

HSTY2667

Politics and Cultures of United States Imperialism



This unit examines: the expansion of US power overseas in the twentieth century and its precursors in the nineteenth century; political, economic and cultural forms of domination and how these transformed both those societies overseas and the US itself; the value of applying the concept of imperialism to US power; the historiography of the US in the world.

Coordinator

Clare Corbould

Room: 851 Brennan Tel: 9036-9662 Email: clare.corbould@usyd.edu.au

Office hours: Wednesday 3:15-5:00 pm or by appointment

Tutor

Rhiannon Davis, rhiannon.mist@gmail.com

Course website: <http://teaching.arts.usyd.edu.au/history/hsty2667> (or google search)

Lectures: 2pm Monday and Wednesday, Quad General Lecture Theatre N205

Prerequisites: 12 Junior credit points in History; Prohibitions: HSTY2067

Required readings: Course “brick” available at University Copy Centre; assessment task readings available in Fisher Reserve

Assessment

Tutorial participation 10%

2500 word essay 50%

2000-word take-home exam 40%

Students must attend classes and submit work in compliance with requirements and guidelines set out in this outline and in Faculty and University policy. If you find yourself in difficulty for whatever reason during the semester, and unable to meet the requirements set out below, you should contact Clare as soon as possible.

| Week | Date | Lecture | Tutorial |
|-------------------------|----------------------|---|---|
| 1 | March 2 March 4 | Introduction Classic interpretations of US foreign policy | No tutorial |
| 2 | March 9 March 11 | Westward “expansion” in the 19th century Native Americans and the new nation | Introduction; assessment explained |
| 3 | March 16 March 18 | Overseas (ad)ventures in the 19th century Missionaries and traders in China | An empire among empires? The US and the comparative study of empire |
| 4 | March 23 March 25 | 1898: Watershed or more of the same? <i>Savage Acts</i> | The meaning of the “frontier” |
| 5 | March 30 April 1 | Rhiannon Davis: Corporations and Empire, 1910-1945 No lecture | Culture and the causes of US imperialism |
| 6 | April 6 April 8 | Teddy Roosevelt’s Big Stick: Gender and Race in Foreign Policy Wilsonianism | Technologies of rule: public health at home and abroad |
| AVCC Common Week | | | |
| 7 | April 20 April 22 | Internationalism and isolationism in the interwar years Haiti and military occupation | Resistance to imperial rule |
| 8 | April 27 April 29 | How to Read Donald Duck WWII: A “Good” War? | Politics and cultures of military occupations |
| 9 | May 4 May 6 | The Cold War – and the “American Century” – Begins War and torture: Korea & Abu Ghraib | Technology, trade, and ordering knowledge |
| 10 | May 11 May 13 | Covert action under Eisenhower: CIA “Soft” power at home and abroad | “Hard” power in the 1950s and 60s |
| 11 | May 18 May 20 | Vietnam Twilight of the Cold War | “Soft” power and cultural blowback |
| 12 | May 25 May 27 | War on Terror Wrapping Up | The Road to Iraq |

Unit of Study Objectives and Learning Outcomes

Themes you will understand by the unit’s end:

1. defining empire; the value (uses, difficulties and limits) and politics of applying the term to the United States, especially issues arising from a postcolonial perspective;
2. history and historiography of U.S. foreign policy: isolationist, internationalist, interventionist, imperialist, exceptional;
3. the relationship between culture and empire, including class, race, gender, sexuality;
4. the relationship between domestic and foreign politics;
5. effects of U.S. power domestically, internationally, and transnationally

Skills you will acquire:

- analytical skills:
 - in reading *primary* documents including autobiographies, court records, interviews, images, film, advertisements, travel narratives, diaries and novels. You will learn to consider what these sources tell us about the past and how to read them as different types of evidence, assessing their strengths, weaknesses and generic characteristics;
 - in reading *historians' interpretations* and assessing critically their arguments in context with the primary material you are reading and in relation to other historians' interpretations. In other words, you will learn about and engage with the historiographical context of the field.

- skills in verbal and written communication:
 - *tutorials* give you the opportunity to develop your spoken and listening skills and encourage you to learn to participate in scholarly debate;
 - the *tutorial presentation* challenges you to present a very short summary of the set readings and to ask questions that provoke discussion;
 - the *essay* of 2500 words, require that you find evidence on which to base your argument as well as locate interpretations written by other historians. You will develop your research skills, writing skills and learn to sustain an argument at length;
 - the *take home examination* allows you to reflect on the themes of the course and to demonstrate your understanding of the course as a whole.

- skills in organization:
 - in managing your time so that you attend lectures, tutorials, read and think about the material prior to class and meet your deadlines.

This unit online

The unit website (<http://teaching.arts.usyd.edu.au/history/hsty2667>) contains links to material mentioned in lectures, and extended reading lists on all the topics covered, including for each tutorial discussion. It will also house recorded lectures and powerpoint presentations. The website is an integral part of this unit of study.

I will occasionally email the class – please ensure you either check your usyd email account regularly, or set it up to forward to your preferred email address.

Attendance

Lectures

Attending lectures will give you an overview of topics, a sense of how different topics relate to one another and illuminate the unit's themes, and an introduction to debates between historians. Lectures also provide the context and framework for more detailed discussion of issues in tutorials. There is no substitute for attending lectures. I use PowerPoint presentation to display images, spell difficult names, and to provide any dates and statistics to which I refer in the lecture. The PowerPoint presentations will aid you to take notes rather than providing a substitute for attending lectures. They will be available online for you to refer to at your leisure after the lecture. I will also record lectures and upload them to the unit website as MP3 files.

Tutorials

Attendance at tutorials is required. Your tutor will keep a record of attendance. The History Department expects a minimum of 80% attendance at tutorials. Tutorial attendance that falls below 80% in this course may be penalised and any student whose attendance record is less than 50%, for whatever reason, will be considered automatically not to have fulfilled the requirements of the unit. (If you become seriously ill or suffer misadventure that will prevent you from attending 50% of tutorials, please contact me to discuss withdrawing from the unit.)

Tutorials give you an opportunity to grapple with the ideas and materials central to this unit. In examining primary documents alongside historians' interpretations, their discussions should also model what is expected of you in your written assessments.

Assessment

It is university policy that you must complete all assessment tasks, even if you gain enough marks without one of them to pass the course. E.g., if you attain 60 marks out of 90 – enough to pass the course – but did not hand in your essay proposal or come to more than 50% of tutorials, you will fail regardless.

Tutorial participation: 10%

You are expected to prepare for tutorials by reading and reflecting on the assigned texts. Additional reading, guided by the lists below, will help you to understand and contextualise the required reading. As you are reading primary sources, ask yourself what they reveal about the themes we explore in this course (see p 2). Whose perspective on events do you find most compelling, and why? When you read historians' interpretations, decide if their arguments stand up. Is the use of evidence convincing? Which examples do you find particularly persuasive and why? Think too, as you read, about the ways in which historians construct arguments, and how you might do the same in your own written work: how do they structure their articles, chapters or books?

You will be assessed on the quality of your contributions to class and the degree to which your efforts reflect your reading and engagement with the themes of the unit.

Essay, 2,500 words, 50%

Choose an essay topic from the list embedded in the tutorial reading list. If you select a topic from weeks 3 or 4, the essay is due at the end of week 6 (ie, Thursday 9 April, before Easter). If you select any topic from week 5 onwards, the essay is due two weeks after your tutorial on the topic. (So, for example, if you choose to write on public health, week 6, your essay will be due on either Monday 20 April or Wednesday 22 April, depending on whether you are in a tutorial on Monday or Wednesday). Make your choice based on your interests and on when in the semester it would best suit you to research and write an essay. To avoid overlap with the take-home exam, there is no essay question for week 12.

