

From Cold War to Global Terror, 1945 to the Present

HIST S-1967 (Summer 2010)

Course Website: <http://hudce7.harvard.edu/~ostrowski/20thcenturyII/>

Harvard Hall 102

Harvard University Summer School

phone: 617-495-4547

office hours: MWF 2:00-6:00 p.m.

instructor: Donald Ostrowski

office: 51 Brattle St. E-703

email: don@wjh.harvard.edu

Teaching Assistants:

Gail Gardner

office: 51 Brattle Street, room 701

email: gparis13@post.harvard.edu

phone: 617-492-0618 (**not** after 8 pm)

office hours: TTh 4-6

discussion section: W 5:30-7:00

John MacDougall

office: Crema Café (Brattle Street)

email: john_macdougall@uml.edu

phone: 617-576-1318 (**not** after 8 pm)

office hours: TW 4:30-6:00

discussion section: Th 3:30-5:00

David Nicholson

office: 51 Brattle Street, room 701

email: dnicholson@post.harvard.edu

office hours: by appointment

Discussion Sessions:

Mondays 5:30-7:00 (Nicholson)

51 Brattle, rm. 721

Wednesdays 5:30-7:00 (Gardner)

51 Brattle, rm. 721

Thursdays 3:30-5:00 (MacDougall)

51 Brattle, rm. 721

Course Goals:

To investigate ideas about the history of the world from the end of World War II to the present while reading critically, thinking logically, and questioning intelligently. To provide a method with which one might continue to study the artifacts of the human past and to encourage that study. As the philosopher of science Sir Karl Popper has written: "all teaching on the University level (and if possible below) should be training and encouragement in critical thinking." In this course every fact, assertion, and interpretation about history is open to reconsideration. Merely accepting authority, invoking political considerations, or agreeing with the instructor is neither necessary nor sufficient for determining one's own views. Such uncritical accepting, invoking, and agreeing are corrupting influences that tend to hinder the development of independent thinking. Ideas and arguments in this class will be accepted or rejected on the basis of three criteria: (1) logical coherence (i.e., no internal contradictions); (2) correspondence to external source testimony (i.e., no suppressed evidence); and (3) conceptual elegance (no unnecessary abstractions). For a fuller explanation, see on the course website: "Three Criteria of Historical Study."

Undergraduate Student Grading and Deadlines:

	<i>draft</i>	<i>grade</i>	<i>TPQN</i>
10% First Writing Assignment (see p. 9)	June 25	July 6	July 20
10% Mid-Term Quiz		July 8	
20% Second Writing Assignment (see p. 10)	July 1	July 15	July 27
30% Third Writing Assignment (see p. 11-13)	July 13	July 29	= July 29
30% Final Examination		August 3	

In the written assignments you have a chance to demonstrate your conceptual thinking ability. The descriptions for the written assignments are on this syllabus. Prepare and write the essays outside of class and hand them in on the designated due dates. The first date is when the draft (for comments, no grade) of each assignment is due. The second date is when the revised version (for

grade) is due. The third date is the *terminus post quem non*, the date after which we will not accept any work on that assignment. The questions on the mid-term quiz and final exam will test your knowledge and thinking ability. The mid-term quiz will take up the first half-hour of the class period on July 8. The rest of that class period will be a lecture. You will have 48 hours for the take home final exam to be given out in class on August 3.

Graduate Student Grading and Deadlines

	<i>draft</i>	<i>revised</i>	<i>TPQN</i>
10% First Writing Assignment (see p. 9)	June 25	July 6	July 20
10% Mid-Term Quiz		July 8	
5% Proposal for Research Paper (see p. 14)	July 1	July 13 =	July 13
45% Research Paper (see pp. 14–15)	July 20	August 3 =	August 3
30% Final Examination		August 3	

The graduate student First Written Assignment is the same as for undergraduates and counts 10% of your final grade (see page 9 of this syllabus).

In the research paper you have a chance to demonstrate your conceptual thinking ability and develop your research skills. It will be up to you to develop your own research topic with the approval of the course assistant and instructor. First, consult with your course assistant and/or the instructor about focusing on a topic. Then following the guidelines in *A Guide to the ALM Thesis*, 6th ed., pp. 12–41. prepare and write the drafts of the proposal (at least 3 pages [750 words]; see page 14) and research paper (see pages 14–15) outside of class and hand them in on the designated due dates. A grade representing 10% of the final grade is given for the research proposal, and a research paper proposal must be approved before we will accept a draft of the research paper itself. The first date for graded written assignments is when you should hand in the draft (for comments, no grade) of each assignment. The second date is when you should hand in the revised version (for grade). The third date is the *terminus post quem non*, the date after which we will not accept any work on that assignment. The research paper, which counts 45% of the course grade, should be between 5000 and 6250 words (approximately 20–25 pages) long, and you should use 12-point type.

