of that information can change depending on the context in which it is used. Ultimately, the importance of historical information is not set in stone, but rather constantly evolving and dependent on the needs and perspectives of those who use it.	Lydia Seong, Isabella, Oriq, Kaylin Wu	Darius T.
Historian	What is your opinion is the most essential quality in a historian?		This seems to be a question regarding the difference between "facts" and arguments. But I am not sure.	Cunningham	Bryce A.
Historian	How does a historian become professional?		Cautions about the past and a desire to explain the complex and nuanced connections between changes and continuities over time.	Cunningham	Bryce A.
Historian	What does it mean for historical information to be "ever-changing" and how does that effect current conditions of history?		A historian can become a professional through the pursuit of being history. As long as you are actively forming your own arguments about this past (using evidence and well articulated reasoning, you are doing what a historian does. As for academically historians, like any other field, one needs to build up a reputation for themselves via higher level education (college) to improve their credibility and access to information that will help them "do history" (make arguments).	Chastin M, Abigail M, Aisha K.	Chastin M.
History	Can history be done without arguments?		Academic history doesn't have a conclusive and because information about the past is constantly being redeveloped which makes it "ever-changing" because the information continuously changes over time which also plays a part in how history can "conclude" itself.	Amanda A, Bryce A, Alexander P.	Darius T.
History	How do historians know the new view points they are seeing isn't useful or helpful?		None. If one is not making an argument about conditions and about significance then one is not doing history. At least, one would be writing a narrative in the style of an antiquarian, not a historian.	Cunningham	Chastin M.
History	Why are textbooks in our school literature from a biased lens? Did the government intend this?		Historians typically use a variety of methods to gauge the usefulness of a new viewpoint. They examine the evidence provided, scrutinize the argument made, and evaluate the credibility of the source. By doing so, they can determine whether the new perspective is worth pursuing or not.	Cunningham	Kearsten M.
Lens	Why are textbooks in our school literature from a biased lens? Did the government intend this?		Notbooks? What do you mean? Also, all sources - primary, secondary, encyclopedic - will contain biases. Biases are neither "good" nor "bad." Bias can be and usually is quite valuable for the historian.	Cunningham	Chastin M.

History	Question	Commenter	Response to Question	Responder	Teacher/Assistant
			The lenses we discussed often overlap and are rarely 100% exclusive. The overall point of the discussion is for you to understand that historians use lenses to illuminate certain connections. When one understands the use of historical lenses, one can more easily recognize the limits of a historical argument and challenge or support the argument by utilizing other lenses. The ultimate goal is to understand the past, not to use a specific lens and make a claim. (Unless you are a dedicated Marxist historian with a politico-economic agenda, which Arthur Marwick (and I feel does more camouflaging than illuminating. On a side note, "historical materialism" which is related to Marxist history, focuses on production and consumption including the Marxist struggle between the owners of production and the workers, but does not necessarily fall into "class struggle" as the key element of change or continuity, and therefore, does not by necessity push a Marxist political or economic agenda.)		
