

WORLD HISTORY III: The Age of Empires
1500 to 1800
Autumn 2007

Harvard University Extension School
phone: (617)495-4547
office hours: MonTueFri 2:00-6:00 p.m.

instructor: Donald Ostrowski
office: 51 Brattle St. E-703
email: don@wjh.harvard.edu

Teaching Assistants:

Gail Gardner
email: gparis13@post.harvard.edu
phone: 617-492-0618
office hours: WedThur 1-5 (Gato Rojo)

John Levy
email: johnisaaclevy@yahoo.com
phone: 781-324-1670

Karen J. Wilson
email: kjwilson3@yahoo.com
phone: 978-275-6927 (o); 978-255-2279 (h)

Course Website:

<<http://hudce7.harvard.edu/~ostrowski/empires>>

Discussion Sessions:

Mondays 6:30–7:30 (Wilson)
51 Brattle, rm. 121
Tuesdays 6:00–7:00 (Levy)
51 Brattle, rm. 721
Thursdays 6:00–7:00 (Gardner)
51 Brattle, rm. 721

Course Goals: To investigate ideas about world history from 1500 to 1800, 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 the course handout “Three Criteria of Historical Study” <<http://hudce7.harvard.edu/~ostrowski/history.pdf>>

Grading:

	<i>Draft</i>	<i>Graded</i>	<i>TPQN</i>
10% First Written Assignment (see p. 7)	Oct 3	Oct 17	Nov 7
10% Mid-Term Quiz		Oct 24	
20% Second Written Assignment (see p. 8)	Oct 31	Nov 14	Dec 12
30% Third Written Assignment (see p. 9)	Dec 5	Dec 19	Jan 9
30% Final Examination		Jan 16	

In the writing assignments you have a chance to demonstrate your conceptual thinking ability. The questions for the writing 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 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. You must hand in two versions of each writing assignment (a “draft” and a “revised” version) to receive a grade on that assignment.

Graduate Student Grading and Deadlines

	<i>Draft</i>	<i>Graded</i>	<i>TPQN</i>
10% First Writing Assignment (see p. 7)	Oct 3	Oct 17	Nov 14
10% Mid-Term Quiz		Oct 24	
5% Proposal for Research Paper (see p. 10)	Oct 31	Nov 14	—
45% Research Paper (see pp. 10–11)	Dec 5	Dec 19	Jan 9
30% Final Examination		Jan 16	

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 (see recommended topics on page 13). First, consult with your teaching assistant and/or the instructor about focusing on a topic. Then follow the guidelines in *A Guide to the ALM Thesis*, 6th ed., pp. 12–41. Prepare and write draft and revisions of the proposal (2–3 pages) and research paper outside of class and hand them in on the designated due dates (see page 10 of this syllabus for further details). A grade representing 5% of your final grade is given for the proposal, and a proposal must be approved before we will accept the research paper itself. The first date 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. 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 should be between 5000 and 6500 words (approximately 20–25 pages) long, and you should use 12-point font. You must hand in two versions (“draft” and “revised”) of a proposal and two versions (“draft” and “revised”) of the research paper to receive a grade on that research paper.

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. See “Guidelines for Writing-Intensive Courses” (p. 11).

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 on the Extension School website, 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* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1998), which is available at the Harvard Coop and online at <<http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~expos/sources>>.

Examinations:

The questions on the mid-term quiz and final exam will test your knowledge and thinking ability. Both tests will be given in the classroom. The mid-term quiz will take up the first half-hour of the class period on October 24. The rest of that class period will be a lecture. You will have 1½ hours on January 16 for the final exam. I will hand out sample questions for each exam.

