H630: READING COLLOQUIUM, BRITAIN’S LONG EIGHTEENTH CENTURY
FALL SEMESTER 2008, COURSE NUMBER 27915

W 6:00-8:40, CA 537
INSTRUCTOR: Jason M. Kelly
OFFICE: CA 504B
OFFICE HOURS: W 3:00-5:00 or by appointment
OFFICE PHONE: 317.274.1689
EMAIL: please use Oncourse to contact me

COURSE DESCRIPTION
This course is a seminar on the history of Britain between 1688 and 1832 – the period more generally known as Britain’s “long eighteenth century.” We will take a thematic approach, discussing a variety of key concepts in the historiography of eighteenth-century Britain. This course will challenge you to develop an understanding of the Enlightenment through close readings of primary documents and historiographical analyses of secondary sources. Our daily meetings consist of discussion and debate rather than lecture. This requires you to approach this course as a cooperative educational project rather than a lecture-driven, note-taking exercise (although, taking notes is important). Teams of students will lead daily conversations, and I will guide your interpretations and conclusions. Therefore, your success in this course relies on your daily preparation and participation.

COURSE OBJECTIVES
History is not a mass of facts waiting to be memorized and organized into a chronological narrative. History is a discipline that requires its practitioners to exercise their critical and analytical skills to interpret the past. Historians must be able to uncover and comprehend a wide variety of historical sources whether they are textual, visual, material, or aural. Applying their understanding of these sources to various questions, which are themselves often the result of specific historical circumstances, historians do their best to approximate an objective representation of the human past.

In this course, you are all historians. Therefore, the assignments will encourage you to improve your ability to communicate effectively through writing and speech, to critically think about the course material, and to integrate and apply your knowledge in a variety of contexts. This course will challenge you on many levels. You will need to refine your understanding of the methodologies of the historical profession and use this knowledge to better understand a diverse array of societies, including their political, social, and cultural traditions. As such, this course conforms to IUPUI’s Principles of Undergraduate Learning. For more information, please see http://www.iupui.edu/~history/ugmain.html.

Assignments in this course will challenge you to learn on several levels. They will oblige you to learn the material at the most rudimentary level – through comprehension and basic knowledge of the historical details. This requires you to read assigned material closely, taking notes and writing questions in the margins. If you are simply highlighting passages that you consider to be important, you are not learning efficiently. The best way to take
notes is to read a passage, then paraphrase it in your own words. If you have adequately read and comprehended a reading, you will be able to answer the “who, what, when, and where” questions that I ask in lecture.

Once you have a good comprehension and knowledge of the course material, you will be prepared to analyze it, answering the “how” and “why” questions in this course. These are the answers on which we will focus most of the time. For example, I will ask you to identify cause and effect for various historical phenomena. I will also require you to give evidence for your answer. I will also ask you to compare and contrast various phenomena and explain why they differ. Remember, “cause and effect”/”compare and contrast” questions in history are rarely simple, and they necessitate that you think creatively about a wide range of possible answers.

At the most advanced level of learning in this course, I will expect you to be able to synthesize what you have learned and evaluate a variety of documents and opinions. Your evaluation of other people’s arguments or your original interpretation of historical sources requires that you both comprehend the basic course material and are able to analyze it before you begin your evaluation. Remember, in history, regardless of what you “feel” or “believe,” you must support your assertions with empirical evidence. So, if you make an argument, be sure to support it with credible data.

**REQUIRED READINGS**

- ———, Reading Sex in the Eighteenth Century: Bodies and Gender in English Erotic Culture (Cambridge, 2004).
• M. Myrone, Bodybuilding: Reforming Masculinities in British Art 1750-1810 (New Haven, 2005).

ANNOUNCEMENTS
You are responsible for all announcements that I make during lecture or through Oncourse. If there is any adjustment to the syllabus, I will announce it in class or through email. You are responsible for checking your email regularly and guaranteeing that your Oncourse email settings are correct. You may email me through Oncourse or come to my office hours for any announcements you missed. If you do not know how to use Oncourse, it is your responsibility to seek tutoring. I will briefly cover some basics of Oncourse in class, but if you do not understand how to use it, you should visit https://oncourse.iu.edu/portal/help/main for more information.

