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Rationale and Objectives

The lack of historical awareness on the part of contemporary university graduates has led recent studies of higher education to call for the creation and development of historical consciousness in undergraduates now and in the future. From one perspective historical awareness is a valuable aid in the analysis of present-day problems because historical forces and traditions have created modern life and lie just beneath its surface. From a second perspective, the historical past is an indispensable source of national identity and of values which facilitate social harmony and cooperative effort. Along with this observation, it should be noted that historical study can produce intercultural understanding by tracing cultural differences to their origins in the past. A third perspective on the need for historical awareness is summed up in the aphorism that he who fails to learn from the past is doomed to repeat it. Teachers of today's students know well that those students do not usually approach questions of war and peace with any knowledge of historic concord, aggression, or cruelty, including even events so recent as Nazi and Stalinist terror.

The requirement of a course which is historical in method and content presumes that "history" designates a sequence of past events or a narrative whose intent or effect is to represent such a sequence. The requirement also presumes that these are human events and that history includes all that has been felt, thought, imagined, said, and done by human beings. The opportunities for nurturing historical consciousness are nearly unlimited. History is present in the languages, art, music, literatures, philosophy, religion, and the natural sciences, as well as in the social science traditionally called History.
Proposer: Please complete the following section and attach appropriate documentation.

**ASU--[H] CRITERIA**

THE HISTORICAL AWARENESS [H] COURSE MUST MEET THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>Identify Documentation Submitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>syllabus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>syllabus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE FOLLOWING ARE NOT ACCEPTABLE:

- Courses in which there is only chronological organization.
- Courses which are exclusively the history of a field of study or of a field of artistic or professional endeavor.
- Courses whose subject areas merely occurred in the past.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria (from checksheet)</th>
<th>How course meets spirit (contextualize specific examples in next column)</th>
<th>Please provide detailed evidence of how course meets criteria (i.e., where in syllabus)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History is major focus of the course.</td>
<td>Historiography of a central debate in Russian culture since the 18th century up to the present, between Slavophiles and Westernizers, about the Europeanization of Russia begun by Peter the Great.</td>
<td>The course begins with the latest manifestations of the debates between Slavophiles and Westernizers, and then returns to the 18th century, Peter the Great (week 2-3), and Europeanization to trace the genesis of the central terms of this debate as it was articulated during important reigns and historical turning points, which provide the context for the weekly topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course examines and explains human development as a sequence of events.</td>
<td>Historiography of ideas of progress and of Russian history as interrupted, first by Peter the Great and then by the Russian Revolution in 1917.</td>
<td>Beginning in the 1830s, with the publication of Petr Chaadaev’s philosophical letter (week 5), Russians articulated their positions in response to historical turning points (1848, 1861, 1881, 1905, 1917, and 1991) as Westernizers, who argued that Russia had to follow Western models of civilization and progress, and Slavophiles, who argued that Russia had its own unique history and mission in the world, one shaped by the Russian Orthodox faith, to which Russians needed to return, rather than progress forwards. This debate continues in the post-Soviet era, which frames the course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. There is a disciplined systematic examination of human institutions as they change over time.

4. The course examines the relationship among events, ideas, and artifacts and the broad social, political and economic contexts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. The formal institutions and informal groups of the Russian noble elite, which brought together cultural figures from many disciplines and created the cross-fertilization of ideas that produced a world-class culture within two generations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. The notion of civil society highlights the formal and informal institutions of the elite as part of governmental and non-governmental organizations, and thus central actors for change and revolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the institutions of circles, societies, and thick journals, covering politics, literature, and history (see week 9), were formed and came to represent various artistic and political tendencies around which ideas coalesced, evolved, and changed from one decade to the next, up to the present. The many letters in the course reflect the connections established through many informal institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The readings come from 2 readers, one in Russian intellectual history and the other in historical readings on civil society, set around the central artifact of one of the greatest Russian memoirs, by the liberal writer and activist Alexander Herzen, written in exile in London over the 1850s and 1860s (weeks 10-13). Herzen is the center of Stoppard's trilogy about 19th-century Russian politics and thought.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Course Description
We survey the central debate in Russian culture since 1700, between the Slavophiles and Westernizers, through political philosophy, literary criticism, literature, history, religion, philosophy, and film. With a focus on nineteenth-century responses by the intelligentsia to the Peter the Great’s Europeanization of Russia, we trace these issues up through recent manifestations of this debate in theater and film. In addition to short works by Catherine the Great, Radishchev, Karamzin, Chaadaev, Pushkin, Gogol, Dostoevsky, Belinsky, Dobroliubov, Solzhenitsyn, Sakharov, Tarkovsky, Mikhalkov, and Sokurov, we read perhaps the greatest nineteenth-century Russian memoir, Alexander Herzen’s *My Past and Thought*. We will examine the special position of the elite and intelligentsia in Russian culture and politics, with particular attention to the institutional role of publications and journals, through the framework of debates in political theory about civil society. In particular, since the 1980s, ideas about the special role of elites and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have taken on a vigorous new role in Russia’s political transitions and its relationship with the United States. The historiography of debates about Russian culture continues to be shaped by the teleological concerns of today.