Required Reading for Graduate and Undergraduate Students:

- Peter N. Stearns, Michael Adas, Stuart B. Schwartz, and Marc Jason Gilbert, *World Civilizations: The Global Experience*, vol. 2: *1450 to Present*, 5th ed. (New York: Pearson, 2008).
- Alfred J. Andrea and James H. Overfield, *The Human Record: Sources of Global History*, vol. 2: *Since 1500*, 5th ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2006).
- # *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>>.
- Miguel Leon-Potilla, ed., *Broken Spears: The Aztecs Account of the Conquest of Mexico*, expanded ed. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1992).
Spanish conquest of the Aztecs from the Aztec point of view
- Hans Jakob Christoffel von Grimmelshausen, *Simplicissimus* (1st published in 1669), translated by Mike Mitchell (Sawtry: Dedalus, 2006).
17th-century novel about the European religious wars
- Maurice Collis, *The Land of the Great Image* (New York: New Directions, 1985; 1943).
The adventures of Father Manrique in Arakan
- Noel Perrin, *Giving Up the Gun: Japan's Reversion to the Sword, 1543–1879* (Boston: David R. Godine, 1979).
How the Japanese adopted the gun, then gave it up during the Tokugawa Shogunate
- *The Memoirs of Catherine Dashkova*, ed. and trans. Kiril Fitzlyon (Chapel Hill, NC: Duke University Press, 1995).
Friend of Catherine II and Director of the Russian Academy of Sciences
- Jonathan D. Spence, *The Emperor of China: Self-Portrait of Kang-Hsi* (New York: Random House, 1974). Experiences of an 18th-century Chinese emperor
- # Voltaire, *Candide, or Optimism* (first published in 1759), fiction <<http://www.literature.org/authors/voltaire/candide>>. Novel about whether this is the best of all possible worlds

In addition, graduates students will be using the following text:

- *Discovering the Global Past: A Look at the Evidence*, vol. 2: *Since 1400*, 3rd ed., edited by Merry E. Wiesner, William Bruce W. Wheeler, Franklin M. Doeringer, and Kenneth R. Curtis (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2002).

All books, except *Primary Sources Supplement* and *Candide*, which are available on-line, have been ordered through the Harvard Coop bookstore.

Lectures:**Readings:**A. *The Proper Occupation of the Historian*

- | | | |
|---------|--|---------------------------------------|
| Sept 19 | 1. <u>Introduction: Demystifying History (or: The Virtual Past, the Historical Past, and the Goals of This Course)</u> | “Three Criteria of Historical Study”* |
| | 2. <u>The Shape of World History during the Early Modern Period: Aspects of the Western Ascendancy</u> | (no assigned reading) |
| | 3. <u>Renaissance Humanism: Men for All Seasons</u>
Video: Kenneth Clark, <i>Civilisation</i> , no. 5: “The Hero as Artist” | |

B. *Kings, Nobles, and Religious Intolerance*

- | | | |
|---------|---|---|
| Sept 26 | 1. <u>Establishment of Overseas Empires: Murder, Disease, and the Demographic Numbers Game</u>
video: “The Day the Universe Changed (3): Scientific Imagination in the Renaissance (James Burke) Fletcher | Stearns 452–477
“Elizabeth I”*
<i>Record</i> P-1–P-18, 86–95
Fletcher, “Integrative History”* |
| Oct 3 | 2. <u>Early Latin America: The Conflicts of the Gods and of Cultural Paradigms</u>
video: “The Buried Mirror: The Conflict of the Gods” (Carlos Fuentes); “The Ascent of Man (3): The Grain in the Stone (Bronowski) | Stearns 514–541
“Montezuma”*
<i>Record</i> 127–146
<i>Broken Spears</i>
<i>PSS</i> 49–54
Clendinnen, “Fierce”* |
| | Draft of first writing assignment due | |
| Oct 10 | 3. <u>“Go, and Spread the Word”: The 11th Commandment?</u> (guest lecturer: Gail Gardner)
video: “The Day the Universe Changed (4): Printing Transforms Knowledge” (James Burke) | Stearns 478–485
“Luther”*
<i>Record</i> 69–85
<i>Simplicissimus</i> (begin) |
| Oct 17 | 4. <u>The Grand Political Experiment: Institutional Limitations on the Power of the Ruler</u>
video: “The Day the Universe Changed (5): Science Revises the Heavens” part 1 (James Burke) | Stearns 485–486, 489–492
“Louis XIV”*
<i>Record</i> 37–39, 95–106,
165–169, 181–184
<i>Simplicissimus</i> (finish)
Henshall, “Myth of Absolutism”* |
| | Revised version of first writing assignment due | |

Oct 24 (5:30–6:00): **Mid-Term Quiz**

(6:00–7:25):

5. Africa: Kano, Kongo, and Kilwa Stearns 542–565
video: “Africa (3): The King and the City” *African Past* (excerpts)*
(Basil Davidson) *Record* 113–127, 204–216