GRADING
The grade breakdown is as follows:

PARTICIPATION 40%
WEEKLY EDITORIAL COMMENTS 40%
FINAL PAPER 20%
EXTRA CREDIT
   B. COWAN ESSAY 3%
   N. KEY ESSAY 3%
SEE THE END OF THE SYLLABUS FOR ASSIGNMENT GUIDELINES

Scale: A=90-100, B=80-89, C=70-79, D=60-69, F=0-59

Your written assignments are due at the beginning of lecture. At that time, you must have submitted a digital copy of your assignment to your Oncourse drop box and have turned in a hard copy to me. If you are a discussion leader, you should come prepared to class with enough handouts for the entire class. If you do not have access to a photocopier, please see me. After lecture begins, your assignments are late. Make sure to turn in your assignments on time. I will not accept late editorial comments, and I will deduct 10 points for every day that your final paper is late.

If you neglect to complete any of the above assignments and turn them in within 7 days, you will fail the course.

If you desire to dispute a grade, you may submit an explanation to me in writing. State your points of contention and your reasons for them. Upon review of your assignment, I reserve the right to raise, lower, or keep your grade the same.

LECTURES
This course meets once a week. ATTENDANCE IS MANDATORY!!! Since we only meet for once a week, there are no excused absences. I expect you to be prepared to discuss the course themes and readings during every lecture. We will spend most of every lecture discussing your readings and research, and your participation is a large proportion of your final grade.

Preparation and participation are integral components to your success in this course. Make sure you spend time reading and analyzing the required texts before you arrive at lecture. I expect each of you to share your thoughts throughout the semester. Discussions with your peers are some of the most entertaining and educational times you spend in class, so come prepared to debate. BRING YOUR BOOKS WITH YOU!!! If you would like to discuss readings with me, be sure to take advantage of my office hours.

I highly recommend taking advantage of all study and writing resources available on campus.

- University Writing Center
  The University Writing Center provides tutoring for students, staff, and faculty on all kinds of writing assignments and projects. A tutoring staff consisting of faculty and peer tutors work with their clients to understand assignments; brainstorm ideas; relate purpose and audience; develop, organize, revise, and edit pieces of writing. For information or an appointment, visit [http://www.iupui.edu/~uwc/](http://www.iupui.edu/~uwc/).

- IUPUI Library Reference Desk

At IUPUI, Adaptive Educational Services (AES) works to make campus life and learning accessible for students with disabilities. AES assists students in achieving their educational goals through such services as note taking, interpreting, and test proctoring. Visit the AES
webpage at: http://life.iupui.edu/aes/ or call them at 317.274.3241.

CLASSROOM ETIQUETTE

The classroom is a space for learning. Therefore, it is every student’s responsibility to foster a productive educational atmosphere. This means that cell phones, pagers, Blackberry messaging devices and the like should be turned off. Newspapers, books, and materials from other courses should be put away. If you use a computer in the classroom, it should only be used for taking notes or supplementing the lecture discussion. If you are late to class, try to make as little a disturbance as possible. If you need to leave early, please inform me before class begins and sit near the door to avoid disturbing your fellow students.

Anything you post online or say in class must conform to the standards of polite and constructive dialogue. This does not mean that you cannot disagree with another person. It just means that you must disagree politely. If I feel that you are not abiding by the standards of polite etiquette, I will notify you and may deduct points from your grade. For those of you looking for more information on internet etiquette, see http://www.library.yale.edu/training/netiquette/index.html. In cases of student misconduct in the classroom or online, I will follow the procedures outlined in http://www.indiana.edu/~ufc/docs/AY05/Circulars/U10-2005.approved.htm.

SOURCES

This course makes extensive use of a variety of source material – some of which you may not often see in history courses. In addition to the typical sources you find in a history lecture or textbook, such as political tracts, letters, or laws, this course examines artwork, films, philosophical treatises, literature, and material objects. This is because all of these sources are historical documents. For example, literature can make profound statements about the ideals, values, and problems of a particular society. An artwork is as much a reflection of a society as a piece of legislation, and both provide important historical insights. Therefore, you will be exposed to an interdisciplinary view of history, the purpose of which is to give you a well-rounded introduction to historical topics and themes.