The questions on the mid-term quiz and final exam will test your knowledge and thinking ability. The mid-term quiz will take up the first half-hour of the class period on July 8. The rest of that class period will be a lecture. You will have 48 hours for the take-home final exam to be given out in class on August 3. You may return the exam via e-mail.

Definitions of “Draft” and “Revised” Versions:

The “draft” of a paper is defined as the first version handed in. The “revised” version of a paper is defined as the next version handed in that addresses the TA’s or instructor’s comments made on the “draft”. Only the “revised” version will receive a grade. Returned drafts need to be handed in along with revised versions.

Note on Use and Citation of Sources:

The responsibility for learning the rules governing the proper use of sources lies with the individual student. In registering for a course, students agree to abide by the policies printed in the Summer

School catalogue, pp. 96–98), which contains brief descriptions of plagiarism, cheating, and computer network abuse. Ignoring these policies may have unpleasant consequences. You will find an excellent introduction to proper citation in Gordon Harvey's *Writing with Sources: A Guide for Harvard Students*, 2nd ed. (Indianapolis: Hackett, 2008), which is also available online at <<http://isites.harvard.edu/fs/docs/icb.topic657773.files/WritingSourcesHarvard.pdf>>. You may also want to be familiar with *Writing with Internet Sources: A Guide for Harvard Students* (2007), at: <http://isites.harvard.edu/fs/docs/icb.topic500638.files/Writing_with_Internet_Sources.pdf>.

Required Reading. The following books are required and the first two are available at the Harvard Coop; the third is available online:

* Michael Hunt, *The World Transformed 1945 to the Present*, Boston and New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2004.

A textbook history of the world since the end of World War II

* Michael Hunt, *The World Transformed 1945 to the Present: A Documentary History*, Boston and New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2004.

Selections from primary sources

Primary Sources Supplement, vol. 2: *Since 1500*, ed. Donald Ostrowski, Minneapolis/St. Paul: West Publishing, 1995 (PSS) <<http://hudce7.harvard.edu/~ostrowski/empires/upshur2.pdf>>.

Especially Recommended for Graduate Students. The following book is a particularly useful resource for selecting a topic and for doing your research paper:

○ Michael D. Richards and Philip F. Reilly, *Term Paper Resource Guide to Twentieth-Century World History*, Greenwood Publishing, 2000.

Recommended Optional Reading. For those of you who would like a different standard textbook treatment but with an emphasis on international relations, I can recommend:

○ Wayne C. McWilliams and Harry Piotrowski, *The World since 1945: A History of International Relations*, Lynne Rienner, 2009.

For those of you who are interested in more information about the 20th century arranged as a year-by-year account, I can recommend:

○ Martin Gilbert, *A History of the Twentieth Century*, vol. 2: *1933–1951*, New York: Avon Books, 1998, and vol. 3: *1952–1999*, New York: Avon Books, 2000.

Additional Required Reading Options. Choose three [3] of the following books. I did not order them through the Coop because they all are widely available trade books:

○ Chinua Achebe, *A Man of the People*, Anchor Books, 1967, fiction (reissued 1989)
Novel about events preceding Nigerian revolution of 1966

- Peter Ackerman and Jack DuVall, *A Force More Powerful: A Century of Nonviolent Conflict*, St. Martin's Press, 2000. Approaching conflict through nonviolent means.
- Richard A. Clark and Robert Knake, *Cyber War: The Next Threat to National Security and What to Do about It*, Ecco, 2010. Internet and computer warfare issues
- Robert Cooper, *The Breaking of Nations: Order and Chaos in the Twenty-First Century*, Grove Press, 2004, non-fiction
Offers a typology of nations: premodern, modern, and postmodern
- Hernando De Soto, *The Other Path: The Economic Answer to Terrorism*, originally published 1985 (reissued by Basic Books with new foreword 2002), non-fiction.
Looks at problems of developing countries based on evidence from Peru
- Larry Everest, *Behind the Poison Cloud: Union Carbide's Bhopal Massacre*, Chicago: Banner, 1985, non-fiction. A critical and controversial look at a disaster in India.
- Thomas Friedman, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, Anchor Books, 2000, non-fiction.
Posits that globalization has replaced the Cold War as international system
- Le Ly Hayslip, *When Heaven and Earth Changed Places: A Vietnamese Women's Journey from War to Peace*, Doubleday, 1989, non-fiction.
The war in Viet Nam from a Vietnamese woman's point of view
- Liang Heng and Judith Shapiro, *Son of the Revolution*, Vintage, 1984, non-fiction.
First-hand account of the Cultural Revolution in China
- John Le Carré, *The Spy Who Came in from the Cold* (first published in 1964), fiction.
Espionage during the Cold War
- Milan Kundera, *The Unbearable Lightness of Being*, New York: Harper & Row, 1984, fiction.
Novel about the Czechoslovak Revolution of 1968
- Malcolm X with Alex Haley, *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*. 1st ed., 1964, non-fiction.
An introduction to the race problem in the U.S.
- Akio Morita, *Made in Japan: Akio Morita and Sony* New York: E. P. Dutton, 1986, non-fiction. One of the architects of the electronics revolution
- Hedrick Smith, *The Russians*, 2nd ed., Ballantine Books, 1984, non-fiction. The best book on what life was like in the Soviet Union
- Bill McKibben, *Deep Economy: The Wealth of Communities and the Durable Future*, Henry Holt, 2007. How ecological economics might save the world from itself.
- Anwar el-Sadat, *In Search of Identity: An Autobiography*, 1st ed., Harper, 1978, non-fiction.
An Egyptian view of the Middle East and the world by a major political figure.