Submit your essay to the SOPHI office by 4 p.m. on the due date, with a signed cover sheet.

The essay topics are quite broad, to give you the scope to pick a narrower issue or set of sources on which to concentrate. Though the tutorial discussion will be useful for your preparation, don't rely on answering the tutorial questions in your essay. They are designed

to prompt discussion and debate in class, and are therefore sometimes deliberately provocative and not necessarily useful for essay writing.

Your essay will be marked according to the criteria established in the small print at the end of this document. To summarise, the best essays, as with all history writing, will persuade your reader that your argument is sound. In order to do this, you must support all claims with evidence/primary sources. To put it another way, in order to persuade your reader, you must analyse evidence convincingly. For an excellent discussion of the difference between descriptive, analytical and persuasive writing, see The Write Site, Module 3, Unit 4 (<http://writesite.elearn.usyd.edu.au/>).

In picking primary sources, you might like to focus on an individual (someone famous such as political figures Teddy Roosevelt or Henry Kissinger, military personnel such as Douglas MacArthur, anti-imperialist writer Mark Twain, health professional Margaret Sanger), or organisations (such as the Rockefeller Foundation, Ford Foundation, Carnegie Corporation), or a cultural form (such as jazz or hip-hop music, or beat poetry). Just remember to base your analysis on primary sources, for instance, presidential speeches, or the reports of the organisations listed above. You can be creative – use photographs, for example, rather than written words. (The university library system has them, though you may have to request them from Storage. They usually take a day to come to the library of your choice.) Alternatively, you could focus on a particular time period and combine several figures/organisations/ideas.

You might like to write about official policy, in which case the United States Department of State Papers relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States (available for 1861-1960 - <http://digicoll.library.wisc.edu/FRUS/About.shtml>) are an amazing resource. If you choose to write about law, then the Congressional Documents and Debates, 1774-1875 (<http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/amlaw/lawhome.html>) might be useful, or The Avalon Project at Yale Law School: Documents in Law, History and Diplomacy (<http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/avalon.htm>). For a *huge* number of sources on a variety of relevant topics, follow the links from Vincent Ferraro's homepage at <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/feros-pg.htm>.

Depending on which question you are answering, you may be writing about the relationship between American foreign relations and domestic culture, in which case there is a plethora of material available (films, comic books, fiction, travel literature, music, advertisements, popular magazines, the list is endless). As a starting point, consult the Library of Congress American Memory Collection, containing millions of scanned primary documents: <http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/index.html>. For more specific guidance, follow the links from this page, many of which contain excellent primary sources: http://www.besthistorysites.net/USHistory_EarlyImperialism.shtml.

For literally dozens more sites, see those listed on Frances Clarke's comprehensive page: "Finding Primary Sources in American History from Australia" (<http://teaching.arts.usyd.edu.au/history/hsty3093/sources.html>). More and more goes up online every day, so feel free to browse online.

The additional reading lists for the tutorials are only a starting point, and will often not be appropriate for the particular slant your essay will take. Feel free to go beyond these lists, but remember you must engage with scholarly literature, so stick (mainly) to university press and

academic trade press books, and articles in refereed journals. If you would like some help, feel free to drop in to see Clare during her office hours.

It's hard to be precise as to how much reading you ought to do for an essay of this length, but as a guide, I would expect you to engage with the arguments presented in at least eight articles or books, in addition to any primary sources.

Extensions: see p 22 of this document.

Examination (take-home): 40%

Date: TBA

Answer two questions. Write 1,000 words on each. Type and double-space your responses. Submit to SOPHI office, all together with a cover sheet on the top. More instructions will come with the exam itself.

Reading

Tutorial readings are in the unit “brick,” available at the Copy Center and Fisher Reserve. There is no textbook for this unit. For an overview of many of the themes, see the following, all in Fisher Reserve:

Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease, eds., *Cultures of United States Imperialism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993).

Craig Calhoun et al, eds., *Lessons of Empire: Imperial Histories and American Power* (New York: New Press, 2006).

Gilbert M. Joseph, Catherine C. LeGrand, and Ricardo D. Salvatore, eds., *Close Encounters of Empire: Writing the Cultural History of U.S.-Latin American Relations* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998).

Christian G. Appy, ed., *Cold War Constructions: The Political Culture of United States Imperialism, 1945-1966* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2000).

Frank Ninkovich, *The United States and Imperialism* (Malden, MA.: Blackwell, 2001).

Alfred W. McCoy and Francisco A. Scarano, eds., *Colonial Crucible: Empire in the Making of the Modern American State* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009).

Ann Laura Stoler, ed., *Haunted By Empire: Geographies of Intimacy in North American History* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006).

James T. Campbell, Matthew Pratt Guterl, & Robert G. Lee, eds., *Race, Nation, and Empire in American History* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).

Tutorial Guide

Week 1, March 2-6

No tutorial

Week 2, March 9-13

Introduction

Explanation and discussion of assessment tasks

Week 3, March 16-20: An empire among empires? The US and the comparative study of empire

Tutorial discussion: What is an Empire? What are the characteristics of an empire? Can a republican democracy also be an empire? What is the relationship between liberalism and imperialism? What are the similarities and differences between the American empire and the British empire? between the American empire and other empires? What are some of the uses and limits of applying the term “empire” to the exercise of American power?

Essay topic: Many millions of words have been expended on trying to characterise American power. Doing so requires a necessarily comparative approach. Evaluate the recent debate as to whether the United States is an empire, with reference to a particular time period (say a decade or two) or a particular place or region (for example, Japan, Korea, Cuba, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, the Caribbean, Germany), or both.

Read:

- Linda Colley, “The Difficulties of Empire: Present, Past and Future,” *Historical Research* 79, no. 205 (Aug. 2006): 367-382.
- Ann Laura Stoler, “Imperial Formations and the Opacities of Rule,” in *Lessons of Empire: Imperial Histories and American Power*, ed. Craig Calhoun et al (New York: New Press, 2006), 48-60.
- Michael Ignatieff, “The American Empire; The Burden,” *New York Times Magazine*, Jan. 5, 2003 (<http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9B03E6DA143FF936A35752C0A9659C8B63>).
- Victor Davis Hanson, “A Funny Sort of Empire,” *National Review Online*, Nov. 27, 2002 (<http://www.nationalreview.com/hanson/hanson112702.asp>).

Additional reading:

Hannah Arendt, “The Imperialist Character,” *Review of Politics*, vol. 12, no. 1 (Jan. 1950), 303-320; and *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, 3rd. ed. (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1966), esp. 123-302.

Thomas Bender, “An Empire among Empires,” in *A Nation among Nations: America’s Place in World History* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2006), 182-245.

Michael Ignatieff, “Why Are We in Iraq? (And Liberia? And Afghanistan?)” *New York Times Magazine*, Sept. 7, 2003.

Craig Calhoun, “Introduction,” in *Lessons of Empire: Imperial Histories and American Power*, ed. Craig Calhoun et al (New York: New Press, 2006),

Amy Kaplan, “‘Left Alone with America’: The Absence of Empire in the Study of American Culture,” in *Cultures of United States Imperialism*, ed. Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993), 3-21.

Charles Maier, *Among Empires: American Ascendancy and Its Predecessors* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006), esp. 24-77.

Michael Mann, *The Dark Side of Democracy: Explaining Ethnic Cleansing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); and *Incoherent Empire* (London: Verso, 2003).

