

The Ascendancy of the West: 1450 to the Present

Harvard University Summer School (2006)

HIST S-1351

course website: <<http://hudce7.harvard.edu/~ostrowski/westernascendancy>>

Course Instructor:

Donald Ostrowski

e-mail: Don_Ostrowski@harvard.edu

office hours: MWF 3-7

office: 51 Brattle Street E-703

phone: 617-495-4547

fax: 617-495-9176

Teaching Assistant:

Gail Gardner

e-mail: gparis13@post.harvard.edu

phone: 617-492-0618

Course Goals:

To investigate ideas about the historical past of Western civilization while reading critically, thinking logically, and questioning intelligently. To provide a method with which one might continue to study the human heritage 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.” Merely accepting authority, invoking political considerations, or agreeing with the instructor is neither sufficient nor necessary for determining one’s own views. Such uncritical accepting, invoking, and agreeing are corrupting influences that tend to hinder the development of independent thinking. I will evaluate evidence, arguments, and interpretations on the basis of three criteria: correspondence to the source testimony (i.e., all relevant evidence considered), logical coherence (i.e., apparent contradictions explained), and conceptual elegance (i.e., simplest explanation that meets the other two criteria). For a fuller explanation, see the course handout written by the instructor, “Three Criteria of Historical Study” (which can also be found at <<http://hudce7.harvard.edu/~ostrowski/history.pdf>>).

Required Reading:

- * John P. McKay, Bennett D. Hill, and John Buckler, *A History of Western Society since 1300*, 8th ed., Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2006.
- * J. Kelley Sowards, ed., *Makers of the Western Tradition: Portraits from History*, 7th ed., New York: St. Martin’s, 1997, vol. 2.
- * *Sources of the Western Tradition*, ed. Marvin Perry, Joseph R. Peden, Theodore H. Von Laue, 6th ed., Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2006, vol. 2: *From the Renaissance to the Present*.
- *Primary Sources Supplement (PSS)*, vol. 2: *Since 1500*, ed. Donald Ostrowski, Minneapolis/St. Paul: West Publishing, 1995 <<http://hudce7.harvard.edu/~ostrowski/westernascendancy/upshur2.pdf>>.
- Course handouts

*Available for purchase at the Harvard Coop and through on-line bookstores on the Internet.

In addition to the assigned reading in the texts (listed above), undergraduates are required to read at least two (2) other books according to the instructions on this syllabus.

Undergraduate Grading and Deadlines:

	<i>draft</i>	<i>revised</i>	<i>TPQN</i>
10% First Writing Assignment (see p. 8)	July 6	July 13	July 25
5% Mid-Term Quiz		July 18	
25% Second Writing Assignment (see p. 9)	July 20	July 27	August 8
25% Third Writing Assignment (see p. 10)	August 3	August 10	August 17
35% Final Examination		August 17	

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. Double-space the text of your papers and use 12-point font. 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>revised</i>	<i>TPQN</i>
10% First Writing Assignment (see p. 8)	July 6	July 13	July 25
5% Mid-Term Quiz		July 18	
5% Proposal for Research Paper (see p. 12)	July 20	July 27	_____
45% Research Paper (see pp. 12–13)	August 3	August 10	August 17
35% Final Examination		August 17	

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 teaching assistant and instructor (see recommended topics on page 12). 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, which can be found at <<http://www.extension.harvard.edu/2003-04/ext03almg1.pdf>>. Prepare and write draft and revisions of the proposal (3 pages) and research paper outside of class and hand them in on the designated due dates (see pages 12–13 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 *terminus post quem non* for this assignment is the same as the date for the revised version since there will not be time for further revisions. The research paper should be between 5000 and 6500 words (approximately 20–25 pages) long. Double-space the text of your papers and 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 course assistant’s or instructor’s comments made on the “draft”. Only the “revised” version will receive a grade.

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 student handbook, 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 July 18. The rest of that class period will be a lecture. You will have 1½ hours on August 17 for the final exam. I will hand out sample questions for each exam.

Optional Discussion Section:

In addition to the scheduled lectures, a discussion section will be held on Wednesdays from 6:00 to 7:00 p.m. at 51 Brattle Street, room 721. The teaching assistant will also arrange for individual tutorials as required.