- Oct 31 6. Muscovite Rus’ Becomes the Russian Empire:
Changing Administrative and Military Models Stearns 498–513
Draft of second writing assignment due (undergrads) “Peter the Great”*
Draft of proposal for graduate research paper due (grad students) “Catherine the Great”*
Record 173–181
Memoirs of Dashkova
Ostrowski, “Façade”*

C. *Protecting Civilization from the Barbarians*

- Nov 7 1. Ottoman Empire and Sharifian Morocco: The Western Reaches
of Civilization under Seige Stearns 566–576
video: “Süleyman the Magnificent” “Suleyman”*
Record 40–47, 58–60,
Terminus post quem non for first writing assignment revision due 64–68, 216–221
Hodgson, “Role of Islam” (begin)*
Great Image (begin)

- Nov 14 2. Safavid Persia and Mogul India: The Islamic Center Stearns 576–591
video: “The Isfahan of Shah ‘Abbas”(Oleg Grabar) “Akbar”* “Shah Abbas I”*
Revised version of second writing assignment due (undergrads) *Record* 48–56, 61–64,
Revised version of proposal for graduate research paper due (grad students) 221–228
Hodgson, “Role of Islam” (finish)*
Great Image (finish)

- Nov 28 3. China Says to the West: We Have Nothing to Learn
from You Stearns 592–609
video: “The Genius That Was China (2): Invention of Progress” *Record* 5–14, 18–27
33–36, 235–247
Emperor of China
Perdue, “Military Mobilization”*

- Dec 5 4. Japan’s Selective Rejection of New Technology:
Coming Out from under the Gun Stearns 609–613
“Tokugawa Ieyasu”*

video: “The Genius That Was China (3): Dreams of Wealth and Power”; “The Ascent of Man (4): The Hidden Structure” (Bronowski) *Record* 15–18, 27–32, 247–256
Giving Up the Gun

Draft of third writing assignment due (undergrads)
Draft of graduate research paper due (grad students)

D. *The Revolution in Europeans’ Outlook on the World*

Dec 12 1. The Seventeenth-Century Scientific Revolution: Mathematics and Rhetoric in the Service of the Counter-Intuitive Stearns 486–489
 “Galileo”*
Record 106–112, 147–157
 video: “Day the Universe Changed (5): Science Ascent 188–243*
 Science Revises the Heavens” part 2 (James Burke)

Terminus post quem non for second writing assignment

Dec 19 2. The Enlightenment: The Triumph of Rationalism and the Bankruptcy of Reason Stearns 492–497
 “Voltaire”*
 video: “Day the Universe Changed (8): Darwin’s “Rousseau”*
 Revolution” part 1 (James Burke) *Record* 158–164, 169–173

Revised version of third writing assignment due (undergrads) *Candide*
Revised version of graduate research paper due (grad students)

Jan 2 3. The French Start Out to Make a Small Revolution and End Up Making a Big One Stearns 622–628
 “Napoleon”*
 video: “Day the Universe Changed (7): Social *Record* 184–200
 Impact of the New Medical Knowledge” Doyle, “Writings on
 Revolutionary Origins”*

Jan 9 Summing Up: The World 1500–1800 (review)

Terminus post quem non for third writing assignment revision (undergrads)
Terminus post quem non for graduate research paper revision (grad students)

Jan 16 **Final Exam** (5:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.)

Jan 21 Grades due in Registrar’s Office

* Reading to be handed out in class

First Writing Assignment: Presenting Evidence
(2½ pages; 650 words)(10% of course grade)

In class, you have been given handouts that contains three sets of readings: (1) Martin Luther, (2) Montezuma, and (3) Elizabeth I. Read all three sets and then choose one to write about.