Frank Ninkovich, *The United States and Imperialism* (Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Publishers, 2001).

Bernard Porter, *Empire and Superempire: Britain, America and the World* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006).

Ann Laura Stoler, "Intimidations of Empire: Predicaments of the Tactile and Unseen," and "Tense and Tender Ties: The Politics of Comparison in North American History and (Post) Colonial Studies," in *Haunted by Empire: Geographies of Intimacy in North American History* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 1-22 and 23-67. (The latter was originally published in the *Journal of American History* 88, no. 3 (Dec. 2001), with responses/critiques from several historians, all worth reading.)

William Appleman Williams, *Empire As a Way of Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980).

Week 4, March 23-27: The meaning of the "frontier"

Tutorial discussion: Discuss the popular representations of Native Americans in nineteenth century culture. How did Native Americans respond to such ideas? What was the relationship between these ideas and government policy?

Essay topic: Was expansion of the United States in the nineteenth century an exercise in empire-building? Ensure that your answer rests on an analysis of evidence/primary sources (see guidelines on pp 4-6).

Reading:

- Richard Slotkin, "Buffalo Bill's 'Wild West' and the Mythologization of the American Empire," in *Cultures of United States Imperialism*, ed. Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993), 164-181.
- Richard White, "Frederick Jackson Turner and Buffalo Bill," in *The Frontier in American Culture*, ed. James R. Grossman (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 7-65.
- Primary sources:
 - Pictures in White chapter and in lecture 3 powerpoint
 - John O'Sullivan, "Manifest Destiny," 1839
 - John Ross, George Lowrey, Major Ridge, and Elijah Hicks, "Cherokee Communication to Congress," 1824
 - Chief Joseph, "I Will Fight No More Forever," speech, 1877
 - Anti-Indian Broadside, 1832
 - Photos: Kit Carson and Black Kettle

Additional reading:

Frederick Jackson Turner, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History," (orig. lecture 1893; published 1894; 1920 version available <http://xroads.virginia.edu/~Hyper/TURNER/>)

Thomas F. Gossett, "The Indian in the Nineteenth Century," in *Race: The History of an Idea in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 228-252.

- Ned Blackhawk, *Violence Over the Land: Indians and Empire in the Early American West* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2006).
- Eric Cheyfitz, "Savage Law: The Plot Against American Indians in *Johnson and Graham's Lessee v. M'Intosh* and *The Pioneers*," in *Cultures of United States Imperialism*, ed. Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993), 109-128.
- Amy S. Greenberg, *Manifest Manhood and the Antebellum American Empire* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- Patricia Nelson Limerick, *The Legacy of Conquest: The Unbroken Past of the American West*
- Richard White, "*It's Your Misfortune and None of My Own*": A History of the American West
- Michael Rogin, "Liberal Society and the Indian Question," *Politics and Society* 1 (1971): 269-312. [Also in Rogin's book, *Ronald Reagan the Movie: And Other Episodes in Political Demonology*.]
- Adam Rothman, *Slave Country: American Expansion and the Origins of the Deep South* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005).
- Aims McGuinness, *Path of Empire: Panama and the California Gold Rush* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007).
- Robert J. C. Young, *Postcolonialism: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).
- Anne McClintock, "The Angel of Progress: Pitfalls of the Term 'Post-colonialism,'" (1992) reprinted in *Colonial Discourse and Post-colonial Theory: A Reader*, ed. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman, New York: Harvester, 1994, 291-304.
- Ann Laura Stoler and Frederick Cooper, "Between Metropole and Colony: Rethinking a Research Agenda," in *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 1-58.

Week 5, March 30 – April 3: Culture and causes of US imperialism

Tutorial discussion: Discuss the ideas about racial and sexual difference circulating the US around the turn of the century. What impact did such ideas have on US policy? As Brands's review suggests, many historians are not convinced that culture *explains* empire, so much as was used simply to justify an expansion of US power overseas that was undertaken for economic and/or political reasons. Did culture cause imperialism? How does a cultural approach help us: to define "empire"? to explain why empires exist? to analyze their characters? to analyze their effects?

Essay topic: "Racism was the excuse for empire, not the cause." Do you agree? Support your argument with analysis of evidence/primary sources. (See guidelines on pp 4-6.)

Reading:

- Amy Kaplan, "Black and Blue on San Juan Hill," in *Cultures of United States Imperialism*, ed. Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993), 219-236.
- Paul A. Kramer, "Race, Empire, and Transnational History," in *Colonial Crucible: Empire in the Making of the Modern American State*, ed. Alfred W. McCoy and Francisco A. Scarano (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009), 199-209.
- H. W. Brands, "The Coils of Empire," *Diplomatic History* 33, no. 1 (Jan. 2009): 129-132.
- Primary sources:
 - Cartoons in powerpoint presentation from lecture 7 and film *Savage Acts*

- Theodore Roosevelt, 1899, from *The Strenuous Life: Essays and Addresses* (New York: The Century Company, 1900).
- Argentina's Foreign Minister Luis Drago Condemns the Collection of Debts by Force, 1902
- The Panama Canal Treaty Grants the United States a Zone of Occupation, 1903.
- President Rafael Reyes Enumerates Colombia's Grievances Against the United States, 1904.
- The Roosevelt Corollary, 1904.
- Rubén Darío, "To Roosevelt," 1905.

Additional reading:

- Paul A. Kramer, "Empires, Exceptions and Anglo-Saxons: Race and Rule Between the British and US Empires, 1880-1910," *Journal of American History*, vol. 88, no. 4 (March 2002), 1315-1353.
- Kristin L. Hoganson, *Fighting for American Manhood: How Gender Politics Provoked the Spanish-American and Philippine-American Wars* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).
- Laura Briggs, *Reproducing Empire: Race, Sex, and Science, and U.S. Imperialism in Puerto Rico* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).
- Hazel V. Carby, "'On the Threshold of Woman's Era': Lynching, Empire and Sexuality in Black Feminist Theory," *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 12 (1985): 262-277 (and reprinted in several collections)
- Matthew Frye Jacobson, *Barbarian Virtues: The United States Encounters Foreign Peoples at Home and Abroad, 1876-1917* (New York: Hill & Wang, 2000).
- Amy Kaplan, *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2002).
- Paul A. Kramer, *The Blood of Government: Race, Empire, the United States, and the Philippines* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).
- Neil Smith, *American Empire: Roosevelt's Geographer and the Prelude to Globalization* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003).
- Paul S. Sutter, "Nature's Agents or Agents of Empire? Entomological Workers and Environmental Change during the Construction of the Panama Canal," *Isis*, 2007, 98: 724-754.
- Sarah Watts, *Rough Rider in the White House: Theodore Roosevelt and the Politics of Desire* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003).
- Laura Wexler, *Tender Violence: Domestic Visions in an Age of U.S. Imperialism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000).
- Eric T. L. Love, *Race Over Empire: Racism and U.S. Imperialism, 1865-1900* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004).
- Reinhold Wagnleitner and Elaine Tyler May, eds., *'Here, There and Everywhere': The Foreign Politics of American Popular Culture* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2000).

Week 6, April 6-10: Technologies of rule: public health at home and abroad

Tutorial discussion: Would you have thought of health management as an instrument of (attempted) rule? How were ideas about race and racial difference embedded in public health efforts? Do intentions matter in the analysis of power? What debt do analyses such as those we are reading this week owe to postcolonial studies?