You are expected to understand the difference between primary and secondary sources, an important distinction in a history course. Primary documents, simply put, are historical materials (textual, visual, or material) that were created in the period being studied. Secondary documents are historical materials (textual, visual, or material) created at a later date which analyze an earlier period. For example, a letter written by Charles I in 1640 is a primary document. A textbook written in 1960, which analyzes Charles I’s letter is a secondary source. For more information on primary and secondary sources, see http://college.hmco.com/history/us/berkin/history_handbook/1e/students/activities.html
PLAGIARISM/CHEATING

I will not tolerate either of these. Cheating includes copying answers from another student or bringing notes to an exam. Plagiarism is using the words or ideas of another person in your work and presenting them as your own. I will fail you for either of these. Additionally, I will report you to the Dean of Student Affairs. If you have any questions as to what constitutes plagiarism or cheating, see me or see the “Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct” online at http://www.iupui.edu/code/.

LECTURES

Required readings are marked with an asterisk (*).

The Long Eighteenth Century

Lecture 1, 20 August 2008

These books are introductory surveys of the eighteenth-century, and they will help you throughout the semester:


Political Culture

Lecture 2, 27 August 2008

Lecture 3, 3 September 2008

Politeness and Sociability

Lecture 4, 10 September 2008
• J. Habermas, The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society (Cambridge, MA, 1989).

Lecture 5, 17 September 2008

Class

Lecture 6, 24 September 2008
Note: Half of the class will choose Clark’s Struggle for the Breeches, and half of the class will choose Thompson’s Making of the English Working Class
• *A. Clark, The Struggle for the Breeches: Gender and the Making of the British Working Class (Berkeley, 1995).
• ———, "The Moral Economy of the English Crowd in the 18th Century", Thompson,

- D. Wahrman, Imagining the Middle Class: The Political Representation of Class in Britain, C. 1780-1840 (Cambridge, 1995).

29 September 2008
"Fashionable Histories: Material Culture and Consumer Society in the Long Eighteenth Century"
Dr. Brian Cowan
Canada Research Chair in Early Modern British History
McGill University, Canada

Lecture 7, 1 October 2008

Lecture 8, 15 October 2008 (Note: we will not have class on 8 October 2008)

Gender and Sexuality
Lecture 9, 22 October 2008
Lecture 10, 29 October 2008

* K. Harvey, Reading Sex in the Eighteenth Century: Bodies and Gender in English Erotic Culture (Cambridge, 2004).

Lecture 11, 5 November 2008

* M. Myrone, Bodybuilding: Reforming Masculinities in British Art 1750-1810 (New Haven, 2005).

Lecture 12, 12 November 2008


Lecture 13, 19 November 2008

* R. A. Austen and W. D. Smith, 'The Economic Value of British Colonial Empire in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', History Compass, 3 (December 2005).
* G. Dening, Mr Bligh's Bad Language: Passion, Power, and Theatre on the Bounty (Cambridge, 1992).
* B. Douglas, 'Voyages, Encounters, and Agency in Oceania: Captain Cook and Indigenous People', History Compass, 6 (May 2008).
* J. Gibney, 'Early Modern Ireland: A British Atlantic Colony?', History Compass, 6 (January 2008).
* ———. 'British Imperial History 'New' and 'Old'
• M. Ogborn, Indian Ink: Script and Print in the Making of the English East India Company (Chicago, 2007).

Slavery

Lecture 14, 3 December 2008

• O. Patterson, Slavery and Social Death: A Comparative Study (Cambridge, Mass., 1982).
• E. Williams, Capitalism & Slavery (Chapel Hill, 1944).