- Lawrence Wright, *The Looming Tower: Al-Qaeda and the Road to 9/11*, New York: Vintage, 2007. Explores both the American and Arab sides of the September 11th attacks.

Note: You may substitute one of the following films for one of the books on the list above. It is recommended that you view the film twice as well as the commentary that comes on many DVDs.

From Cold War to Global Terror Films

- *The Good German* (2008), George Clooney, Cate Blanchett; dir. Steven Soderbergh
– conflicting interests in post-World War II Berlin
- *Good Night and Good Luck* (2005) [93 min], David Strathairn, George Clooney; dir. George Clooney – Edward R. Murrow in the McCarthy era
- *Moscow Does Not Believe in Tears* (1981) [150 min], dir. Vladimir Menshov – Life in the Soviet Union under Brezhnev
- *Battle of Algiers* (1966) [121 min], dir. Gillo Pontecorvo – Algerian fight for independence through terrorism in 1950s
- *Platoon* (1986) [120 min], Willem Dafoe, dir. Oliver Stone – U.S. military in Vietnam
- *The Lives of Others* (2006) [138 min] , dir. Florian Henckel von Donersmark, (R)
East Germans spy on other East Germans
- *The Beast* (1988) [110 min], dir. Kevin Reynolds – Soviet military in Afghanistan, based on the play *Nanawatai!*
- *The Last King of Scotland* (2006) [123 min], Forest Whitaker, James McAvoy; dir. Kevin MacDonald – Idi Amin, dictator of Uganda
- *Official Story* (1985) [112 min], dir. Luis Puenzo – A history teacher in Buenos Aires in the early 1980s confronts the “Dirty War”
- *The Circle ((Dayereh)* (2000) [91 min], dir. Jafar Panahi – Iranian women in a theocratic state
- *Blue Kite (Lan feng zheng)* (1993) [140 min], dir. Zhuangzhuang Tian – Life in China under Mao Zedong
- *Tokyo Sonata* (2008) [120 min], dir. Kiyoshi Kurosawa – Life in Japan
- *Mandela and de Klerk* (1997) [114 min], Sidney Poitier, Michael Caine; dir. Joseph Sargeant
– The end of apartheid in South Africa
- *Body of Lies* (2008) [128 min], Russell Crowe, Leonardo de Caprio, Mark Strong, Golshifteh Farahani; dir. Ridley Scott – Counter-terrorism in the Middle East

Lectures:**Readings:**A. *Introduction to the Course*

- June 22 1. Introduction: History as Investigation, or: Historical Methods and Approaches “Three Criteria of Historical Study”
2. The Origins of the Cold War Hunt 1–26
video: CNN, Cold War, “Berlin 1948–1949” *Reader* 2–40, 87–89, 427–432

B. *The Super Powers in the Post-World War II War*

- June 24 1. The United States, 1945–1991 Hunt 27–48
video: CNN, Cold War, “Make Love Not War: The Sixties” *Reader* 46–51, 145–150, 165–170, 180–183, 207–211, 279–283, 327–328
PSS 102–105
Autobiography of Malcolm X

June 25 **Draft of First Written Assignment Due** (you may submit the paper via e-mail)

- June 29 2. The Soviet Union, 1945–1991 Hunt 49–76
video: CNN, Cold War, “Red Spring: The Sixties” *Reader* 41–46, 132–145, 151–153, 193–196, 284–292
Smith, *The Russians*