Essay topic: “Americans who worked to improve the health of colonised people were missionaries of science.” To what extent is this statement accurate? Answer with reference to a specific person, group of people, place or region, and/or time period. (See guidelines on pp 4-6.)

Reading:

- Mariola Espinosa, “A Fever For Empire: U.S. Disease Eradication in Cuba As Colonial Public Health,” in *Transitions & Transformations in the U.S. Imperial State: The Search for New Synthesis*, ed. Alfred W. McCoy and Francisco A. Scarano (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009).
- Warwick Anderson, “States of Hygiene: Race ‘Improvement’ and Biomedical Citizenship in Australia and the Colonial Philippines,” in *Haunted by Empire: Geographies of Intimacy in North American History* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 94-115.

Additional reading:

Warwick Anderson, *Colonial Pathologies: American Tropical Medicine, Race, and Hygiene in the Philippines* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006).

Michelle T. Moran, *Colonizing Leprosy: Imperialism and the Politics of Public Health in the United States* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).

Laura Briggs, *Reproducing Empire: Race, Sex, Science, and U.S. Imperialism in Puerto Rico* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), especially ch. 2 on prostitution.

Catherine Choy, *Empire of Care: Nursing and Migration in Filipino American History* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003).

Gabriela Soto Laveaga, “Uncommon Trajectories: Steroid Hormones, Mexican Peasants, and the Search for Wild Yam,” *Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences* 36 (2005): 743-760. (Ask Clare for a copy.)

Paul S. Sutter, “Tropical Conquest and the Rise of the Environmental Management State: The Case of U.S. Sanitary Efforts in Panama,” in *Colonial Crucible: Empire in the Making of the Modern American State*, ed. Alfred W. McCoy and Francisco A. Scarano (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009).

Nicholas Turse, “Experimental Dreams, Ethical Nightmares: Leprosy, Isolation, and Human Experimentation in Nineteenth-Century Hawaii,” in *Imagining Our Americas: Toward a Transnational Frame* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007), 168-189.

Steven Palmer, “Central American Encounters with Rockefeller Public Health, 1914-1921,” in *Close Encounters of Empire*, 311-332.

Anne-Emanuelle Birn, “Public Health or Public Menace? The Rockefeller Foundation and Public Health in Mexico, 1920-1950,” *Voluntas* 7, no. 1 (1996): 35-56.

Marcus Cueto, “The Cycles of Eradication: The Rockefeller Foundation and Latin American Public Health, 1918-1940,” in *International Health Organisations and Movements, 1918-1939*, ed. Paul Weindling (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 222-243.

S. Franco-Agudelo, “The Rockefeller Foundation’s Antimalarial Program in Latin America: Donating or Dominating,” *International Journal of Health Services* 13 (1983): 51-67.

Natalie J. Ring, “Inventing the Tropical South: Race, Region, and the Colonial Model,” *Mississippi Quarterly* 56, no. 4 (Fall 2003): 619-631.

For a comparative perspective:

Alison Bashford, *Imperial Hygiene: A Critical History of Colonialism, Nationalism, and Public Health* (Palgrave, 2004).

Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (Melbourne University Press, 2002).

Heather Bell, *Frontiers of Medicine in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, 1899-1940* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), esp. 163-197 on “The International Construction of Yellow Fever.”

For more, type “Imperialism -- Health Aspects” into a subject search on the Fisher catalogue.

Week 7, April 20-24: Resistance to imperial rule

Tutorial discussion: Discuss some of the effects of US power (1) overseas, and (2) within the United States. In what ways do colonized people resist or comply with American rule? Would you characterize the U.S. state as republican, democratic or imperial? Are these categories mutually exclusive?

Essay topic: To what extent has the exercise of American power been constrained by anti-imperial activism? Answer with reference to a particular time period, place, region or group of people, using primary as well as secondary sources (see guidelines on pp 4-6).

Reading:

- Christopher Schmidt-Nowara, “From Columbus to Ponce de León: Puerto Rican Commemorations between Empires, 1893-1908,” in *Colonial Crucible: Empire in the Making of the Modern American State*, ed. Alfred W. McCoy and Francisco A. Scarano (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009), 230-237.
- Vicente L. Rafael, “White Love: Surveillance and Nationalist Resistance in the U.S. Colonization of the Philippines,” in *Cultures of United States Imperialism*, ed. Amy Kaplan and Donald E. Pease (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993), 185-218.

Additional reading:

Sam Erman, “Meanings of Citizenship in the U.S. Empire: Puerto Rico, Isabel Gonzalez, and the Supreme Court, 1898 to 1905,” *Journal of American Ethnic History* 27, no. 4 (Summer 2008): 5-33. (<http://www.historycooperative.org/journals/jaeh/27.4/erman.html>)

Ada Ferrer, *Insurgent Cuba: Race, Nation, and Revolution, 1868-1898* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999).

Michael H. Hunt, “Resistance and Collaboration in the American Empire, 1898-1903: An Overview,” *Pacific Historical Review* 48, No. 4 (Nov. 1979): 467-471.

Hal Brands, “Third World Politics in an Age of Global Turmoil: The Latin American Challenges to U.S. and Western Hegemony, 1965-1975,” *Diplomatic History*, 32, no. 1 (Jan. 2008): 105-138.

Robert Vitalis, *America’s Kingdom: Mythmaking on the Saudi Oil Frontier* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006).

Noenoe Silva, *Aloha Betrayed: Native Hawaiian Resistance to American Colonialism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004).

Rona Tamiko Halualani, “A Critical-Historical Genealogy of Koko (Blood), 'Aina (Land), Hawaiian Identity, and Western Law and Governance,” in *Colonial Crucible: Empire in the Making of the Modern American State*, ed. Alfred W. McCoy and Francisco A. Scarano (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009).

J. Kēhaulani Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2008).

Accounts of anticolonial resistance from within America’s borders:

Penny von Eschen, *Race Against Empire* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1997).
Nikhil Pal Singh, *Black Is a Country* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2004).

Accounts of resistance in other empires:

Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin, *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures* (1989; London: Routledge, 2002). [Not on the American empire, but provides a model for thinking about colonial responses.]

Homi Bhabha, "Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse," in *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 152-160.

Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, trans. Charles Lam Markmann (1952; New York: Grove Press, 1967); and *The Wretched of the Earth*, trans. Constance Farrington (New York: Grove Press, 1963).

J. Ellen Gainor, ed., *Imperialism and Theatre: Essays on World Theatre, Drama, and Performance* (London: Routledge, 1995).

Albert Memmi, *The Colonizer and the Colonized*, trans. Howard Greenfeld (1957; London: Earthscan, 2003).

Daniel B. Schirmer and Stephen Roskamm Shalom, *The Philippines Reader: A History of Colonialism, Neocolonialism, Dictatorship, and Resistance* (Boston: South End Press, 1987).

Week 8, April 27 – May 1: Politics and cultures of military occupations

Tutorial discussion: What role have occupying forces played in mediating the relationship between the US and the world, and between cultures? Do you see any cultural, experiential, and/or linguistic parallels between Haiti and Iraq?

More generally, what is the relationship between domestic U.S. society and empire? How is American domestic culture affected by U.S. foreign relations? How are America's foreign relations shaped by its citizens at home? What are some contemporary examples of the interchange between domestic consumer culture and American ventures overseas?

Essay question: To what extent is the American empire a military one? Answer with reference to a particular time period, place or region. (See guidelines on pp 4-6.)