Lens	How does one prevent themselves from misinterpreting a lens as one does?			Cunningham	Chaztin M
Misc.	so is the historian claim, the chain of both primary and secondary type moderate?			Cunningham	Alexander P
Misc.	can we not argue against all bias?		I don't understand this question.	Cunningham	Alexander P
Misc.	How can we change the education of history to develop?		I don't understand?		Byrce A
Opposes in history	What does it mean by a historian facts only being judgement of what occurred, so are there really any facts or only just opinions?				Kearsten M
Primary/Secondary sources	Is using a second source that pertains to your argument and more so ignores any evidence that contradicts or disproves your argument still a valid source?				Kearsten M
Primary/Secondary sources	Is there really that much value from a primary source if most historians will approach it differently or give a different meaning from what it actually is?		I don't really understand the question really well, but I'm going to try to answer to the best of my abilities. Historians will likely want to use evidence that is helping their argument. Some primary sources, make conflict with the argument that they want to make, so in result historians would see that primary source, as not much value as others. Though those primary source that may counter the historians argument can be strengthened, and can be used so the historians argument can be strengthened, and yes, sometimes primary sources may be misinterpreted. Everyone may have a different interpretation. Primary sources are reliable regardless of the historian's perspective because it allows readers to gain an unbiased perspective of the era source, it is understandable that it can become confusing when different historians have different arguments to make about the source, but it should also be taken into consideration that it isn't necessarily wrong.	Pedro, Sergio, Lucia	Kearsten M
Primary/Secondary sources	Do historians use primary and secondary sources in the same manner?				Lydia Seong
Sources	What does it mean to over rely on a source? "The ability to recognize the values of a source while not overly relying on that source" (3)		In that context, I mean not using a source without source evaluation without recognizing the limits to the values of that source. To accept a source without critical consideration. To build an argument on the idea that the source in question has no bias, not potential ulterior motives, is 100% accurate. For example, an example of a paper that has been heavily criticized for doing this was actually written by a well-known and prominent historian. The book is called "The Great Oup by Fire" while the historian is quite a good historian, many have argued that this particular work sheds the dangers of his doing an evaluation/criticism. He essentially takes what medieval nobles said about peasants as undeniable fact without considering the ulterior motives or simple misunderstandings that a nobleman might have had about peasants etc.	Cunningham	Chaztin M
Thinking like a Historian	How does thinking like a historian involve examining the big gradual changes in society/cultures that might not be immediately obvious?	Byrce, Ope, Gabbri, Marquell	"How does it involve [these] exam[ina]tions?" Thinking like a historian means doing these examinations - thinking of them to begin with rather than not thinking of them.	Cunningham	Amanda U.C.
Thinking like a Historian	When you do history do you mean essay writing?	Cunningham	Our understanding from your answer is basically realizing that historians should strive to be unconscious think of it already come to history looking for the change, continuity, cause, and effect rather than not thinking about them before coming into a text.	Cunningham	Lydia Seong
Thinking like a Historian	Why do historians have the urge to create argument, could there not be an argument?		Essays are one form of articulating/presenting the history that has been done. But it's not the only form. When I say "do history" I really mean thinking like a historian.	Cunningham	Byrce A
Thinking like a Historian	How does "Thinking like a historian" involve using "primary/secondary sources"?	Ope, Gabbri, Byrce, Marquell	Nope. To be history there must be an argument.	Cunningham	Byrce A
Thinking like a Historian	What if historical questions weren't grounded in reality?	Cunningham	Primary source material is a huge part of the "evidence" - the left over traces of the past - that historians must utilize to develop evidence of the connections we are making. Secondary sources are the previously answered questions through an organization of the primary "evidence." We can't do it all until previous historians have already said about the past. (In one sense we could say that it is like using the Pythagorean theorem to derive an argument about something else. We don't have to spend time proving the theorem itself, we can just reference it and build on it. Similarly, the historian can often utilize an argument that has already been made in a secondary source and build on it without having to re-prove it.)	Cunningham	Amanda U.C.
Thinking like a Historian	What does it mean to think like a historian?	Ope, Gabbri, Byrce, Marquell	Yes, I do try to look at a primary source as something natural and a secondary source as something that is man made?	Cunningham	Amanda U.C.