ASSIGNMENT GUIDELINES

Discussion Leadership

Each student will lead a discussion of the day’s readings twice during the semester. You will sign up for these on the Wiki page on Oncourse. You will be teamed with another student, and your responsibilities will be the following:
• Preparing a handout on the day’s readings for your fellow students. The format is up to you, but it should include a short summary of each of the readings as well as a discussion of significance, historiographical relevance, and methodology. We will discuss the details on the first day of class.
• Preparing a lesson plan for the discussion. Your lesson plan should include your goals for the day as well as a list of questions to guide the class’s discussion. It is also important that you relate the day’s learning goals to the topics and themes that we have been discussing in class. You can design your lesson plan any way that you want, so feel free to be creative.
• The best discussions will bring in material beyond the readings, including other secondary sources, artwork, broadsheets, music, etc.
**Weekly Editorial Critique**

In this course, each of you will act as editors for the journal and book publishing firm Historians, Inc. As editors, you will be assigned a group of writings each week. Your job will be to read these articles and books to determine their theses and major points and to explain their historiographical significance. Each week, you are required to submit a publication report for each publication to the general editor (me) with your suggestions regarding acceptance or denial of publication. You should use the report sheet provided at the end of this syllabus (extras available on Oncourse under the “Resources” tab). You should write your review in essay form because we may read these out loud during class. A good report will be at least 500 words.

**Historiographical Essay**

Your final assignment is a thematic historiographical essay. Your historiographical essay will be 2500-3000 words, not including your bibliography. Your papers are due on 8 December 2008. You will meet with me to determine a topic. While your essay may not discuss all of the books in your bibliography, your bibliography should be comprehensive. We will discuss how to create a bibliography during class.

Hints for Writing a Historiographical Essay, Prof. Jeremy Popkin

http://www.uky.edu/~popkin/650%20HolocaustSyl_files/Historiographical%20Essay.htm

A historiographical essay is an essay which analyzes the way a single historical topic or issue is treated by a number of authors. A historiographical essay is usually problem-centered, unlike a book review, which is centered on a single publication (even though a book review does normally make some reference to other works related to the book being discussed). For example, a historiographical essay on Jewish resistance during the Holocaust might look at the differing definitions of resistance offered by Hilberg, Bauer, Gutman and Paulsson, their differing conclusions about the extent of such resistance, and their opinions about its impact. In addition to pointing out areas of agreement and disagreement in the work on this subject, a good historiographical essay should discuss the reasons for these differences and their implications for the understanding of the subject. Whereas book reviews usually deal with full-length books, historiographical essays are more flexible and often discuss articles as well as books.

There is no single formula for organizing a historiographical essay. Like all interpretive and argumentative essays, a historiographical essay should have an introduction defining its subject and offering a preview of the following argument, and it should end with a conclusion in which you look back over what you have said, summarize your most important findings, and leave the reader with a significant thought to carry away from the piece. The introduction and conclusion should be separate paragraphs or sequences of paragraphs; if you combine them with paragraphs that are really part of the body of your paper, you have probably not devoted enough time and effort to them. In between, however, there are several different ways to organize your material. The best approach will depend on the nature of the issue discussed in your readings and the nature of the readings themselves. Some of the various approaches that are possible are:
(1) the “historiographical-evolution” approach: This usually works best if you are comparing a series of more or less comparable secondary works that deal with closely related questions and that show a clear evolution of viewpoints over time. Such essays usually begin by discussing a fundamental book that set forth important theses on a historical topic and then looking at subsequent publications that challenged those theses, perhaps substituting a new general interpretation that was subsequently revised in its turn. Thus, if you were reviewing the historiographical literature on what Holocaust historians call the “intentionalist-functionalist debate” (did Hitler and the Nazis have a clear plan for dealing with the Jews when they came to power in 1933, or did their measures evolve as they encountered new aspects of the problem?), you might begin with Hilberg’s thesis that they knew what they wanted to do from the start, proceed through the works of historians like Schleunes, Mommsen and Broszat who claimed that there was no initial plan, turn to Fleming’s counterargument that Hitler knew all along what he wanted to do, and perhaps conclude with S. Friedlaender’s and Ian Kershaw’s attempts to find a kind of middle ground on the issue. In an essay of this sort, you tend to treat each successive publication as a response to the earlier ones; your job as historiographical analyst is to show how this conversation among historians proceeded and what ending point it finally reached. In such an essay, you would usually discuss each book in turn, normally in chronological order.