Reading:

- Mary A. Renda, *Taking Haiti: Military Occupation and the Culture of U.S. Imperialism, 1915-1940* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 3-9, 39-88.
- Jana K. Lipman, "Guantánamo and the Case of Kid Chicle: Private Contract Labor and the Development of the U.S. Military," in *Colonial Crucible: Empire in the Making of the Modern American State*, ed. Alfred W. McCoy and Francisco A. Scarano (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009), 452-459.
- Primary sources:
 - Anthony Swofford, *Jarhead: A Marine's Chronicle of the Gulf War and Other Battles* (New York: Scribner, 2003), 175-210.
 - Nuha Al-Radi, *Baghdad Diaries: A Woman's Chronicle of War and Exile*, New York: Vintage Books, 1998, 9-31, 37-38, 46-49, 53-60.

Additional reading:

Salam Pax, Iraqi blogger, 2002-2004: http://dear_raed.blogspot.com/

Introduction and essays to Part 7, "U.S. Military," in *Colonial Crucible: Empire in the Making of the Modern American State*, ed. Alfred W. McCoy and Francisco A. Scarano (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009).

Emily S. Rosenberg, "Turning to Culture," in *Close Encounters of Empire: Writing the Cultural History of U.S.-Latin American Relations*, ed. Gilbert M. Joseph et al (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998) (and many of the other chapters in this collection).

Marilyn Blatt Young, "In the Combat Zone," *Radical History Review* 85 (2003): 253-264. [A great review of *Saving Private Ryan*, *Black Hawk Down* and *Pearl Harbor*.]

Melani McAlister, "A Cultural History of the War Without End," *Journal of American History* 89, no. 2 (Sept. 2002): 439-455. (And for additional reading see other articles in this issue of the *JAH*.) [Note this piece is in the reader for Week 11.]

On the cultures and politics of military rule in Haiti specifically:

Brenda Gayle Plummer, "Afro-American Response to the Occupation of Haiti, 1915-1934," *Phylon*, vol. 43, no. 2 (Summer 1982): 125-143.

Hans Schmidt, *The United States Occupation of Haiti, 1915-1934* (1971; New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1995).

Week 9, May 4-8: Technology, trade, and ordering knowledge

Tutorial discussion: To what extent can we speak of trade and technology as agents of imperialism? Aside from the examples in this week's readings, what other examples from other time periods can you think of?

Essay topic: To what extent can we speak of trade and technology as agents of imperialism? (See guidelines on pp 4-6.)

Reading

- Emily S. Rosenberg, "Ordering Others: U.S. Financial Advisers in the Early Twentieth Century," in *Haunted by Empire: Geographies of Intimacy in North American History*, ed. Ann Laura Stoler (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 405-424.
- Ed McKennon, "Importing Hegemony: Library Information Systems and U.S. Hegemony in Canada and Latin America," *Radical History Review* 95 (Spring 2006): 45-69.

Additional reading:

Elizabeth Borgwardt, *A New Deal for the World: America's Vision for Human Rights* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2007).

Emily S. Rosenberg, *Financial Missionaries to the World: The Politics and Culture of Dollar Diplomacy, 1900-1930* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1999).

David Armitage, *The Declaration of Independence: A Global History* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2008).

More to come.

Week 10, May 11-15: "Hard" power in the 1950s and 60s

Tutorial discussion: What forms of "hard" power did the US engage in during the Cold War? In what ways can the character of present US-Iran relations be traced back to the 1950s? What are the uses and limits of a distinction between "hard" and "soft" power?

Essay topic: “The CIA’s actions in the 1950s and 1960s represented the culmination of the development of the American imperial state.” Do you think this is a fair assessment? Why or why not? Answer with reference to both primary and secondary sources (see guidelines on pp 4-6).

Reading

- Stephen G. Rabe, *U.S. Intervention in British Guiana: A Cold War Story* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 75-103.
- Stephen G. Rabe, “‘No Basis for Suspicion Election May Be Rigged’: The Johnson Administration, the CIA, and the Caribbean, 1964–1968,” *Diplomatic History* 31, no. 5 (Nov. 2007): 953-957.
- Douglas Little, “Mission Impossible: The CIA and the Cult of Covert Action in the Middle East,” *Diplomatic History* 28, no. 5 (Nov. 2004): 663-701.

Additional reading:

Primary Sources

- CIA electronic resource via Fisher
[<http://opac.library.usyd.edu.au/record=b3172703~S4>]
- Peter Kornbluh, ed., *Bay of Pigs Declassified: The Secret CIA Report on the Invasion of Cuba*
- Robert Baer, *See No Evil: The True Story of a Ground Soldier in the CIA’s Counterterrorism Wars*
- Duane D. Clarridge with Digby Diehl, *A Spy for All Seasons: My Life in the CIA*

John Prados, *Safe for Democracy: The Secret Wars of the CIA* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2006).

John Prados, “Intelligence for Empire” in Andrew Bacevich, ed., *The Long War: A New History of U.S. National Security Policy Since World War II* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2009). (Ask Clare if Fisher doesn’t have it.)

John Prados, “Notes on the CIA’s Secret War in Afghanistan,” *Journal of American History* 89, no. 2 (Sept. 2002): 466-471.

Steve Coll, *Ghost Wars: The Secret History of the CIA, Afghanistan, and bin Laden, from the Soviet Invasion to September 10, 2001* (New York: Penguin, 2004).

Sallie Pisani, *The CIA and the Marshall Plan* (Lawrence, Kansas: Kansas Uni Press, 1991).

Loch K. Johnson, *America’s Secret Power: The CIA in a Democratic Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989).

Alfred W. McCoy, *A Question of Torture: CIA Interrogation, from the Cold War to the War on Terror* (New York: Metropolitan, 2006).

Nick Cullather, *Secret History: The CIA’s Classified Account of Its Operations in Guatemala, 1952-1954*, Rev. Ed. (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999).

Amy B. Zegart, *Spying Blind: The CIA, the FBI, and the Origins of 9/11* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007).

Max Holland, “Private Sources of U.S. Foreign Policy: William Pawley and the 1954 Coup d’État in Guatemala,” *Journal of Cold War Studies* 7, no. 4 (2005) 36-73.

Week 11, May 18-22: “Soft” power and cultural blowback

Tutorial discussion: What is “soft” power? Is it a useful way to think about America’s role in the world? In what direction does culture flow between the US and other places? What effects have American “cultural imperialism” had on the US and on other places? How have people around the world responded to American cultural dominance?

Essay topic: What are the uses and limits of a distinction between “hard” and “soft” power? Answer with reference to primary sources of some sort (see guidelines on pp 4-6).

Reading:

- Reinhold Wagnleitner, “Foreword to the American Edition” and “Introduction,” in *Coca-Colonization and the Cold War: The Cultural Mission of the United States in Austria after the Second World War*, trans. Diana M. Wolf (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994), ix-xiv, 1-7.
- Penny Von Eschen, “Duke Ellington Plays Baghdad: Rethinking Hard and Soft Power from the Outside In,” in *Contested Democracy: Freedom, Race, and Power in American History*, ed. Penny Von Eschen and Manisha Sinha (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), 279-300. [NOT IN READER: download from library website.]
- Melani McAlister, “A Cultural History of the War Without End,” *Journal of American History* 89, no. 2 (Sept. 2002): 439-455. (And for additional reading see other articles in this issue of the *JAH*.)

Additional reading on so-called soft power:

Primary sources

- The Marshall Plan and the Future of U.S. European Relations
<http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/marshall/mal1a.html>

John Tomlinson, *Cultural Imperialism: A Critical Introduction* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1991).