Thinking like a Historian	What if historical questions weren't grounded in reality?	Cunningham	Then they really are not historical questions (i.e. not questions that a historian would ask).	Cunningham	Byrce A
Thinking like a Historian	What does it mean to think like a historian?	Cunningham	This is the topic of the entire first unit. In summary, historians try to understand the past by asking questions and then attempting to make connections between changes and continuities in the past, by questioning and trying to answer questions of causes and consequences of changes and continuities, of illuminating and articulating significances of the various causes and consequences of changes and continuities in the past, and re-evaluating these conclusions by recognizing the need for various contemporary and historical perspectives (examples of differing contemporary perspectives - nobles versus peasants, men versus women, minority groups versus majority groups; examples of historical (or historiographical) perspectives - cultural lens, economic lens, political lens, top-down lens, bottom-up lens).	Cunningham	Lydia Seong
Thinking like a Historian	Is the manipulation of evidence (active note-taking/the gathering of more evidence) what makes a historian?	Zhorace Brown, Mason Iffitt, Madeline Martin	Historians do not manipulate evidence in order to do history, however, they often evaluate it in order to back up their thesis and argument. Proper collection and utilization of evidence make a historian, alongside argument and asking questions. Simply gathering evidence does not make a historian either, that is essentially what an antiquarian does. A historian leaves evidence and uses it for their argument. Historians need to gather evidence to further evaluate its implications on their thesis, but the act of gathering it does not make a historian.	Zhorace Brown, Mason Iffitt, Madeline Martin	Lydia Seong
Thinking like a Historian	What does it mean to think like a historian? (Remaining engaged/objective)				Lydia Seong
This History Class	How would we assess our knowledge surrounding this concept/question, "what is history" or "thinking like a historian"?		An educational assessment of the topic is difficult but could involve developing historical questions, recognizing when a question is NOT a historical question (e.g. a question of moral philosophy or a question of legality). Another way would be to choose a topic in history that one is somewhat familiar and write out an explanation on what historians do by exploring questions that have been answered and showing the "thinking like a historian" aspect by including potential unanswered questions. As we move into the more concrete tasks of a historian, one would identify primary and secondary sources, would show how to find them, would show how to evaluate them. But at the end of the day, the lessons involve showing them the methods used by historians. Ultimately, the true test is when a student's practices being a historian via a research paper - which in this class is the Internal Assessment. (But also in the way we think when being presented lessons, and in our structuring of an essay.)	Cunningham	Kearsten M
This History Class	Will we be doing more research papers or reports in this class?		Research - hopefully.	Cunningham	Lydia Seong
This History Class	How can I know what is most important to take notes on if I'm not a good note-taker?	Oscar, Cao, Ashley, Janyan	First you need general concrete facts. Like years, people, environment, etc. Remember note taking is used for recall. You are then to use these notes to make connections and questions about the past. Maybe it is best to take anything you find "interesting" and then take look at those notes and make connections. Note taking is only the beginning process of doing history and is not meant to be something that is just "memorized." You need background knowledge in order to find gaps, change, continuity, and significance. You must remember we are not just memorizing cold hard facts (as an antiquarian) but you must develop upon these facts through connections to truly understand history.	Oscar, Cao, Ashley, Janyan	Lydia Seong
This History Class	In this history class, what historical lenses will be mostly be looking through? Or will this be an opportunity to choose our own historical lenses to look through pieces of history with?		We need to recognize the lenses being used to present the history whether or not it is in a lecture, a reading, a documentary or other form. Recognizing the predominant lens helps us consider questions from different historical perspectives. In my lecture, the lens is probably a political lens due to the nature of the IB syllabus. However, there is a big push to include a social history lens.	Cunningham	Darius T
Unbiased history	If all history is written by historians, how can we be capable of writing an unbiased historiography?		I am not sure you are using the word "historiography" correctly here.	Cunningham	Kearsten M
Unbiased history	Do you think it is sometimes appropriate to filter, or pick, certain pieces or events history to highlight its appeal or make it more interesting?	Pedro, Lucia, Sergio	I don't think it is appropriate for us to "filter" or "pick" out certain pieces of history for the reason to make it more interesting. It's better to pick out certain historical events and leaving out the missing puzzle pieces.	Pedro, Lucia, Sergio	Darius T

History	Question	Commenter	Response to Question	Responder	Number of Responses
			By "less known" do you mean the figures that have not been explored in school curriculum, or do you mean the masses of people that collectively influenced the past but are not the "great men" of our history? If you mean the latter, then the rise of social history in the 1960s has done part and is now the key element of historical investigations. If you mean the former, then one could say that all historical figures are "less known" until a historian makes them known by digging into the primary source archives and telling the previously ignored, overlooked, story. Think of the book, Hidden Figures regarding the role of several women in the early years of NASA including Catherine the African American calculator who was a key, but "hidden figure" in Alan Shepard's space flight and (although the movie doesn't cover it) the safe return of Apollo 13.	Cunningham	Amanda U.C.
