

## **HIST 510: Modern European Cultural History**

Assoc. Prof. Ian F. McNeely

Fall 2006

The purpose of HIST 510 is to introduce graduate students to exemplary works and key methodological approaches in the study of modern European cultural history. Its purpose is fundamentally different from HIST 410, but the two courses complement each other.

Students in HIST 510 should plan to meet with the instructor on most Fridays from 8:30 to 9:50 in 319 MCK. *You* will be expected to do most of the talking at these meetings. Attendance at the MW class meetings of HIST 410 is mandatory, and doing the assigned 410 readings is highly recommended, but neither the journal nor the proposals are required.

Graduate students will instead be graded on class participation (in 410 as well as 510), on eight short reaction papers of 2-3 pages apiece, and on a longer (ca. 15 pp.) research paper. This paper should situate the methodology of HIST 410 amidst other approaches to cultural history by focusing on one of the weekly themes—and its historiography.

You should familiarize yourself with the definition of historiography (see, e.g., <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Historiography>). I also assume you will acquire expertise in the use of these search engines: Historical Abstracts and JSTOR for articles, books, and reviews; Amazon.com for recent (and some older) books; and Academic Search Premier for more book reviews. All of them are linked to my homepage. There, too, you can find links to various online new and used booksellers to purchase the texts below.

### Friday meetings

|       |   |
|-------|---|
| 9/29  | (no meeting)  |
| 10/6  | Lynn Hunt, <i>Politics, Culture, and Class in the French Revolution</i> , 1-119, 213-36 |
| 10/13 | Benedict Anderson, <i>Imagined Communities</i> (2 <sup>nd</sup> ed.)                    |
| 10/20 | Carl Schorske, <i>Fin-de-siècle Vienna</i> , xvii-xxx, 3-115, 208-78, 322-66            |
| 10/27 | Patrick Joyce, <i>Visions of the People</i> , 1-113, 145-72, 329-42                     |
| 11/3  | Klaus Theweleit, <i>Male Fantasies</i> , vol. 1 to p. 228                               |
| 11/10 | Jochen Hellbeck, <i>Revolution on My Mind</i>   |
| 11/17 | Art Spiegelman, <i>Maus</i> , vol. 1  |
| 11/24 | (no meeting)  |
| 12/1  | Geoff Eley, <i>The Crooked Line</i>   |

### Requirements

Every week: 2-3 page reaction papers (see guidelines below).

Due Wed. 12/6: 15pp. synthetic historiographical paper on one of the syllabus themes.

## REACTION PAPER GUIDELINES

(adapted from Prof. John McCole)

About half the written work for this course consists of weekly reaction papers on the reading, each week except for the first and the ninth. Each paper should be 2-3 pages in length, and is due at the session when the book is to be discussed.

I use the term “reaction” paper with some hesitation. I am interested in an *analytical* reaction to the work, not in subjective impressions of it. Please don’t simply write “this was hard to follow,” or “I was not convinced” (or their contraries!) unless you are about to explain and demonstrate why the argument is incoherent or fails to prove its point.

At a minimum, you should incorporate answers to questions like the following:

- what is this book’s topic?
- what is its thesis? (not the same thing as its topic)
- how does it argue for that thesis?
- how does this book seem to figure in the literature of its field? (Your ability to judge this in any given case will vary.)
- what sorts of evidence is it based on?
- what methods does it use to interpret that evidence and build explanations?
- is there a characteristic rhetorical strategy in the book?
- is there an underlying valuational, moral, or political point?

This list is meant to be not a mechanical or exhaustive recipe for writing a paper but as a collection of some ingredients you will want to concoct in your own fashion.

Finally, you should try to take account of the distinctiveness of each of the works. Not all of them will follow the same pattern. Some books may be exemplary monographs; others may be syntheses of maturing fields; still others may be more experimental, provocative, or even field-transforming.