Rob Kroes, “Americanization: What Are We Talking About?,” *If You’ve Seen One You’ve Seen the Mall: Europeans and American Mass Culture* (Urbana and Chicago: U of Illinois P, 1996)

Marja Roholl, “Uncle Sam: An Example for All,” in *Dutch-American Relations, 1945-1969*, ed. Hans Loeber (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1992).

Ralph Willett, *The Americanization of Germany, 1945-1949* (London: Routledge, 1989).

Richard Pells, *Not Like Us: How Europeans Have Loved, Hated, and Transformed American Culture Since World War II* (New York: Basic Books, 1997).

Richard F. Kuisel, *Seducing the French: The Dilemma of Americanization* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).

Uta G. Poiger, *Jazz, Rock, and Rebels: Cold War Politics and American Culture in a Divided Germany* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).

Marc Trachtenberg, *A Constructed Peace: The Making of the European Settlement, 1945-1963* (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1999).

Jonathan Zeitlin and Gary Herrige, eds., *Americanization and Its Limits: Reworking US Technology and Management in Post-war Europe and Japan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Geir Lundestad, “‘Empire by Invitation’ in the American Century,” in *The Ambiguous Legacy: U.S. Foreign Relations in the ‘American Century’*, ed. Michael J. Hogan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 52-91.

Special edition of *Diplomatic History*, vol. 24, no. 3 (Summer 2000), includes:

- Jessica C.E. Gienow-Hecht, “Shame on US? Academics, Cultural Transfer, and the Cold War – A Critical Review,” *Diplomatic History* 24 (3) (Summer 2000): 465-495.
- Richard Pells, “Commentary: Who’s Afraid of Steven Spielberg?” *Diplomatic History* 24 (3) (Summer 2000): 495-502.
- Richard Kuisel, “Commentary: Americanization for Historians,” *Diplomatic History* 24 (3) (Summer 2000): 509-515.

Donna Alvah, *Unofficial Ambassadors: American Military Families Overseas and the Cold War, 1946–1965* (New York: New York University Press, 2007).

Victoria de Grazia, *Irresistible Empire: America’s Advance through Twentieth-Century Europe* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005).

Penny Von Eschen, *Satchmo Blows Up the World: Jazz Ambassadors Play the Cold War* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2004).

Additional reading on Cultural Blowback:

Frances Stoner Saunders, *Cultural Cold War: The CIA and the World of Arts and Letters* (New York: New Press, 2001).

Ellen Schrecker, *Many Are the Crimes: McCarthyism in America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), esp. chs. 4, 5, 9.

Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era* (New York: Basic Books, 1988), esp. ch. 4.

Stephen J. Whitfield, *The Culture of the Cold War* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1991).

Hugh Wilford, *The Mighty Wurlitzer: How the CIA Played America* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2008).

Natasha Zaretsky, *No Direction Home: The American Family and the Fear of National Decline, 1968–1980* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).

Christian G. Appy, ed., *Cold War Constructions: The Political Culture of United States Imperialism, 1945-1966* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2000).

Kristin Hoganson, “Cosmopolitan Domesticity: Importing the American Dream, 1865-1920,” *American Historical Review* 107, no. 1 (Feb. 2002): 55-83.

Lizabeth Cohen, *A Consumers’ Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America* (New York: Knopf, 2003).

Thomas Doherty, *Cold War, Cool Medium: Television, McCarthyism, and American Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993).

Linda Gordon, “Internal Colonialism and Gender,” in *Haunted by Empire: Geographies of Intimacy in North American History* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 427-451.

David K. Johnson, *The Lavender Scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

Melani McAlister, *Epic Encounters: Culture, Media, and U.S. Interests in the Middle East, 1945-2000* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001).

Nicholas Evan Sarantakes, “Cold War Pop Culture and the Image of U.S. Foreign Policy: The Perspective of the Original *Star Trek* Series,” *Journal of Cold War Studies* 7, no. 4 (2005): 74-103.

Week 12, May 25-29: The Road to Iraq

Tutorial discussion: Is the current war in Iraq an imperial war? What are its antecedents/historical contexts?

There is no essay topic for this week.

Reading

- Robert G. Lee, “Brown Is the New Yellow: The Yellow Peril in an Age of Terror,” in *Race, Nation, and Empire in American History*, ed. James T. Campbell, Matthew Pratt Guterl, and Robert G. Lee (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 335-351.
- Melani McAlister, “Rethinking the ‘Clash of Civilizations’: American Evangelicals, the Bush Administration, and the Winding Road to the Iraq War,” in *Race, Nation, and Empire in American History*, ed. James T. Campbell, Matthew Pratt Guterl, and Robert G. Lee (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007), 352-374.

Additional Reading:

- R. Scott Appleby, “History in the Fundamentalist Imagination,” *Journal of American History* 89, no. 2 (Sept. 2002): 498-511.
- Judith Butler, Preface and “Explanation, Exoneration, or What We Can Hear,” *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*, London: Verso, 2004, xi-xxi, 1-18.
- Douglas Little, “Opening the Door: Business, Diplomacy, and America’s Stake in Middle East Oil,” in *American Orientalism: The United States and the Middle East since 1945* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2002), ch. 1 on U.S. cultural understandings of Arabs.
- Melani McAlister, *Epic Encounters: Culture, Media, and U.S. Interests in the Middle East, 1945-2000* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001).
- Robert D. Kaplan, “Centcom: Iraq, Spring 2004, with notes on Nicaragua and Vietnam,” in *Imperial Grunts: The American Military on the Ground* (New York: Random House, 2005), 307-370.
- Jean Bethke Elshtain, *Just War Against Terror: The Burden of American Power in a Violent World* (New York: Basic Books, 2003).
- Cynthia Enloe, “The Politics of Constructing the American Woman Soldier,” in *The Morning After: Sexual Politics at the End of the Cold War* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), 201-227.

SCHOOL OF PHILOSOPHICAL AND HISTORICAL INQUIRY POLICY ON ASSESSMENT OF COURSEWORK

Assessment

Students are required to:

- attend lectures and tutorials (or seminars);
- participate in class discussion;
- complete satisfactorily such written work, presentations and examinations as may be prescribed; and
- meet the standards required by the University for academic honesty

Attendance requirements

The School of Philosophical and Historical Inquiry requires satisfactory class attendance as part of participation in a unit of study. Attendance below 80% of tutorials/seminars without written evidence of illness or misadventure will be penalised with loss of marks; attendance at less than 50% of tutorials/seminars, regardless of the reasons for the absences, will result in the student being deemed not to have fulfilled requirements for the unit of study. The University does not recognise employment as

excusing unsatisfactory performance, nor are timetable clashes a valid excuse. Students should not take a unit of study unless they can meet the above attendance requirement.

Grade distribution

Departments within the School of Philosophical and Historical Inquiry follow Academic Board and Faculty of Arts guidelines in awarding a determined percentage of each grade. Departments may scale marks in order to fit these grade guidelines.

A. General philosophies of assessment practice

1. The School favours 'deep learning' over 'shallow learning'. In other words, we are more interested in evidence that students have made conceptual developments in their ways of understanding and interpreting the world than in their familiarity with 'facts', figures and dates.
2. Original and thoughtful argument is valued more highly than polished regurgitations of lectures or set reading.
3. Evidence of a thoughtful response to the conceptual framework of any individual unit is valued more highly than pre-existing skills of, for example, debate and expression.
4. Students are encouraged to explore areas of particular interest to themselves, and will be rewarded for initiative and ingenuity in discovering relevant material.
5. An idea that cannot be expressed clearly probably has not been understood clearly. We therefore value evidence of logical, coherent thought, argument and expression in essays.
6. While recognising that the political and ethical values of students vary widely, the School does not reward or condone unreasoned polemic or racism or sexism.