You are to write two-and-one-half (2½) pages, which will contain a total of five (5) double-spaced paragraphs—two on the first page, two on the second, and one on the third. The first paragraph will 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 next three paragraphs are to be brief summaries of each major section within the set you have chosen. Thus, if you choose the Martin Luther set of readings, you will write one paragraph summarizing the selection from the primary source, Luther's *Tabletalk*, one paragraph summarizing the selection from Hartmann Grisar, and one paragraph summarizing the selection from Erwin Iserloh. If you choose the Montezuma set of readings, you will write one paragraph summarizing the selection from the letter of Hernan Cortes, one paragraph summarizing the selection from the *Codex Florentino*, and one paragraph summarizing the selection from J. H. Elliott and Anthony Pagden. If you choose the Elizabeth I set of readings, you will write one paragraph summarizing the selection from Sir Francis Bacon, one paragraph summarizing the selection from James Anthony Froude, and one paragraph summarizing the selection from Garrett Mattingly. 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 some correlation between your first (introductory) paragraph and your fifth (concluding) paragraph.

This exercise is meant to fulfill two purposes: (1) to allow you to demonstrate that you know the difference between direct 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.

Second Undergraduate Writing Assignment: Formulating a Logical Argument
(5 pages; 1250 words)(20% of course grade)

Choose a statement, argument, or interpretation—either in the readings or the lectures—that you disagree with. In writing up your disagreement, include a logical argument opposed to it. 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 seventeenth century follows. It is from Galileo’s *Dialogue concerning Two New Sciences* and is an argument against Simpleton who is defending Aristotle’s theory of falling weights:

Aristotle declares that bodies of different weights in the same medium travel (insofar as their motion depends upon gravity) with speeds that are proportional to their weights. . . . If we take two bodies whose natural speeds are different, it is clear that on uniting the two, the more rapid one will be partly retarded by the slower, and the slower one will be somewhat hastened by the swifter But if this is true, and if a large stone moves with a speed of, say, eight while a smaller moves with a speed of four, then when they are united, the system will move with a speed less than eight. But the two stones when tied together make a stone larger than that which before moved with a speed of eight. Therefore, the heavier body moves with less speed than the lighter; an effect that is contrary to your supposition. Thus, you see how from your assumption that the heavier body moves more rapidly than the lighter one, I infer that the heavier body moves more slowly.

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, Galileo uses two explicit “if..., then...” constructions, one “[t]herefore” and one “[t]hus.” The point is that, unless the argument is a fallacious one and, therefore, not logical, the only way to avoid acceptance of the conclusion is to attack the premises or the evidence.

Present as fairly as you can the other side, that is whatever it is you are disagreeing with and whatever evidence or logical argument would seem to support it. Then marshal your evidence and logical argument against it. For example, you might disagree with an assertion I made in the lectures. 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 particular statement in the textbook or one of the readings, for example, something in *Broken Spears* or something Grimmelshausen asserted in *Simplicissimus*. In any event, we will judge your essay on the logic of the argument and your use of evidence, not on what you decide to oppose.

Your essay should be no longer than 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 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. 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 Writing Assignment: Constructing an Interpretation
(8 pages; 2000 words)(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 between 1500 and 1800. And you will have had a chance to formulate your own ideas and interpretations. Your assignment is to construct an interpretation that provides an explanation of a set of primary source evidence. You might, for example, begin your essay by analyzing the point of view of the author of the textbook. You could then present your own point of view on an aspect or aspects of world history. 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 Garrett Mattingly, *The Armada* (p. 397), in which Mattingly explains what is and what is not significant about the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588 at the hands of the English:

Historians agree that the defeat of the Spanish Armada was a decisive battle, in fact one of the Decisive Battles of the World, but there is much less agreement as to what it decided. It certainly did not decide the issue of the war between England and Spain. Though no fleet opposed Drake, ... the war dragged itself out for nearly fourteen years more ... and ended in no better than a draw. Some historians say that the defeat of the Armada “marked the decline of the Spanish colonial empire and the rise of the British.” It is hard to see why they think so. By 1603, Spain had not lost to the English a single overseas outpost, while the English colonization of Virginia had been postponed for the duration. Nor did the Armada campaign “transfer the command of the sea from Spain to England.” English sea power in the Atlantic had usually been superior to the combined strengths of Castile and Portugal, and so it continued to be, but after 1588 the margin of superiority diminished. The defeat of the Armada was not so much the end as the beginning of the Spanish navy.

Mattingly characterizes his interpretation in the last line and presents this expansion as a way of understanding the evidence and the logical surmises we make from that evidence. The statement that the Armada’s defeat represented the beginning of the Spanish navy is also a hypothesis that can be tested against the evidence.