Lectures and Readings:*A. The Rise and Fall and Rise of the Western Civ Course*

June 27

1. Introduction: Historical Methods and Approaches

Reading: Handout: Donald Ostrowski, “The Historian and the Virtual Past,” *The Historian. A Journal of History* 51 (1989): 201–220; idem, “Three Criteria of Historical Study” <<http://hudce7.harvard.edu/~ostrowski/history.pdf>>.

2. Eight Components of the Western Ascendancy*B. Kings, Nobles, and Religious Wars*1. Overseas Expansion: Microscopic Pioneers and the Demographic Numbers Game

Reading: McKay, A History, pp. 502–528; PSS, pp. 49–54.

June 29

2. Renaissance Perspectives

Reading: McKay, A History, pp. 412–451; Sources, vol. 2, pp. 1–16; Handout from Makers, 6th ed., vol. 1, pp. 220–245 (excerpts from Giorgio Vasari’s Lives of the Most Eminent Painters, Sculptors and Architects from Cimabue until Our Own Time; John Herman Randall, Jr., “The Place of Leonardo da Vinci in the Emergence of Modern Society”; Ladislao Reti, “Leonardo the Technologist”).

3. Origins of the Reformation: Challenge to the Unity of Western Christendom

Reading: McKay, A History, pp. 452–502; Sources, vol. 2, pp. 16–20; Handout from Makers, 6th ed., vol. 1, pp. 270–289 (excerpts from Martin Luther’s Tabletalk; Hartmann Grisar, Martin Luther: His Life and Work; Erwin Iserloh, The Theses Were Not Posted: Luther between Reform and Revolution).

July 6

4. The Grand Political Experiment: Constitutional Limitations on the Power of the Ruler

McKay, A History, pp. 530–592; Sources, vol. 2, pp. 20–28; Makers, vol. 2, pp. 2–26; Handout from Makers, 6th ed., vol. 1, pp. 290–310 (excerpts from Sir Francis Bacon, “On the Fortunate Memory of Elizabeth Queen of England”; James Anthony Froude, History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada); Garrett Mattingly, The Armada); Handout from Makers, 5th ed., vol. 2, pp. 26–48 (excerpts from Mikhail Lomonosov, “Panegyric to the Sovereign Emperor Peter the Great”; M. M. Shcherbatov, On the Corruption of Morals in Russia; Nicholas V. Riasanovsky, A History of Russia;(excerpts from Louis, Duc de Saint-Simon, Memoirs; Voltaire, The Age of Louis XIV; Pierre Goubert, Louis XIV and Twenty Million Frenchmen); Handout: Donald Ostrowski, “The Façade of Legitimacy: Exchange of Power and Authority in Early Modern Russia,” Comparative Studies in Society and History 44 (2002): 534–563.

Draft of 1st Writing Assignment Due

C. *The Revolution in People’s Outlook on the World*

July 11

1. The Seventeenth-Century Scientific Revolution: Mathematics and Rhetoric in the Service of the Counter-Intuitive

Reading: McKay, A History, pp. 594–605, 660–680; Sources, vol. 2, pp. 29–52; Handout from Makers, 5th ed., vol. 1, pp. 266–288 (excerpts from Galileo Galilei, Dialogue concerning the Two Chief World Systems—Ptolemaic and Copernican; Giorgio de Santillana, The Crime of Galileo; Stilman Drake, “The Galileo-Pellarne Meeting: A Historical Speculation”).

July 13 2. The Enlightenment: The Triumph of Rationalism and the Bankruptcy of Reason
Reading: McKay, A History, pp. 605–627, 680–688; *Sources*, vol. 2, pp. 53–94;
Makers, vol. 2, pp. 28–46, 48–71; *PSS*, pp. 55–59.
Revised Version of 1st Writing Assignment Due

July 18 **Mid-Term Quiz (6:00–6:30 p.m.) — 20 multiple-choice questions (5%)**

6:30–8:30 3. The French Start Out to Make a Small Revolution and End Up Making a Big One
Reading: McKay A History, pp. 690–723; *Sources*, vol. 2, pp. 95–123, 152–154;
Makers, vol. 2, pp. 72–97; *PSS*, pp. 60–67; **Handout** from *Makers*, 4th ed., vol. 2, pp. 48–68 (excerpts from Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract*; J. L. Talmon, *The Origins of Totalitarian Democracy*; Lester G. Crocker, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: The Prophetic Voice (1758–1778)*).