C. *The Cold War Regime: Overview*

- July 1 1. The World’s Policeman: Crises in the Middle East, Latin America, and Africa Hunt 77–110
video: CNN, Cold War, “Cuban Missile Crisis” *Reader* 254–261, 272–275
Le Carre, Spy Who Came In
Draft of Second Undergraduate Written Assignment Due
Draft of Graduate Research Proposal Due
- July 6 2. The U.S. Excursion into “Star Trek” Diplomacy: Policymaking in the Rearview Mirror in China, Korea, and Southeast Asia Hunt 111–146
video: CNN, Cold War, “Korea,” “Viet Nam” *Reader* 106–117, 155–165
Website: “LBJ’s Foreign Policy”
When Heaven and Earth Changed Places
Revision of First Written Assignment Due for Grade

July 8 (6:30–7:00) **Mid-Term Quiz** (30 minutes)

D. *The Cold War Regime: Specific Cases*

- (7:00–9:30) 1. West European Reform and East European Revolutions Hunt 147–190
video: WGBH and BBC, *People’s Century*,
“People Power” *Reader* 154–155, 170–174,
184–193, 277–279, 302–316,
323–326, 335–341
Website: Margaret Thatcher
Kundera, *Unbearable Lightness*
- July 13 2. South Asia: Cultural Reassertion and Divergent
Economic Strategies Hunt 191–238
video: CNN, *Cold War*, “Soldiers of God: 1975–1988” *Reader* 117–130
Website: Nanawatai!
Revised Version of Graduate Research Proposal Due for Grade *Behind the Poison Cloud*
Draft of Third Undergraduate Written Assignment Due
- July 15 3. African Independence: Economic Development
in Reverse? Hunt 239–296
video: Ali Mazrui, *The Africans: A Triple Heritage*,
(8): “Tools of Exploitation” *Reader* 241–254
Website: Jomo Kenyatta
Achebe, A Man of the People
Second Undergraduate Written Assignment Due for Grade
- July 20 4. Latin America: The Shark and the Sardines Hunt 297–336
video: CNN, *Cold War*, “Backyard: 1954–1990” *Reader* 174–179, 375–386
Terminus post quem non for First Written Assignment PSS 106–110
Draft of Graduate Research Paper Due De Soto, *Other Path*
- July 22 5. The Middle East and North Africa: Necktie, Turban,
and Chador Hunt 337–382
video: PBS, *The 50 Years War: Israel and the Arabs* *Reader* 231–241, 364–375,
386–398
Website: Golda Meir
Sadat, *In Search
of Identity*
- July 27 6. China: Cultural Revolution and Economic
Transformation Hunt 383–415
video: CNN, *Cold War*, “China. 1949–1972” *Reader* 90–106,
268–272, 351–362

*Website: Mao Tse-Tung
Son of the Revolution*

7. Japan and the Pacific Rim: Economic Superpower
and the Little Dragons

video: *The Genius That Was China* (3): “The Threat
from Japan” (pt. 2)

Hunt 416–434
Reader 53–63, 83–87,
203–207
Morito, *Made in Japan*

Terminus post quem non for 2nd Undergraduate Written Assignment

E. *The Global Terror Regime*

- July 29 1. “Halcyon” Days of the 1990s and Their End in 2001
video: Bob Cringely, *Triumph of the Nerds*,
vol. 2: “Riding the Bear”

Hunt 435–452
Reader 328–334, 341–350
*Website: Mandela
Lexus and Olive Tree*

Third Undergraduate Written Assignment Due for Grade

- Aug. 3 2. The Global Market Place and the Global Terror Regime
video: “Torturing Democracy” (view before class
(available online))

Hunt 452–469
Reader 400–427,
432–442
Breaking of Nations
or *Deep Economy*
or *The Second World*
or *A Force More Powerful*
or *The Looming Tower*

- Aug. 3 **Final Examination** (take-home exam to be handed out in class)
Graduate Research Paper Due for Grade

Note: Under “Lectures/Readings” on pages 6 through 8 of this syllabus, I have indicated by double underlining the recommended week for reading each of the additional-required-reading-option books.

* available at Harvard Coop textbooks department

○ available for purchase at virtual bookstores (like Amazon.com, BarnesandNoble.com, Borders.com, VarsityBooks.com, BookFinder.com, Bibiliofind.com, etc.), at physical bookstores (like the Barnes and Noble, Borders, Harvard Coop book store, and Harvard Bookstore, etc.), or for borrowing at your local library.

Essay Assignments

First Written Assignment: Presenting Evidence (10% of Course Grade)

Available on the course website are five sets of readings: (1) Jomo Kenyatta, (2) Nelson Mandela, (3) Golda Meier, (4) Margaret Thatcher, and (5) Mao Tse-Tung. Read all five sets and then choose one set to write about.

You are to write two-and-one-half (2½) pages (or about 625 words), which will contain a total of five (5) double-spaced paragraphs—which most likely will appear as two on the first page, two on the second, and one on the third.