Understanding Historians	How do historians determine the significance and impact of lesser known historical figures/events?		We think that a historian would determine the significance of a lesser known event or figure the same way they would with any other event or figure by interpreting it based on their historical lens. So for one Marquita an event or figure may be more significant than another historian's perspective		
Understanding Historians	Do historians tweak their research skills based on source materials?		One may have to "tweak" one's approach, or argument, or focus, but I think it better say that historians hone the research skills. However, I would say that one is honing or sharpening the skill based on the source material	Cunningham	Amanda U.C.
Understanding Historians	* - the illusion that in getting the facts the historian's own subjectivity... How much can a Historian put their own values into their work without compromising it?	Gabby, Marquita, Styles, Ope	As historians look for more resources they get better at picking out their resources.	Sanaa, Avery, Ben, Michelle	Amanda U.C.
Understanding Historians	Have we been making reports and not research papers all this time (in history)?		I cannot say what you have done. But in general, I feel that most middle school and elementary school research papers are, in fact, reports/summaries.	Cunningham	Lydia Seong
Understanding the nature of history	How many hours are needed to do history?		Infinite, because a clear picture of the connections in the past is never clear. Also, every research project I have ever done has taken me at least twice as long as I anticipated when I started.	Cunningham	Lydia Seong
Understanding the nature of history	Historical evidence has 5 components and get historical people who document it, who are generally similar to literature writers. Couldn't some historians write historical fiction based on their perspective?		Some professional historians do write historical fiction. However, when they are engaged in the endeavor they are asking questions that a historian does not ask (e.g. what motivation do I want my character to have, how will my motivation move the plot?) A historian says "What motivation did this historical character have (based on my evidence), and how did this character act in response to that motivation?"	Cunningham	Lydia Seong
Understanding the nature of history	History cannot be done without arguing. Quality source material does not equal the truth. Nothing we know about history is 100% true. Why study the past?		Nothing we study is "100% true" so by asking this question you are implying we should not study anything we cannot "100% prove, but the reason for studying the past is so we can get closer to a clearer answer about history.	Sanaa, Avery, Ben, Michelle	Kaylin Wu
Understanding the nature of history	In history, is there ever truly a right answer, or a definitive reason or will there constantly be a new perception?		History is a dynamic discipline, there are always things being discovered and rediscovered or simply corrected. There is no way to tell if the history known today is actually what happened in that past. With the advancements of technology, more and more pieces of history are being rediscovered everyday, once historians begin to analyze and connect this new evidence, they can begin to draw new connections. Ultimately, this can correct old history or change the way one could look at the past. In short, there is no way for history to be "right" or "definitive" because new discoveries could possibly change the facts, information, and view on previous historical conclusions.	Darius, Mike, Ned	Lydia Seong
Understanding the nature of history	Can you use the wrong perspective on something and does that make the argument also incorrect?		I don't know about "wrong perspective." We can over-rely on a particular perspective when then history or argument by leaving the argument vulnerable to counter attack from someone who is considering a different perspective.	Cunningham	Lydia Seong
What Historians do	What does it mean to rework the evidence? to change its meaning?		I would say we do not "rework" evidence in history, you simply shine a light on different types of informations that becomes your evidence when you look through various historical lenses. However sometimes "evidence" in history is used to show an historical argument as corrected fact which is not how history should be done.	Michelle, Sanaa, Ben, Avery	Alexander P
What Historians do	Could you elaborate on why historical writing is an exercise in communication?				Kaylin Wu
	If parts of history are pixels how much more can you refine the pixels?				Alexander P
	How do you know whether a question is open ended or closed?		There is no fixed answer to a historical question. All hypotheses about how, why, and the responsibilities of events that have occurred in history can be disproved. Even then, disproving claims and be disproved themselves. So what? I think is the answer to this question is that all questions are open-ended.	Lydia Seong	Alexander P
	Changing perspectives is hard. If you haven't lived through the perspective you are trying to analyze in how can you really view something through that lens?			Hba G.	Alexander P