D. *Industry and Ideology*

July 20 1. The Industrial Revolution: Theoretical Practices and Practical Theories
Reading: McKay, A History, pp. 628–659, 724–753; *Sources*, vol. 2, pp. 124–144, 168–181 ; *Makers*, vol. 2, pp. 99–121.
Draft of 2nd Undergraduate Writing Assignment Due
Draft of Graduate Proposal for Research Paper Due

July 25 2a. Assorted Ideologies from Conservatism to Anarchism: A Modified Mannheim Typology
Reading: Handout: Donald Ostrowski, “A Metahistorical Analysis: Hayden White and Four Narratives of ‘Russian’ History,” Clio: A Journal of Literature-History-Philosophy of History 19 (1990): 215–236.

2b. Latin America since Independence
Reading: McKay, A History, pp. 754–785, 812–821; *Sources*, vol. 2, pp. 145–151, 154–168, 181–192; **Handout** from *Makers of World History*, 2nd ed., pp. 180–197 (excerpts from General H. L. V. Ducoudray Holstein, *Memoirs of Simón Bolívar*; Felipe Larrazábal, *Life of Bolivar*; J. B. Trend, *Bolívar and the Independence of Spanish America*).

Terminus post quem non for Re-revision of 1st Writing Assignment

- July 27 3. The New Imperialism: The White Man’s Burden and How the Non-Whites Carried It
Reading: McKay, A History, pp. 786–799, 802–805, 854–885; Sources, vol. 2, pp. 241–272, 466–471; Makers, vol. 2, pp. 190–214; PSS, pp. 72–77.
Revised Version of 2nd Undergraduate Writing Assignment Due
Revised Version of Graduate Proposal for Research Paper Due
- August 1 4a. The Status of Women and the Women’s Movement
Reading: McKay, A History, pp. 800–802, 805–812; Sources, vol. 2, pp. 205–225; Handout from *Makers*, 6th ed., vol. 2, pp. 316–333 (excerpts from Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*; Karl A. Menninger, “Another Myth,” *Saturday Review*; Carol Ascher, *Simone de Beauvoir: A Life of Freedom*).
- 4b. The Origins of World War I: Diplomacy Gives Way to the Railroad Timetable
Reading: McKay, A History, pp. 822–853, 886–904; Sources, vol. 2, pp. 303–331, 336–341; PSS, pp. 78–81; Handout from *Makers*, 5th ed., vol. 2, pp. 116–137 (excerpts from Otto von Bismarck, “The Speech for the Military Bill of February 6, 1888”; Joseph Vincent Fuller, *Bismarck’s Diplomacy at Its Zenith*; A. J. P. Taylor, *Bismarck: The Man and the Statesman*).
- E. *The Race between Education and Catastrophe*
- August 3 1. The Russian Revolution, or How Not to Make a Revolution
Reading: McKay, A History, pp. 904–910, 957–963; Sources, vol. 2, pp. 203–205; 238–240, 331–336; Makers, vol. 2, pp. 147–169, 171–189; Handout from *Makers*, 4th ed., vol. 2, pp. 298–323 (excerpts from Pablo Picasso, “Picasso Speaks”; Rudolf Arnheim, *Picasso’s Guernica: The Genesis of a Painting*; Robert Otero, “Portrait of the Artist as an Old Man”); **Handout:** Donald Ostrowski, “A Reexamination of Richard Halliburton’s Interview with P. Z. Ermakov as Evidence for the Murder of the Romanovs,” *Russian History* 25 (1999): 301–328.
Draft of Graduate Research Paper Due
- August 8 2. Between the World Wars: The Eschenberg Thesis Revised
Reading: McKay, A History, pp. 911–951; Sources, vol. 2, pp. 342–395; Makers, vol. 2, pp. 216–241 PSS, pp. 96–101.
Terminus post quem non for Re-revision of 2nd Undergraduate Writing Assignment