The first paragraph is to be an introduction (which you may want to write last). This introductory paragraph provides some orientation to the reader for what follows and a statement of the main theme of your essay. The TA will be looking for a general introduction to the topic and a strongly worded thesis sentence toward the end of the paragraph.

The next three paragraphs are to be brief summaries of each major section within the set you have chosen. Thus, if you were to choose the Jomo Kenyatta set of readings, you would write one paragraph summarizing the selection from the primary source, Kenyatta's *Suffering without Bitterness*. You would write one paragraph summarizing the selection from Donald L. Barnett and Karari Njama. And you would write one paragraph summarizing the selection from Jeremy Murray-Brown. The wording of your summaries should be as neutral as you can make it—no editorializing and no value judgments either explicit or implicit.

In your fifth paragraph, you will briefly recapitulate your main theme and point out evidence from the summary paragraphs that relate to this theme. Briefly give your own opinion about the set of readings you have just summarized. Ideally, whatever you mention in the fifth paragraph, you should have previously referred to in one of the first four paragraphs. Make sure there is a correlation between your first (introductory) paragraph, where you state the theme of your paper, and your fifth (concluding) paragraph, where you present your conclusions.

This exercise is meant to fulfill two purposes: (1) to allow you to demonstrate that you know the difference between straight presentation of evidence, on the one hand, and analysis and interpretation, on the other; and (2) to give you practice in succinct summarizing and characterization of what you have read. Finally, be aware that the structure of this 5-paragraph essay is the basic structure for all expository writing, including longer papers, exam essays, articles, and books.

Second Undergraduate Written Assignment: Formulating a Logical Argument
(20% of course grade)

Choose one of the books from “Additional Required Reading Options” list. Pick out a statement, assertion, or proposition relating to the author’s interpretation in that book to analyze. The analysis should take the statement apart into its various components and put it back together again. The main part of your analysis should include a logical argument or arguments.

A logical argument is a chain of reasoning, such that if the premises are accepted, then the conclusion must be accepted. An example of a chain of reasoning formulated in the early fifth century A.D. follows. It is from a letter that Caspar Weinberger, then U.S. Secretary of Defense, sent to selected newspapers in countries that were members of NATO. It provides an argument for nuclear deterrence:

The policy of deterrence is difficult for some to grasp because it is based on a paradox. But this is quite simple: to make the cost of a nuclear war much higher than any possible “benefit” to the country starting it. If the Soviets know in advance that a nuclear attack on the United States could and would bring swift nuclear retaliation, they would never attack in the first place.... But for deterrence to continue to be successful in the future we must take steps to offset the Soviet military build-up. If we do not modernize our arsenal now, as the Soviets have been doing for more than 20 years, we will, within a few years, no longer have the ability to retaliate. The Soviet Union would then be in a position to threaten or actually to attack us with the knowledge that we would be incapable of responding.... This is exactly why we must have a capability for a survivable and enduring response—to demonstrate that our strategic forces could survive Soviet strikes over an extended period.

The outward signs of a logical argument can include “if ..., then ...” phrases, and words like “therefore” and “thus.” Sometimes these words and phrases are only implicit. In the passage above, Weinberger uses two “if ..., then...” constructions and one “[t]his is exactly why,” equivalent to “therefore.” Unless the argument is a fallacious one and, therefore, not logical, the only way to avoid acceptance of the conclusion is to challenge the premises or the evidence that argument relies on.

Present as fairly as you can whatever it is you are analyzing and whatever evidence or logical arguments would seem to support it. Then marshal your evidence and logical arguments for and/or against it. For example, you might analyze an assertion in Chinua Achebe’s *A Man of the People*. You could point out evidence and argument that shows this assertion is a faulty one. Or you might argue that the assertion is a simplistic one that does not take into account the complexity of the issue. Or you might disagree with a statement in Hernando De Soto’s *The Other Path: The Economic Answer to Terrorism* or something Akio Morita asserted in *Made in Japan*. Or you may take issue with something in Anwar el-Sadat’s *In Search of Identity: An Autobiography*. In any event, avoid writing a book review, a read-write summary, or subjective evaluation of the book. We will judge your essay on the logic of the argument and your use of evidence, not on what you decide to analyze.

Your essay should be no longer than 1250 words (approximately five [5] pages). This exercise is meant for you to develop and demonstrate your analytical skills. Follow the same procedure as you did in the first essay: state your main theme in the first paragraph, present your evidence and logical argument in the middle paragraphs, and recapitulate your theme in the final paragraph. But do pick a topic different from that of your first essay. We will judge your essay on the basis of the criteria discussed in the “Course Goals” and in “Three Criteria of Historical Study.”