	How do you analyze information to convert it into evidence?				Alexander P
	What is the purpose of seeking knowledge through history if you can focus on developing the future?				Alexander P
Evaluating Sources/evidence	How do you know how much information to use from certain sources if they are neither good nor bad?		Using the main components of the source that either helps or contradicts your thesis. It is also important to be able to use various sources to support your argument. Using the same source to support your thesis makes your argument weak. I also encourage you to find other sources not looked at can be contradictory to your thesis. (Also what did you mean by if they are neither good nor bad).	Ashley, Jariyah, Oscar, Ocasee	Alexander P
Arguments and Evidence	When is it appropriate to use recall?		When you are doing history you are constantly using recall because you can't have a historical argument without recalling claims/information. Without using recall your argument holds less truth, and is unable to make more connections.	Sanaa, Michelle, Ben, Avery	Alexander P
	David Hackett is trying to say that if we don't ask questions about the history we have discovered, then we just consume the information without having a purpose for it. The way we get answers to an 'on-going' history by answering with what we are given. History will always be being rediscovered, so the answer that we have now will always be changing. The reason being we have more information and so we are able to draw more nuanced conclusions about history. When doing history you only know what you have, and as a historian, you must draw the best conclusion you can <u>with</u> the information you have. Therefore, with an 'on-going' history come new and more accurate answers about it.				
	David Hackett mentioned that without questions we wander aimlessly through dark corridors of learning as specifically in history since it is not static how do we get an answer to question of something that is on-going?			Darius, Mike, Ned	Bryce A.
	Acknowledging the various sources one has available to them, how can you find the evidence that supports your thesis without the evidence being, presumably, cherry-picked?			Ashley, Jariyah, Oscar, Ocasee	Kaylin Wu
	If possible, could you elaborate upon the except under "Accumulation of Source Material"?				Kaylin Wu
Understanding Historians	How do we know when a question is vague?		You can know when a question is too vague by assessing how clear/closed the question is to the topic. If the question has an answer that is too broad you may need to specify more. An example would be a question like, "What cause WWII?", which is a very broad question that can be answered from many different views, if you wanted to focus on one lens, like a economic one you would ask "How did WWII impact the supply and demand for certain goods?". This question helps narrow down what you want to answer about the topic.	Sanaa M.	Lydia Seong
Understanding Historians	How can evidence be taken out of context?	Cunningham	However, the second question, "How did WWII impact the supply and demand for certain goods?" is a question for an economist rather than a historian. Also, I wouldn't say a question is "too vague." I would say it is "too broad." As Sanaa pointed out a question about the causes of WWII would be too broad. Consider the question "What were the consequences of WWII?" This question would require thousands of pages to be answered from different viewpoints. We need to limit our questions for investigation to something appropriate for the length we have (a 300-page book, a 400-word article, a 1500-word essay, etc.).		
grey areas in history	Larger canvas? Is history one finite canvas or infinite, and is it blurry?		By only looking at the evidence that one perspective or ideologically using out aspects of historical information, evidence can be taken out of context or otherwise known as cherry-picking.	Openpipo	Lydia Seong
Understanding Historians	How does someone ask questions? I never seem to ask questions when studying/doing history.		The ability to ask questions was covered in the "Skills and Concepts in History" pdf which provided plenty of information on developing historical questions. To start off, a proper historical question is more often than not open-ended. When forming such questions one must adopt the thinking of a historian, recognizing changes over time or continues and really ask questions about the change and/or the consequences of them. Essentially, historical questions are there to help you, personally, understand the past.	Hba G.	Mason M
	Open-ended questions are answerable? I thought historical questions couldn't be answered directly.		The "answer" and conclusions historians come up with are arguments. Arguments are arguments for a reason. You expose your answers, but fellow historians may argue with you about your conclusions. Answers are not definitive, and they are simply supported by evidence. Open-ended questions are there for arguments to be formulated. You may come up with one answer, but that does not mean that your answer is THE only answer.	Mason, Zhoraak, Madeline	Mason M