(2) The “rival-schools” approach: You may find that your readings reflect differing approaches to a subject, but that they do not fall into the pattern of assertion—challenge—synthesis—new challenge that is characteristic of the “historiographical evolution” essay. In this case, it may make more sense to present the major interpretations of a problem as examples of competing historiographical or ideological approaches. In this case, the chronological order in which works appeared may be less important, since you may be suggesting that different interpretations have co-existed with each other over time, rather than one replacing the other. One might, for example, contrast the “German national character” approach to perpetrator mentality, found in Goldhagen’s work, with the “conformity/pressure of circumstances” interpretation in Browning and the “working-toward-the-Fuehrer” explanation offered in Kershaw. Here your emphasis would be on explaining the logic of each explanation and its strengths and weaknesses.

(3) The “different aspects of the problem” approach: Sometimes one constructs a historiographical essay by treating the different works you read, not as competing attempts to explain a single central problem, but as different perspectives that add up to a larger whole. This type of essay would be appropriate, for example, if you were examining different types of primary sources, as we did in the readings on the experience of Jews in the Polish ghettos. It does not make much sense to treat Ringelblum’s Notes from the Warsaw Ghetto, the Chronicle of the Lodz Ghetto, Chaim Kaplan’s diary, Adam Czerniakow’s journal, and Janina David’s memoir as a series of publications leading to a synthesis, or as representatives of differing schools of interpretation. It would make more sense to talk about the different kinds of information one can extract from each of these sources, and how they may complement or undermine each other. While such an approach would be natural in dealing with primary sources, it may also be used in discussing secondary literature. An essay on the Final Solution in the countries of western Europe might cover the two books on France by Marrus/Paxton and Poznanski, along with Bob Moore’s monograph on Jews in the Netherlands and Suzanne Zuccotti’s book on Italy; in this case, you would be looking at the similarities and differences of the Holocaust in three different societies that
shared some common features, and suggesting a general picture of the situation in western Europe that could be constructed from these more limited studies.

(4) The “thematic” approach: in the three schemes of organization discussed above, the essay would normally be organized as a succession of sections, each discussing a particular book, held together by an introduction explaining why you are discussing these books and a conclusion recapitulating the argument you have made about how they are related. A completely different approach would start by defining several issues or themes that are found in all the books you have read, and then discussing each issue in turn, comparing and contrasting what each of your authors says about it. In an essay on Jewish resistance, for example, rather than proceeding book-by-book, you might decide that the important issues are the way in which different authors define resistance, the motives they attribute to resisters, and the way in which they measure the success of resistance efforts. In this case, your discussion of any one book will be broken up into sections dealing with the way your themes are treated in it.

As these remarks indicate, a historiographical essay may look somewhat like a series of separate book reviews strung together (or, in the case of the thematically organized review, several book reviews combined in a blender). Try not to think of your historiographical essay in these ways, however. The success of a historiographical essay depends on showing how the materials you are discussing relate to each other, rather than just evaluating each one on its individual merits. While a historiographical essay may, and often does, include comments on the sources used in each book discussed, the organization of the book, and the author’s style, these issues, which are often central in book reviews, should be subordinated to the more general arguments that link the books together. A book review is often trying to answer questions such as “Is this particular book worth reading? What does it say that is new? Does it make its point clearly?” In a historiographical essay, we usually take it for granted that the books being discussed have already proved their worth, and the bigger question is “How does what we read in this book compare with what we find in other, related works? What is the significance of the differences and of the things the books have in common?” Think of it as the difference between painting an accurate picture of an individual subject (book review) and writing a play with several different characters who interact (historiographical essay).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reviewer:</th>
<th>Time spent reading book/article:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Overall quality of text (1=good, 5=poor):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographical Information (use Chicago Manual of Style):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis:</td>
<td>Thesis supported by evidence (1=good, 5=poor):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory and Methodology:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(What theoretical model/s does the author use to articulate the thesis? What methodological approach does the author make? What kinds of sources does the author use?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Author clearly explains historiographical significance (1=good, 5=poor):
Author makes a significant contribution to the state of the historical literature (1=good, 5=poor):
DO YOU RECOMMEND THIS BOOK OR ARTICLE FOR PUBLICATION?:
(Explain in detail why or why not.)