Third Undergraduate Written Assignment: Constructing an Interpretation
(30% of course grade)

By this point in the course, you will be familiar with a number of different interpretations of aspects of world history from 1945 to the present. And you will have had a chance to formulate your own ideas and interpretations. You may have realized that everything derives from some kind of interpretive framework.

Your assignment is to identify an interpretation in **two** (2) of the books you have chosen from “Additional Required Reading Options.” You could then present your own point of view on this aspect or aspects of world history. Try to tie your paper in with other readings in the course and the lectures, or even one or more of the films. An interpretation is an explanation of something. While it can involve use of, and be based on, logical argument, it goes beyond the argument itself to try to elucidate why something is the way it is. An interpretation in historical study can take the form of a narrative or of an analysis, but it should, in any case, fulfill the requirements of a hypothesis testable against the evidence with more research.

An example of an analytical interpretation follows. It is taken from T. E. Vadney, *The World since 1945* (Penguin, 1998), 550, in which Vadney explains Soviet policy toward Third World revolutionary movements:

The former Soviet Union certainly had an interest in encouraging anti-Western forces in the Third World, but its motives tended to be pragmatic rather than ideological, having more to do with the national security and self-interest of the USSR than any mission to spread social revolution. Soviet policy was calculated to achieve strategic gains by winning allies in the East-West struggle and therefore tended to be opportunistic. Hence Moscow was much more likely to take advantage of existing revolutionary movements in the Third World than to try to create them itself. For example, the Soviets had nothing to do with fomenting the 1979 revolution in Nicaragua, whereas US support for the Somoza dictatorship contributed directly to the outcome, though subsequently the USSR provided small amounts of aid to the Sandinistas.

Vadney characterizes his interpretation in the first line and presents this explanation as a way of understanding the evidence and the logical surmises we make from that evidence. The statement that the Soviet policy was not ideological but pragmatic and based more on considerations of “national security and self-interest” than disseminating “social revolution” is also a hypothesis that can be tested against the evidence by doing further research.

Your essay should be no longer than 1750 to 2000 words (approximately seven [7] to eight [8] pages). Not only should the essay be your own work, it should also show some originality. Merely repeating someone else’s interpretation does not fulfill the assignment. Follow the same procedure as you did in the first two essays in terms of stating your main theme in the first paragraph, presenting your evidence and logical argument in the middle paragraphs and recapitulating your theme in the final paragraph. Neither of the books you choose should be the same as the one for your second written assignment. We will judge your essay on the basis of the criteria discussed in the “Course Goals” and in “Three Criteria of Historical Study.”

Some possible ways to proceed: In writing a paper on two of the books you have read for this course, you could choose one (1) of the following options. Read the two (2) books listed under that option. Compare and analyze them. Interpret (i.e., explain) the findings of your comparison and analysis. Your interpretation (explanation) should be based on a fair presentation of the evidence and structured argument. Be sure to place your findings in a historical context by relating them to the lectures, discussions, or other readings in the course. You are allowed to substitute a book or books for any of the following with the instructor's permission.

Option 1

- Larry Everest, *Behind the Poison Cloud: Union Carbide's Bhopal Massacre*, Chicago: Banner, 1985, non-fiction.
- Malcolm X with Alex Haley, *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*. 1st ed., 1964, non-fiction.
Question for consideration: In both books, the authors focus on the theme of injustice, one in regard to India, the other in regard to the United States. How do they do so and how representative are their respective depictions of injustice in the modern world? What are their respective proposals for resolving the injustice they experienced?

Option 2

- Chinua Achebe, *A Man of the People*, Anchor Books, 1967, fiction (reissued 1989)
- Anwar el-Sadat, *In Search of Identity: An Autobiography*, 1st ed., Harper, 1978, non-fiction.
Question for consideration: The focus of both Achebe's novel and Sadat's autobiography are young men in politics in developing countries. To what extent are their experiences similar and to what extent are they different? To what can we attribute the differences?

Option 3

- Hernando De Soto, *The Other Path: The Economic Answer to Terrorism*, 1st ed., 1986, non-fiction.
- David Remnick, *Lenin's Tomb: The Last Days of the Soviet Empire*, Random House, 1992, non-fiction.
Questions for consideration: Both books deal with the problems of areas of the world that have suffered considerable hardship. Like Peru, the Soviet Union during the second half of the 20th century was one of political oppression combined with social and economic development. To what extent are the two areas of the world comparable? What biases do the respective authors of these books influenced their interpretations?

Option 4

- Liang Heng and Judith Shapiro, *Son of the Revolution*, Vintage, 1984, non-fiction.
- *The Lives of Others* (2006), dir. Florian Henckel von Donersmark, fiction.
Questions for consideration: Both books are set in countries that have communist regimes, one Chinese, the other European. How are their experiences similar? How do they differ? To what extent can we attribute the differences to the different cultures of their societies?