August 10 3. World War II and the Origins of the Cold War: It Takes Two to Tango
Reading: McKay, A History, pp. 952–957, 964–1025; Sources, vol. 2, pp. 396–466, 471–478; Makers, vol. 2, pp. 242–268; 270–296; PSS, pp. 89–95; Handout from *Makers*, 5th ed., vol. 2, pp. 302–323 (excerpts from Margaret Thatcher, “The Falklands Crisis”; Robert Gray, “The Falklands Factor”; Peter Jenkins, “A New View of the Falklands War”).
Revised Version of 3rd Undergraduate Writing Assignment Due
Revised Version of Graduate Research Paper Due

August 15 4. The Process of “Globalization”: The PC Revolution and the Internet
Reading: McKay, A History, pp. 1026–1064; Sources, vol. 2, pp. 479–519; Makers, vol. 2, pp. 322–348; PSS, pp. 102–110; Handout from *Makers*, 4th ed., vol. 2, pp. 270–297 (excerpts from Eleanor Roosevelt, *On My Own*; Elizabeth Janeway, “The First Lady of the UN”; Joseph P. Lasch, *Eleanor: The Years Alone*).

August 17 **Final Exam** (6:00–9:00) (35% of course grade)
***Terminus post quem non* for Re-revision of 3rd Undergraduate Writing Assignment**
***Terminus post quem non* for Re-revision of Graduate Research paper**

The final exam will consist of 60 multiple-choice questions (for 15% of the course grade) to be taken in class and one take-home essay question (for 20% of the course grade) to be handed in or sent as a readable e-mail attachment on the day of the final exam. I will hand out sample multiple-choice questions in class, as I did for the mid-term quiz. Thirty of the questions on the exam will be taken from the sample questions.

The essay will involve discussion and critique of the eight components of the Western ascendancy as presented in the lectures. These eight components are: 1. competition; 2. widespread literacy; 3. democratic institutions; 4. scientific thinking; 5. secularization of society; 6. equality before the law; 7. industrialization; and 8. equal opportunity for women

You will be asked to analyze these components in terms of the lectures, the textbook, source readings, and your own research and critical reasoning. You might consider such issues as: whether there are more components of the Western ascendancy not covered by any of the eight and just as significant as those that are covered; whether the definitions presented in the lectures are sufficient to describe them adequately; whether there is better evidence to support each of the components; and how each of these components developed during the last 550 years. Then pick one of these components or one of your own that you think is particularly important to analyze further in depth. You will probably have to do some outside research to answer this question adequately. We will evaluate your essay on the basis of its correspondence to available source evidence, logical argument, and conceptual elegance (see “Course Goals” on page 1 of this syllabus and “Three Criteria of Historical Study”).

First Writing Assignment: Presenting Evidence
(10% of course grade)

In class, you have been given a handout that contains three sets of readings:

- (1) Leonardo da Vinci
- (2) Martin Luther
- (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 Leonardo da Vinci set of readings, you will write one paragraph summarizing the selection from the primary source, Giorgio Vasari’s *Lives of the Most Eminent Painters, Sculptors and Architects from Cimabue until Our Own Time*; one paragraph summarizing the selection from John Herman Randall, Jr.’s “The Place of Leonardo da Vinci in the Emergence of Modern Society”; and one paragraph summarizing the selection from Ladislao Reti’s “Leonardo the Technologist”. 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 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, should appear.

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 conclusion 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 presentation of evidence, on the one hand, and analysis and interpretation, on the other; and (2) to give you practice in succinct summarizing and paraphrasing of what you have read. The teaching assistant will work with you to improve the quality of the essay.

Second Undergraduate Writing Assignment: Analyzing an Interpretation (5 pages) (1250 words) (25% of course grade)

Choose one (1) of the books list on page 9, Section 1, and read it. Identify and summarize the main interpretation of the author of the book. Then compose a structured argument (i.e., a chain of reasoning) either *in favor of* or *against* that interpretation. Be sure to place your findings in a historical context by relating them to the lectures, discussions, and other readings in the course. You are allowed to substitute another book for one of those listed with the instructor's or teaching assistant's permission.