Requirements
- Weekly response to study questions comparing positions of authors or directors (300-400 words) (25%)
- 5 to 7-page midterm paper (1,250-1,750 words) due in class on one author or director that includes a work in addition to that read or viewed in class. (30%)
- 10-page final paper (2,500 words) due in class that examines an important debate between two or more authors or directors in the context of arguments in political theory about civil society. (35%)
- Class participation includes listening as well as speaking. (10%)

Required Texts
- Other readings will be posted on Blackboard

Texts on Reserve
  o Part I: Voyage, PR 6069 T6 V69X 2002
  o Part II: Shipwreck, PR 6069 T6 S55X 2002
  o Part III: Salvage, PR 6069 T6 S255 2002

**Websites**
Brockhaus and Efрон, *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar’* (Moscow, 1890-1906)

**Attendance**
Attendance is mandatory. I will take formal attendance. Let me know ahead of time if you cannot come to class. After 4 unexcused absences, your grade for the course will drop a half grade.

**Goals**
Students should learn the following information and skills:
1. Key figures, texts, and their arguments in a major Russian cultural debate over the past 3 centuries about Russia’s relationship to the West, and how it relates to current issues.
2. A historical understanding of debates on civil society and their relationship to current relations between the United States and Russia.
3. How to interpret primary texts from diverse disciplines (literature, history, political theory, religion, and philosophy).
4. How to identify, articulate, and write about key arguments in Russian culture.
5. The précis: summary, analysis and critique of ideas in weekly paragraphs.

**Syllabus**

**Week 1**
Introduction: Peter the Great and Europeanization
Slavophile/Westerner debate today in Russian culture; historiography of the debate; the role of the intelligentsia

- Tom Stoppard, *The Coast of Utopia* (2002), reviews of the MXAT’s production

**Week 2**

Peter I (1689-1725)

- Prince Mikhail M. Shcherbatov (1733-90), “Petition of the City of Moscow on Being Relegated to Oblivion” (1787; pub. 1860); “Approximate Evaluation of the Length of time Russia would have Required, in the Most Favorable Circumstances, to Attain by Her Own Efforts, without the Autocratic Rule of Peter the Great, Her Present State of Enlightenment and Glory” (pub. 1890), (Raeff, No. 3, 49-60).


**Week 3**

Catherine II (1762-96)

- Empress Catherine the Great (1729-96), *Nakaz* (1768), *Documents of Catherine the Great*, ed. by W. F. Reddaway (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1931), 215-35
- Princess Catherine Dashkova (1743-1810), Russian Academy Dictionary (1786-94)

**Week 4**

Alexander I (1801-25)

- Nikolai Mikhailovich Karamzin (1766-1826),
  - *Letters of a Russian Traveler* (1791-1801)
  - “Notes of Old and New Russia in her Political and Civic Relations” (1811, 1861) (Riya, 280-94)
- Alexander Pushkin, “The Bronze Horseman” (1833)
- G.F.W. Hegel, from *Philosophy of Right* (1821) (Hodgkinson & Wiley, *Reader*, 76-95)

**Week 5**

Nikolai I (1825-55)
• Petr Iakovlevich Chaadaev (1794-1856), “Letters on the Philosophy of History” (Teleskop, 1836) (Raeff, No. 8, 160-73)
• Alexander Sergeevich Pushkin (1799-1837), “Letter to Chaadaev” (Oct. 19, 1836)
• Ivan Kireevsky (1806-56), “European Culture: Its Relation to the Culture of Russia,” (1852) (Raeff, No. 9, 174-207)
• Alexei Stepanovich Khomiakov (1804-60), “On Humboldt” (1849; pub. 1861-73) (Raeff No. 10, 208-29)

Week 6 1840s
• Vissarion Grigor’evich Belinsky (1811-48)
  o “Thoughts and Notes on Russian Literature” (Otechestvennye zapiski 1846) (Matlaw 33-82)
  o “A Survey of Russian Literature in 1847: Part Two” (1847) (Matlaw)
  o “Letter to N. V. Gogol” (1847; pub. Poltarnaia zvezda, 1855) (Raeff No. 12, 252-61), or (Matlaw 83-94)
• Nikolai Vasil’evich Gogol (1809-52), Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends (1847)
• Ivan Turgenev (1818-83), A Huntsman’s Sketches (1847-51, 1852, 1872-74)