B. Marking criteria

In assessing written work, academic staff within the School look for demonstrated effort, abilities and skills in the following areas. Note that individual units are likely to have additional and more specific requirements and criteria. These should be made clear to students by the coordinator in each unit.

1. Content
 - extent of reading
 - accuracy of knowledge
 - breadth and depth of knowledge
 - relevance of information
 - sufficiency of evidence and documentation
2. Understanding
 - understanding of problem or project
 - judgement of significance of material
 - awareness/understanding of different arguments in reading
 - recognition of implications of evidence
 - ability to think critically
 - grasp of relevant theory
 - understanding of ethics and values relevant to reading and subject matter
3. Independence
 - judgement and initiative in reading and research
 - originality in use and interpretation of evidence
 - development of argument
 - independence in use of concepts and language
4. Style
 - correctness of grammar and scholarly documentation
 - organisation and presentation of material
 - clarity of writing style
 - originality and creativity of writing style

C. Guide to interpretation of grades

This guide indicates broadly the qualitative judgements implied by the various grades which may be awarded. A more precise evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of individual essays will be provided in examiners' comments. Evaluation is made with due consideration of the different standards likely to be achieved by students in junior and senior units.

Below 50% (Fail)

Work not of an acceptable standard. Work may fail for any or all of the following reasons: unacceptable levels of paraphrasing; irrelevance of content; presentation, grammar or structure so sloppy it cannot be understood; submitted very late without extension.

50-54% (Low Pass)

Work of an acceptable standard. Written work contains evidence of minimal reading and some understanding of subject matter, offers descriptive summary of material relevant to the question, but may have a tendency to paraphrase; makes a reasonable attempt to organise material logically and comprehensibly and to provide scholarly documentation. There may be gaps in any or all of these areas.

55-59% (Medium Pass)

Work of a satisfactory standard. Written work meets basic requirements in terms of reading and research, and demonstrates a reasonable understanding of subject matter. Offers a synthesis of relevant material and shows a genuine effort to avoid paraphrasing, has a logical and comprehensible structure and acceptable documentation, and attempts to mount an argument, though there may be weaknesses in particular areas.

60-64% (High Pass)

Work has considerable merit, though Honours is not automatically recommended. Written work contains evidence of a broad and reasonably accurate command of the subject matter and some sense of its broader significance, offers synthesis and some evaluation of material, demonstrates an effort to go beyond the essential reading, contains clear focus on the principal issues, understanding of relevant arguments and diverse interpretations, and a coherent argument grounded in relevant evidence, though there may be some weaknesses of clarity or structure. Articulate, properly documented.

Note that roughly 45-50% of students in junior levels of study and 25-50% of students in senior level units of study will receive marks within the Pass range each semester.

65-69% (Low Credit)

Competent work, demonstrating potential to complete Honours work, though further development needed to do so successfully. Written work contains evidence of comprehensive reading, offers synthesis and critical evaluation of material on its own terms, takes a position in relation to various interpretations. In addition, it shows some extra spark of insight or analysis. Demonstrates understanding of broad historical significance, good selection of evidence, coherent and sustainable argument, some evidence of independent thought.

70-74% (High Credit)

Highly competent work, demonstrating clear capacity to complete Honours successfully. Evidence of extensive reading and initiative in research, sound grasp of subject matter and appreciation of key issues and context. Engages critically and creatively with the question, and attempts an analytical evaluation of material. Makes a good attempt to critique various interpretations, and offers a pointed and thoughtful contribution to an existing debate. Some evidence of ability to think theoretically as well as empirically, and to conceptualise and problematise issues. Well written and documented.

75-84% (Distinction)

Work of a superior standard. Written work demonstrates initiative in research and reading, complex understanding and original analysis of subject matter and its context, both empirical and theoretical; makes good attempt to 'get behind' the evidence and engage with its underlying assumptions, takes a critical, interrogative stance in relation to argument and interpretation, shows critical understanding of the principles and values underlying the unit. Properly documented; writing characterised by style, clarity, and some creativity.

85%+ (High Distinction)

Work of exceptional standard. Written work demonstrates initiative and ingenuity in research and reading, pointed and critical analysis of material, innovative interpretation of evidence, makes an insightful contribution to debate, engages with values, assumptions and contested meanings contained within original evidence, develops abstract or theoretical arguments on the strength of detailed research and interpretation. Properly documented; writing characterised by creativity, style, and precision.

Academic dishonesty

The School of Philosophical and Historical Inquiry is committed to the principles of academic honesty as set out in the Academic Board policy on *Academic Honesty in Coursework*. Students have a responsibility to familiarise themselves with these principles.

In accordance with Academic Board policy, the School's definition of academic dishonesty includes but is not limited to:

- plagiarism: for full details see below;
- recycling: the submission for assessment of one's own work, or of work which is substantially the same, which has previously been counted towards the satisfactory completion of another unit of study, and credited towards the satisfactory completion of another unit of study, and credited towards a university degree, and where the examiner has not been informed that the student has already received credit for that work;
- fabrication of data;
- the engagement of another person to complete an assessment or examination in place of the student, whether for payment or otherwise;
- communication, whether by speaking or some other means, to other candidates during an examination;
- bringing into an examination and concealing forbidden material such as textbooks, notes, calculators or computers;
- attempts to read other student's work during an examination; and/or
- writing an examination or test paper, or consulting with another person about the examination or test, outside the confines of the examination room without permission.

In suspected cases of academic dishonesty, students may be counselled or the matter may be referred to the Head of School.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the theft of intellectual property. The School of Philosophical and Historical Inquiry is opposed to and will not tolerate plagiarism. Students have a responsibility to understand the full details of the Academic Board policies on *Academic Honesty in Coursework* and *Student Plagiarism: Coursework Policy and Procedure* (<http://www.usyd.edu.au/senate/policies/Plagiarism.pdf>).

All students are required to include a signed statement of compliance with work submitted for assessment, presentation or publication certifying that no part of the work constitutes a breach of the University's policy on plagiarism. This statement of compliance is printed on all assignment/essay cover sheets and written work will not be marked if the compliance statement is unsigned.

In accordance with Academic Board policy, the School defines plagiarism as presenting another person's work (ideas, findings or written and/or published material) as one's own by presenting, copying or reproducing the work without acknowledgment of the source. Common forms of plagiarism include but are not limited to:

- presenting written work that contains sentences, paragraphs or longer extracts from published work without attribution of the source;
- presenting written work that reproduces significant portions of the work of another student; and/or
- using the structure of another person's argument, even if the wording is changed.

Legitimate cooperation between students is permitted and encouraged but students should be aware of the difference between cooperation and collusion. Discussion of general themes and concepts is allowed but students are not permitted to read each other's work prior to submission or cooperate so closely that they are jointly selecting quotes, planning essay structure or copying each other's ideas.

While plagiarism is never acceptable, there is a distinction between negligent plagiarism and plagiarism that involves dishonest intent.

Negligent plagiarism is defined in Academic Board policy as ‘innocently, recklessly or carelessly presenting another person’s work as one’s own work without acknowledgement of the source’. In the case of negligent plagiarism, the School’s first responsibility is educative. Where plagiarism is deemed to arise from poor referencing practices or lack of confidence, students will be counselled, provided with strategies for improvement and referred to appropriate services for assistance. They will also be issued with a written warning explaining the consequences of any subsequent breaches of the University’s policy prohibiting plagiarism.