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.

If you choose to disagree with the interpretation, be sure to present as fairly as you can the author's side—that is, whatever it is you are disagreeing with as well as whatever evidence or logical argument would seem to support it. Then marshal your evidence and logical argument against it. For example, you could point out evidence and argument that shows the interpretation is a faulty one. Or you might argue that the interpretation is a simplistic one that does not take into account the complexity of the issue. If you choose to agree with the author's interpretation, then you need to go beyond it to explain why you agree. You could bring in evidence the author did not cite or argument the author did not use. It is not sufficient, however, merely to paraphrase what the author wrote, then say you agree with it (read-write). In any event, we will judge your essay on the logic of the argument, your use of evidence, and your overall conceptual framework, not on what you decide to agree with or oppose. Your essay should be no longer than 5 pages (1250 words) . This exercise is meant for you to develop and demonstrate your analytical skills.

Recommended Reading:

- Alec Fisher, *The Logic of Real Arguments*, Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- David Hackett Fischer, *Historians' Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought*, New York: Harper, 1970.

Third Writing Assignment: Explication of Text (5 pages) (1250 words) (25% of course grade)

Choose one (1) of the books list on page 9, Section 2, read it, and analyze it. Explicate the text as a primary historical source. Your 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 another book or books for any of those listed with the instructor's or teaching assistant's permission.

By this point in the course, you will be familiar with a number of different interpretations of aspects of Western history since 1500. And you will have had a chance to formulate your own ideas and interpretations. Your assignment is to construct an interpretation to explain a primary source. You might, for example, begin your essay by analyzing the point of view of the author of the chosen book. You could then present your own understanding of an aspect or aspects of Western history. An explanation is an interpretation 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 analysis, but it should, in any case, fulfill the requirements of a hypothesis that can be tested against the evidence, with more research.

An example of an analytical interpretation follows. It is 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 explanation as a way of understanding the evidence and the logical surmises we make from that evidence. The statement that the Armada represented the beginning of the Spanish navy is also a hypothesis that can be tested against the available evidence.

Your essay should be 5 pages (1250 words). Not only should the essay be your own work, it should also show some sign of originality. Merely repeating someone else's interpretation does not fulfill the assignment. We will judge your essays on the basis of the criteria discussed in the "Course Goals" and in "Three Criteria of Historical Study."

Book Choices for Second and Third Undergraduate Writing Assignments

Section 1: 1500–1800 (second undergraduate writing assignment)(choose one)

- *The Broken Spears: The Aztec Account of the Conquest of Mexico*, ed. Miguel Leon-Portilla. Boston: Beacon, 1992 (first pub. 1962).
- Steven Ozment, *The Burgermeister's Daughter: Scandal in a Sixteenth-Century German Town*, New York: HarperCollins, 1997.
- Natalie Zemon Davis, *The Return of Martin Guerre*, Harvard University Press, 1979.
- Carlo Ginzburg, *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller*, trans. John Tedeschi and Anne Tedeschi, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1992, rpt. (1982).
- Dava Sobel, *Galileo's Daughter: A Historical Memoir of Science, Faith, and Love*, New York: Penguin, 1999.
- William Beik, *Louis XIV and Absolutism: A Brief Study with Documents*, Boston: Bedford's/St. Martin's, 2000.
- *The Enlightenment: A Brief History with Documents*, ed. Margaret C. Jacobs, Boston: Bedford's/St. Martin's, 2001.
- William Doyle, *The Origins of the French Revolution*, Oxford University Press, 1988.

Section 2: 1800–2004 (third undergraduate writing assignment)(choose one)