Week 7 Alexander II (1855-81)
• Konstantin Sergeevich Aksakov (1817-60), “On the Internal State of Russia” (1855; pub. Rus’, 1881) (Raeff, No. 11, 230-51)
• Nikolai Aleksandrovich Dobroliubov (1836-61), “What is Oblomovitis?” (Sovremennik, 1859) (Matlaw, 133-75)
• Nikolai Gavrilovich Chernyshevsky (1828-89), “The Russian at the Rendez-Vous” (Sovremennik, 1859) (Matlaw, 108-29)

Week 8 Emancipation 1861/Assassination 1881
• Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky (1821-81)
  o Winter Notes on Summer Impressions (1863)
  o Notes From Underground (1864)
  o “Pushkin: A Sketch” (Dnevnik pisatel’ia, 1880) (Raeff, No. 14, 288-300)
• Konstantin Dmitrievich Kavelin (1818-85), “A Letter to F. M. Dostoevsky” (1880; pub. Vestnik Evropy, 1889) (Raeff, No. 15, 301-21)
• First paper due

Week 9 Thick Journals
• Vestnik Evropy, Sovremennik, Evropeets, Moskвитинин, Biblioteka dlia chtenia, Russkii vestnik, Otechestvennye zapiski
• Alexis de Toqueville, from Democracy in America (1832) (Hodgkinson & Wiley, Reader, 113-32)

Week 10 Alexander Ivanovich Herzen (1812-70)
*My Life and Thought (1852-68)*

**Week 11**
*My Life and Thought (1852-68)*
- Karl Marx, from “On the Jewish Question” (1844) (Hodgkinson & Wiley, *Reader*, 96-112)

**Week 12**
*My Life and Thought (1852-68)*

**Week 13**
*My Life and Thought (1852-68)*

**Week 14**
- Viacheslav Ivanovich Ivanov (1866-1949) and Mikhail Osipovich Gershenzon (1869-1925), “A Corner-to-Corner Correspondence” (1921) (Raeff, No. 18, 372-401)

**Week 15**
- Leonid Brezhnev (1964-82)
  - *Landmarks* (Vekhi, 1909), *From the Depths* (Iz glubiny, 1918), *From Under the Rubble* (Iz pod glyb, 1974)

**Week 16**
  - *The Coast of Utopia* (2002), reviews of the MXAT’s production

**Week 17**
Conclusions

Final paper due

**Disability Accommodations:** Qualified students with disabilities who will require disability accommodations in this class are encouraged to make their requests to me at the beginning of the semester either during office hours or by appointment.

**Plagiarism**
Plagiarism is bad scholarship with serious consequences. Do not do it. It is the equivalent of being caught doping in athletics: an attempt to gain a competitive advantage by illegal means. Here are some ASU guidelines that you will have covered or will cover in ASU101:

http://provost.asu.edu/academicintegrity
http://ctes.asu.edu/firstYrSeminar/core/integrity/

We will review proper ways to acknowledge ideas and quotations by others before you write your first paper. Papers for this course do NOT require research, just that you read the texts carefully, think about how they work and what that means, and articulate YOUR ideas clearly.

**Guidelines for Papers**

Papers must be double-spaced and responsive to all aspects of the assignment, including length (provide a word count on the first page), and prepared according to the Modern Language Association or *Chicago Manual of Style*. Make sure you document every reference—in quotation or paraphrase—including page numbers whenever possible. Your name should appear only on the back of the last page. Feel free to write in the first person. Support claims with evidence and conclusions with argument. Avoid wordiness and hyperbolic words like *extremely*.

**Paper grades:**

An “A” paper demonstrates that the writer has not only mastered the concepts of the course, but also has applied them in an imaginative and incisive way. The paper shows a command of language that allows the writer to express worthwhile ideas or perceptions clearly, effectively, *in detail* and with virtually no mechanical errors. There is grace to the sentence structure, which is clear and varied throughout. The paper consistently includes adequate documentation. The “A” grade is reserved for exceptional papers; “A-” papers tend to be exceptional in part but marred by one or two problems.

A “B” paper demonstrates that the writer has understood the concepts of the course, and has applied them with some originality. The paper shows the writer can organize a coherent essay with few mechanical errors. The thesis statement is clear and is responsive to the assigned topic. It is supported with strong, logical argumentation and use of evidence. The paper for the most part includes adequate documentation.

A “C” paper demonstrates that the writer has understood most of the concepts of the course, but needs to pay more attention to detail in reading or writing. Thesis statement and topic sentences are weak, and documentation is erratic.

A “D” paper demonstrates that the writer has only a minimal understanding of the concepts of the course. Significant gaps in the writer's comprehension indicate the need for more study. Moreover, the writer's basic compositional skills are below satisfactory for university work. Documentation is unsatisfactory.

An “NC” paper demonstrates that the writer has little, if any, understanding of the concepts of the course. Because of the writer's lack of skill or concern, the work includes gross errors as well as a conspicuous lack of content. Documentation is negligible. The paper may also fail to address parts of the assignment.

A paper may combine different levels of work. In that case, the grade will depend on the paper's overall demonstration of knowledge of the material and of writing skills.