Dishonest plagiarism is defined in Academic Board policy as ‘knowingly presenting another person’s work as one’s own work without acknowledgement of the source’. Where dishonest intent is apparent, the School may proceed to disciplinary measures. In the most serious cases, University procedures relating to student misconduct may be invoked and can lead to expulsion.

The School of Philosophical and Historical Inquiry encourages students to think for themselves. In assessing students’ work academic staff look for evidence of understanding and capacity for independent thought; it is always disappointing to discover plagiarism. Written work containing plagiarism will be assessed according to its academic merit, but may fail because it does not meet the minimum standard required.

Submission of written work

Essays and assignments must be submitted through the School office, located on Level 3, Lobby H, in the Main Quadrangle. Students may not hand essays or assignments directly to their lecturer or tutor. Online submission of essays and assignments through WebCT is available in some units of study.

A completed and signed cover sheet must be attached to the front of all written work submitted through the School office. Written work will not be marked if the plagiarism policy compliance statement on the cover sheet is unsigned. All incoming essays and assignments are date stamped. The School office maintains a register of submitted work, including any claims by students that written work submitted to the School office has been lost. Students submitting work through WebCT must read and accept the plagiarism policy compliance statement for their work to be submitted.

Students are advised to retain a copy of all written work submitted.

Late submission and extensions

Essays and assignments not submitted on or before the due date are subject to penalty. Late work is penalised at the rate of 2% of the full marks of the assignment per weekday late and 2% of the full marks of the assignment per weekend late. The maximum penalty for any assessment will be 100%.

Only coordinators, either of individual units or of the junior and/or senior curricula have the authority to grant extensions. Extensions will not be granted for pressures of outside work or competing academic commitments. Requests for extension must normally be submitted in writing to the unit coordinator on or before the due date. Where circumstances of illness or misadventure prevent submission of a request for extension before the due date, students may apply for special consideration through the Faculty of Arts office.

Late essays or assignments will not be accepted (except where applications for special consideration are lodged) beyond the designated return date for the relevant written work. In cases where documented misadventure or serious illness prevents students from submitting work before the designated return date an alternative assessment task may be set.

Special consideration: illness or misadventure

The School of Philosophical and Historical Inquiry assesses student requests for special consideration in accordance with the principles set out in Part 5 of the Academic Board policy on *Assessment and*

Examination of Coursework. Students intending to submit an application for special consideration should make themselves familiar with the full details of this policy.

Generally, serious illness or misadventure will be taken into account when considering a student's academic performance in a course or units of study. There is, however, a clear distinction between longstanding illness or difficulties which prevent students from attending classes or completing required work or which seriously interfere with their capacity to study for long periods and short-term illness or misadventure that may prevent an otherwise well-prepared student from sitting for an examination or completing a particular assessment.

Students who, because of serious illness or misadventure, are prevented from attending classes for prolonged periods should seek an interview with the Head of School. Even if they do not exceed the specified permitted period of absence, they may need to consider whether their best academic interests are served by discontinuing with permission from the course until they are able to resume their studies effectively.

It should be noted that only well-attested serious illness or misadventure during a semester or occurring at the time of an examination will warrant special consideration for academic performance. Occasional brief or trivial illness would not normally be regarded as sufficient to explain an absence or a poor performance and students are discouraged from submitting certificates for absences totalling less than one week, although frequently recurrent short absences would need documentation.

To apply for special consideration students need to:

1. Obtain a special consideration form from the Faculty of Arts office, Faculty of Arts website or the Student Centre.
2. Complete the special consideration form:
 - a. For consideration due to serious illness - have a registered medical practitioner or counsellor complete the Professional Practitioners Certificate.
 - b. For consideration due to misadventure attach appropriate documentation (e.g. police report).
3. Make the appropriate number of copies - one copy per assessment for which special consideration is sought.
4. Lodge the original of this form with the Faculty office.
5. Lodge a stamped copy of the form with each School office.

Applications must be received no less than one week from the end of the period for which consideration is sought (i.e. within one week of the date of the assessment). Students must retain their stamped receipt. Students will be notified of the academic judgement concerning their special consideration application by the relevant unit coordinator.

Special arrangements

Special arrangements may be made available to students unable to meet assessment requirements or attend examinations for the following reasons:

- essential religious commitments or essential beliefs (including cultural and ceremonial commitments);
- compulsory legal absence (e.g. jury duty, court summons etc)
- sporting or cultural commitments, including political/union commitments, where the student is representing the University, state or nation;
- birth or adoption of a child; and
- Australian defence force or emergency service commitments (including Army Reserve)

Special arrangements for assessment or examination may include but are not limited to:

- alternative dates for submission of assessments;
- provision of alternative assessment tasks; and
- alternative examination times/arrangements

Applications for special arrangements should be made in writing to the Head of School. Students seeking special arrangements will need to provide sufficient and relevant supporting documentation in English.

Full details are available in the Academic Board policy on *Special Arrangements for Examination and Assessment*.

Appeals

All care is taken to ensure that marking is consistent and fair and that markers adhere to the assessment criteria as advertised. In some rare cases, however, a student may feel that the mark awarded does not reflect the quality of the work done. If you wish to lodge an appeal against the grade awarded, the first step is to contact the Unit of Study Coordinator to arrange for a time to discuss the assessment task. This should happen within twenty working days of marks being made available to students.

If you are not happy with the outcome of this discussion, then you may appeal formally against the grade awarded. The student should first read the Academic Board Resolution on 'Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions'. This appeal should be lodged within twenty working days, of the outcome of discussions at local level as outlined above. The appeal must be lodged through the Faculty Office (attention Dean of the Faculty of Arts) and include the following:

- Appeal for Reassessment Form (PDF) (available online & from the School Office)
- Written statement outlining the reasons for appeal and any additional supporting documentation. The written statement should draw attention to such matters as perceived injustice in terms of bias or inconsistent application of the grade descriptors published by the Department.

The Dean will follow up on your appeal within the time limits and according to procedures set out in the Faculty policy on Student Appeals and Re-marking of Written Work, available at http://www.arts.usyd.edu.au/current_students/undergrad/policies.shtml.

All information concerning your appeal will be confidential and you will not suffer disadvantage as a result of your appeal (e.g. your mark will not be lowered).

Learning Assistance

Students experiencing difficulties with their written expression, including essay writing style or structure can seek assistance from the Learning Centre, which runs workshops on a range of subjects including study skills, academic reading and writing, oral communication, and examination skills. The centre offers programs specifically designed for students from a non-English speaking background. The Learning Centre is located on Level 7 of the Education Building A35 (beside Manning House); contact them on 9351 3853 or email lc@stuserv.usyd.edu.au. For further information visit the Learning Centre website at http://www.usyd.edu.au/stuserv/learning_centre.

Online learning assistance is available via the Write Site, which offers modules on grammar, sources and structure to help students develop their academic and professional writing skills. Each module provides descriptions of common problems in academic and professional writing and strategies for addressing them. Students can view samples of good writing and also do some practice activities in error correction. For further information visit the Write Site at <http://writesite.elearn.usyd.edu.au>.

Learning assistance is also available to Indigenous Australian students via the Koori Centre and includes academic skills group workshops covering topics such as concentration strategies, writing for specific disciplines, time management, research and reading strategies, academic writing styles and referencing. The Koori Centre is located on Level 2 of Old Teachers College A22; contact 9351 2046 or 1800 622 742 (toll free) or email koori@koori.usyd.edu.au. For further information visit the Koori Centre website at <http://www.koori.usyd.edu.au>.

Note: All Academic Board policies referred to are available online at <http://www.usyd.edu.au/policy>.