Option 5

- Le Ly Hayslip, *When Heaven and Earth Changed Places: A Vietnamese Women's Journey from*

War to Peace, Doubleday, 1989, non-fiction.

- John Le Carré, *The Spy Who Came in from the Cold* (first published in 1964), fiction.
Questions for consideration: Both works deals with a period when the Cold War was the prevailing paradigm of international relations. Hayslip's book describe the interaction of the American military presence in an Asian country, while Le Carré's describes British espionage in a European country. In both books, communism is contrasted with the ideals of a free and open society. How does this theoretical contrast play out in practice? To what extent are they able to overcome the differences?

Option 6

- Thomas Friedman, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, Anchor Books, 2000, non-fiction.
- Akio Morita, *Made in Japan: Akio Morita and Sony*. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1986, non-fiction.
Questions for consideration: Morita's book is a personal memoir of economic practice during the Cold War while Friedman describes a post-Cold War paradigm. To what extent are Morita's practice and Friedman's paradigm similar and to what extent do they differ? How well does each practice and paradigm correspond to their respective time periods?

Option 7

- Peter Ackerman and Jack DuVall, *A Force More Powerful: A Century of Nonviolent Conflict*, St. Martin's Press, 2000. non-fiction.
- Lawrence Wright, *The Looming Tower: Al-Qaeda and the Road to 9/11*, Vintage Books, 2007. non-fiction.
Questions for consideration: The claim of the book by Ackerman and Du Vall is that non-violence can overcome violent conflict. The history of the United States and of Al-Queda has been one of violence. To what degree can we say that nonviolent conflict has triumphed over violent conflict and vice-versa? What have been the conditions necessary for one or the other to succeed?

Option 8

Choose your own two books to compare. Use your innate ingenuity to formulate your own question or questions to answer. Note: Please obtain instructor or teaching assistant approval for your topic.

Other possible question to consider: Do those countries that have European cultures and those countries that have non-European cultures have anything to learn from each other? If so, what new synthesis will emerge? If not, why not?

Graduate Research Proposal

(3 pages) (750 words) (5% of final grade)

In your proposal, which should be 3 pages long, you need to indicate a tentative title for your research paper. Then devote a paragraph to each of the following points:

1. General introduction to the topic
2. Description of research question(s)
3. Description of tentative answer (hypothesis)
4. Types of sources you plan to use to test your hypothesis
5. Broader implications of your research

Include a working bibliography with works cited, works consulted (with a one-line annotation), and works to be consulted.

For format style, use *A Guide to the ALM Thesis*, 6th ed. (available on-line at <http://www.extension.harvard.edu/2004-05/libarts/alm/reqs/thesis.jsp#resources>). Use either the *Chicago Manual of Style* or the *MLA Handbook for Writers of Research Papers*.

Graduate Research Paper

(20–25 pages) (5000–6500 words) (45% of final grade)

In your research paper, follow the standard format for an expository essay. State your hypothesis up front. Provide a roadmap for the reader to show how you will present the results of your research. Then close with a conclusion that recapitulates your hypothesis and any modifications that you have made in it along the way. You may choose to research further an aspect of one of the following controversies that will be discussed in the lectures:

- The Nature of Historical Study
- Relationship of Science and Religion
- Beginning of the Cold War: Why and How?
- End of the Cold War: Why and How?
- Global Regime after the Cold War
- Islam and Its Clash with Modernity: What Went Wrong and Why?
- Can Democracy Survive Counter-Terrorism?

Or you may choose one of the topics from Richards and Reilly, *Term Paper Resource Guide*, to develop further, among which are:

- Juan Peron and Argentine Politics, 1946–1955
- Ho Chi Minh and the Vietnamese War against the French, 1946–1954
- The Japanese Economic Miracle in the 1950s
- The Korean War, 1950–1953