- Vera Brittain, *Testament of Youth: An Autobiographical Study of the Years 1900–1925*, Penguin, 1994, memoir.
- Erich Maria Remarque, *All Quiet on the Western Front* (published in 1928), fiction.
- Ignazio Silone, *Bread and Wine* (first published in 1936, revised in 1955), fiction.
- Evgeniia Ginzburg, *Journey into the Whirlwind*, Harcourt, 1975, memoir.
- Tadeusz Borowski, *This Way for the Gas, Ladies and Gentlemen* (first published in 1948), fiction.
- Freeman Dyson, *Disturbing the Universe* (published in 1979), memoirs.
- David Edmonds and John Eidinow, *Wittgenstein's Poker: The Story of a Ten-Minute Argument between Two Great Philosophers*, HarperCollins, 2001, non-fiction..
- John Le Carré, *The Spy Who Came in from the Cold* (first published in 1964), fiction.
- James Watson, *Double Helix: A Personal Account of the Discovery of the Structure of DNA*, New York, W. W. Norton, 1981, memoir.
- Malcolm X with Alex Haley, *The Autobiography of Malcolm X*. 1st ed., 1964, non-fiction.
- Robert X. Cringely, *Accidental Empires: How the Boys of Silicon Valley Make Their Millions, Battle Foreign Competition, and Still Can't Get a Date*, rev. ed., New York: HarperBusiness, 1996, non-fiction.
- Thomas Friedman, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, Anchor Books, 2000, non-fiction.
- Deepak Lal, *In Praise of Empires*, Oxford, 2004, non-fiction.

Note: I did not place an order for these books through the Harvard Coop, nor are they on reserve. But they are all readily available, either in physical or virtual bookstores. Virtual bookstores include Amazon.com; Barnes&Noble.com; Bibliofind.com; BookFinder.com; and Borders.com. Make your choices quickly and order them early, so you have time to read them carefully.

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>). For footnoting and bibliographical style, 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 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 plays attributed to William Shakespeare
- The nature of early modern kingship: was it absolutist?
- Origins of French Revolution of 1789
- Relationship of science and religion
- Origins of the Russian Revolutions of 1917
- Rise of Naziism: why and how did it occur?
- What led to the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor?
- The dropping of atom bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki
- Could the Cold War have been avoided?
- The West and Islam: the nature of the relationship

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 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 the teaching assistant or the instructor.

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 Summer 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.

This course is based on writing intensive courses I teach during the academic year, which means you will have a chance to practice your writing skills and receive comments on your essays more than in most history courses. 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 adversely 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 fourteen 2½-hour classes in this course. Even if I wanted to I could not possibly cover all of the Western Ascendancy since 1450 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 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 or in the discussion sessions, 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 drafts with a ✓-, ✓, or ✓+. The ✓- means a total rewrite is necessary and you should talk with the 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. Likewise, when you hand in a written assignment for a grade, be aware that we reserve the option to give it a grade of "R" for mandatory rewrite.

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.

Course Readings at a Glance

	<u>McKay</u>	<u>Sources</u>	<u>Makers</u>	<u>Handouts</u> “Three Criteria” “The Historian”
June 27 (A-1)				
(B-1)	502–528			<i>PSS</i> 49–54
June 29 (B-2)	412–451	1–16		da Vinci
(B-3)	454–502	16–20		Luther
July 6 (B-4)	530–592	20–28	Louis XIV	Elizabeth; Peter; “Façade”
July 11(C-1)	594–605 660–680	29–52		Galileo
July 13 (C-2)	605–627 680–688	53–94	Voltaire Catherine	<i>PSS</i> 55–59
July 18 (C-3)	690–723	95–123, 152–154	Napoleon	Rousseau; <i>PSS</i> 60–67
July 20 (D-1)	628–659 724–753	124–144 168–181	Darwin	
July 25 (D-2)	754–785 812–821	145–151, 154–168 181–192		Bolívar “Metahistorical”
July 27 (D-3)	786–799 802–805 854–885	241–272, 466–471	Rhodes	<i>PSS</i> 72–77
Aug 1 (D-4)	800–802 805–812 822–853 886–904	205–225 303–331 336–341		Beauvoir Bismarck <i>PSS</i> 78–81
Aug 3 (E-1)	904–910 957–963	203–205, 238–240 331–336	Freud Lenin	Picasso “Reexamination”
Aug 8 (E-2)	911–951	342–395	Hitler	<i>PSS</i> 96–101
Aug 10 (E-3)	952–957 964–1025	396–466 471–478	Einstein Stalin	Thatcher <i>PSS</i> 89–95
Aug 15 (E-4)	1026–1064	479–519	Mandela	Roosevelt <i>PSS</i> 102–110