Your essay should be no longer than 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. We will judge your essay on the basis of the criteria discussed in the “Course Goals” and in “Three Criteria of Historical Study.”

Graduate Research Proposal

(2–3 pages) (500–750 words)(5% of final grade)

In your proposal, which should be 2–3 pages long, you need to indicate a tentative title for your research paper. Then devote a paragraph to each of the following points:

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

For format style, consult *A Guide to the ALM Thesis*, 6th ed. (available in hard copy and on-line at <http://www.extension.harvard.edu/2004-05/libarts/alm/reqs/thesis.jsp#resources>)

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 upfront. 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:

- Richard III and dynastic power transfer in England
- European exploration and the high price of spices
- How many people were in pre-Columbian America?
- Why did Montezuma allow Cortés and his soldiers such easy access to Tenochtitlan?
- The identity of the author of Shakespeare’s Plays
- The debate over the film *The Return of Martin Guerre*
- The nature of early modern monarchy
- The role of Inner Eurasia in world history
- Galileo and the Roman Catholic Church
- Origins of the French Revolution

Or you may choose one of the topics from *Discovering the Global Past* to develop further:

- The Village and the State
- First Encounters: The Creation of Cultural Stereotypes (1450–1650)
- Gender Differences in Peasant Households in Southeast Asia and Central Europe
- Sweet Nexus: Sugar and the Origins of the Modern World (1600–1800)
- The Confucian Family (1600–1800)
- The Liberator-Hero and Western Revolutions (1770s–1810s)

Or you may formulate a topic in relation to current historiographical debates over the rise of the West to global dominance, why it occurred, and when it began. For aspects of that debate, the following books should be consulted:

- Adas, Michael. *Machines as the Measure of Men: Science, Technology, and Ideologies of Western Dominance*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989.
- Blaut, J. M. *The Colonizer's Model of the World: Geographical Diffusionism and Eurocentric History*. New York: Guilford, 1993.
- Blaut, J. M. *Eight Eurocentric Historians*. New York: Guilford, 2000.
- Diamond, Jared. *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1997.
- Frank, Andre Gunder. *ReOrient: Global Economy in the Asian Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- Hanson, Victor Davis. *Carnage and Culture: Landmark Battles in the Rise of Western Power*. New York: Anchor Book, 2002.
- Marks, Robert B. *The Origins of the Modern World: A Global and Ecological Narrative*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002.
- McNeill, William. *The Rise of the West: A History of the Human Community*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963.
- Pomeranz, Kenneth. *The Great Divergence: China, Europe, and the Making of the Modern World Economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Pomeranz, Kenneth and Steven Topik. *The World That Trade Created: Society, Culture, and the World Economy 1400 to the Present*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1999.

Or you may pick a topic or topics of your own with the approval of your teaching assistant or the instructor.

Guidelines for Writing-Intensive Courses

“Writing-intensive courses at Harvard Extension offer students the opportunity to develop their writing skills in the context of a particular academic discipline, and they all feature common elements. Students will develop core writing skills, as defined by the instructor, in the discipline of the course;

- complete multiple writing assignments of varying lengths, at least 2 of which must be revised;
- produce a minimum of 10–12 pages of writing, exclusive of the required revisions, over the course of the term;
- meet at least once in individual conference (in person, by phone, or electronically) with the instructor or TA to discuss writing in progress; and
- receive detailed feedback on their drafts and revisions, on both content and expression.”

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, just 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 fifteen 2-hour classes in this course. Even if I wanted to I could not possibly cover all of 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 world 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.

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 *one week* to grade your assignment. 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 course 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. Returned drafts need to be handed in along with revised versions. 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 what before was unknown and of understanding what before was puzzling. That is our common endeavor.