- The Discovery of the Double Helical Structure of DNA, 1953
- The Guatemalan Coup, 1954
- Khrushchev’s “Secret Speech” at the 20th Party Congress, 1956
- Gamel Abdel Nasser and the Suez Crisis, 1956
- The Hungarian Revolution, 1956
- Kwame Nkrumah and the Independence of Ghana, 1957
- The Founding of the European Economic Community, 1957
- France and the Algerian Revolution, 1954–1962
- Fidel Castro and the Cuban Revolution, 1959
- Apartheid in South Africa from the 1950s to the 1970s
- The Berlin Wall, 1961
- The Sino-Soviet Split, 1959–1969
- The “Green Revolution” in Agriculture in the 1960s
- Vatican II, 1962–1965
- The Cuban Missile Crisis, 1962
- The Beatles, 1964
- The Six-Day War, 1967
- Civil War in Nigeria (Biafra), 1967–1970
- The 1968 Tet Offensive
- May 1968 in France
- The Prague Spring, 1968
- Northern Ireland and “The Troubles,” 1969–1998
- Pol Pot and the Cambodian Incursion, 1970–1979
- The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China, 1966–1976
- OPEC and the Oil Price Shock, 1973
- The Overthrow of Salvador Allende in Chile, 1973
- The Helsinki Accords, 1975
- Terrorism in the 1970s
- Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini and the Iranian Revolution, 1979
- Margaret Thatcher and the Conservative Revolution in Britain, 1979–1990
- Solidarity in Poland, 1980–1990
- The Israeli Invasion of Lebanon, 1982
- The Iran-Iraq War, 1980–1988
- Chernobyl, 1986
- The Montreal Protocol, 1987
- The Sandinistas and the Contras in Nicaragua, 1981–1989
- Vaclav Havel and the “Velvet Revolution,” 1989
- German Reunification, 1989–1990
- The Breakup of the Soviet Union, 1991
- Nelson Mandela and the End of Apartheid in South Africa, 1989–1994
- The Dissolution of Yugoslavia in the 1990s
- Genocide in Rwanda, 1994
- The Asian Economic Meltdown at the End of the 1990s
- John Paul II’s First Twenty Years as Pope, 1978–1999
- The Internet
- The Chinese Economy 1990–2010

Course Ground Rules

This syllabus is a statement of intent and not a legal contract. As such, I reserve the right to change or modify it, but changes or modifications will be done only with fair warning. At the Extension School, Harvard University standards apply across the board, including amount of work required and grading. There is no watering down or special allowance in this regard.

The course is writing intensive, which means you will have a chance to practice your writing skills and receive comments on your essays more than in the usual history course. It does not mean that we guarantee to make you a better writer, nor will you be evaluated on your writing skills, except insofar as lack of such skills negatively affects the articulation of your ideas. Becoming a better writer, like learning in general, is up to you. The world of learning is open to you and the process is never ending. One of the aims of this course is to provide you a means to continue studying history on your own after the course is over. We will do our best to assist you in the learning process, but in the end what you get out of the course is mainly up to you.

There are thirteen 3-hour classes in this course. Even if I wanted to I could not possibly cover all of post-World War II world history during class time. What I can do is select certain topics and go into a little more depth than the readings provide. One of the aims of this course is to inspire you to investigate aspects of history on your own. I will try to provide to you some indication of what to look for and how to orient yourself when undertaking that further investigation. I firmly believe that every person benefits from learning to be their own historian. As a result, the human community benefits as well. For that to happen, however, you must not uncritically and unquestioningly adopt someone else's interpretations, but instead you must think things through for yourself and come to your own conclusions. That is why I place so much emphasis on method, as opposed to so-called "facts." Facts as such are not given but are frequently the result of some historian's (biased) interpretation and (faulty) argument. It is up to you to spot the biases and fallacies and to ascertain the evidence for yourself. As A. W. Tozer wrote: "The best book is not the one that informs merely but the one that stirs the reader up to inform him [or her]self" ("Some Thoughts on Books and Reading," p. 149).

Since the time is limited, I cannot engage in extended class discussions while giving the lecture. I do encourage you to ask questions in terms of points of clarification and contributing to general understanding. If you have a point or points of dispute with something in the lecture (that is, you understand what I am saying but you do not agree with it), I am more than willing to discuss the issues with you outside class, but class time is short and we should all try to use it efficiently.

Give us at least *one week* to grade each of your assignments. We would prefer that you not ask special favors in terms of getting your paper back in less time. You may, however, hand in your assignments earlier than the deadlines. We will mark the drafts with a ✓-, ✓, or ✓+. The ✓- means a total rewrite is necessary and you should talk with your teaching assistant about it. A ✓ means you are headed in the right direction but substantial changes are required. A ✓+ means your essay is almost there in terms of getting a good grade. It does not, however, guarantee an A on the next version. If you choose not to hand in a revised version after you have done the draft, we will count the assignment as incomplete and will enter the following equivalent grades for computation of your final course grade: ✓- = E; ✓ = D; ✓+ = C. Please consider this as an incentive to complete the assignments.

Finally, I urge you to be open to new ideas, tolerant of different viewpoints, and willing to try to understand that which may seem alien. Learning should be an enjoyable process, which is not to say that hard work is not involved. But that hard work can evoke a sense of satisfaction and achievement. The ultimate goal in this course is for you to come away with a sense of the joy of learning about what before was unknown and of understanding what before was puzzling. That is our common endeavor.