Undergraduate Student Paper and Exam Schedule

October 3: Draft of First Written Assignment due (for comments)

October 10: TA returns Draft of First Written Assignment handed in October 3

October 17: Revised Version of First Written Assignment due (for grade)

October 24: Mid-Term Quiz;

TA returns Revised Version of First Written Assignment handed in October 17

October 31: Draft of Second Written Assignment due (for comments)

November 7: First Written Assignment TPQN;

TA returns Draft of Second Written Assignment handed in October 31

November 14: Revised Version of Second Written Assignment due (for grade)

November 21: Thanksgiving Holiday (no class)

November 28: TA returns Revised Version of Second Written Assignment handed in Nov. 14

December 5: Draft of Third Written Assignment due (for comments)

December 12: Second Written Assignment TPQN;

TA returns Draft of Third Written Assignment handed in December 5

December 19: Revised Version of Third Written Assignment due (for grade)

December 26: Winter Break (no class)

January 2: TA returns Revised Version of Third Written Assignment handed in December 19

January 9: Third Written Assignment TPQN

January 16: Final Examination

Important Points to Remember

- Drafts and revised versions should be handed in and picked up on Wednesdays before or after class.
- Maintain contact with your TA throughout the entire semester; if you cannot hand in or pick up your paper on any particular Wednesday, you will need to consult with your TA about it.
- Hand in all previous drafts and revised versions of each assignment with the accompanying new revised version.
- A “draft” is the first version you hand in; a “revised version” addresses the comments of the TA on the draft.
- TPQN stands for *terminus post quem non* (“end after which not”)—that is, no drafts or revised versions for that assignment will be accepted after that date.

Graduate Student Paper and Exam Schedule

October 3: Draft of First Written Assignment due (for comments)

October 10: TA returns Draft of First Written Assignment handed in October 3

October 17: Revised Version of First Written Assignment due (for grade)

October 24: Mid-Term Quiz; TA returns Draft of First Written Assignment handed in Oct. 17

October 31: Draft of Proposal for Research Paper due (for comments)

November 7: First Written Assignment TPQN;

TA returns Draft of Proposal for Research Paper handed in October 31

November 14: Revised Version of Proposal for Research Paper due (for grade)

November 21: Thanksgiving Holiday (no class)

November 28: TA returns Revised Version of Proposal for Research Paper handed in Nov. 14

December 5: Draft of Research Paper due (for comments)

December 12: TA returns Draft of Research Paper handed in December 5

December 19: Revised Version of Research Paper due (for grade)

December 26: Winter Break (no class)

January 2: TA returns Revised Version of Research Paper handed in December 19

January 9 Research Paper TPQN

January 16 Final Examination

Important Points to Remember

- Drafts and revised versions should be handed in and picked up on Wednesdays before or after class.
- Maintain contact with your TA throughout the entire semester; if you cannot hand in or pick up your paper on any particular Wednesday, consult with your TA about it.
- Hand in all previous drafts and revised versions of each assignment with the accompanying new revised version.
- A “draft” is the first version you hand in; a “revised version” addresses the comments of the TA on the draft.
- TPQN stands for *terminus post quem non* (“end after which not”)—that is, no drafts or revised versions for that assignment will be accepted after that date.

**Feature Films on Historical Topics Relevant to the Lectures for
World History III: The Age of Empires**

Sept 19	<i>The Agony and the Ecstasy</i>	Renaissance Humanism
Sept 26	<i>Plymouth Adventure</i> (1952) [1 hr. 44 min.]	Overseas Empires
Oct 3	<i>Captain from Castile</i> [2 hrs. 20 min.]	Early Latin America
Oct 10	<i>Martin Luther</i> [1 hr. 45 min.]	Reformation
Oct 17	<i>Queen Christina</i> [1 hr. 37 min.]	Political Experiment
Oct 24	<i>Roots</i> Part I (entire) and Part II (1 st ½ hr.)(1977) [2 hrs.]	Africa
Oct 31	<i>Young Catherine</i>	Russian Empire
Nov 7	<i>Killing the Shadows</i> (2006)	Ottoman Empire
Nov 14	[no film]	Safavid Persia and Mogul India
Nov 21	[no film]	[Thanksgiving vacation]
Nov 28	[no film]	China
Dec 5	<i>Ugetsu monogatari</i> (1953) [1 hr. 38 min.]	Japan
Dec 12	<i>The Mission</i> (1986) [2 hrs. 5 min.]	Scientific Revolution
Dec 19	<i>Amadeus</i> [1984] [2 hrs. 40 min.]	The Enlightenment
Jan 2	<i>A Tale of Two Cities</i> (1935) [2 hrs. 8 min.]	French Revolution
Jan 9	<i>The Return of Martin Guerre</i> (1982) [1 hr. 51 min.]	Summing Up