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The Craft of History is unique in the master’s program at Rutgers-Camden. Rather than a readings or research course in a particular area of history, Craft is designed to familiarize students with major problems, questions, and methods that shape the discipline of history as a whole.

 In the late 19th century, the study of history was conceived of as a science—and science was conceived of as being ahistorical. That is, history was a phenomenon that the historian could observe objectively, without affecting or being affected by the process of observation; likewise, scientific knowledge built progressively upon itself, existing outside any particular historical context. Over the course of the 20th century, though, understandings of history and science changed. Historians were recast not as objective observers of history but as subjective participants in history, who interpreted the past through their own biases and who were limited by their own historical context. By the 1960s, the very concept of “knowledge”—historical, scientific, and otherwise—had been destabilized, and claims to knowledge were often interpreted as claims to power. New understandings of how to study the past came to challenge traditional approaches, leading to an expansion of subjects of historical study but also to a final collapse of the consensus that had defined academic history at the start of the century.

The course is divided into two parts. In Part I, our readings cover a variety of major historiographical approaches. In Part II, we will examine several cases of historiographical debate and consider the boundaries between scholarship and fraud.

**Required books:**

*Note: All other required readings will be posted on the Sakai course website under “Resources.” These shorter readings (book chapters and articles) are subject to change.*

1. Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The “Objectivity Question” and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge, 1988)
2. Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (University of Chicago Press, 1962)
3. Eugene Genovese, *Roll Jordan Roll: The World the Slaves Made* (Vintage, 1976 [1972])
4. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (Verso, 2006)
5. Edward Said, *Orientalism*. (Vintage, 1994)
6. Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman, *Denying History: Who Says the Holocaust Never Happened and Why Do They Say It?* (University of California Press, 2009)
7. Arias, ed., *The Rigoberta Menchu Controversy* (University of Minnesota, 2001)
8. David Blight, *Race and Reunion* (Harvard, 2002)
9. Richard Evans, *In Defense of History* (Norton, 2000)

**Assignments and Grading:** Since this class is a seminar, students are expected to complete all reading assignments on time (that is, before the class for which they are listed on the schedule below) and to participate actively in discussion.

The course has three writing assignments, 8–10 pages each. For the first paper, you will come up with and answer a question that treats any single week’s readings from weeks 1 through 5; you may turn it in at any time on or before October 11. For the second paper, you will do the same for the readings for weeks 6 through 9; you may turn it in at any time on or before November 15. For the third paper, you will consider the ways in which people have sought to distinguish valid from invalid claims about the past as covered in the readings from weeks 10 through 14; it is due on December 16.

Your final grade will be distributed as follows:

• 30% for class participation

• 20% for the first paper [due by Oct. 11]

• 25% for the second paper [due by Nov. 15]

• 25% for the final paper [due on Dec. 16]

**Attendance**: If you must miss a class, you will be required to write a 5-7-page paper on that week’s readings, to be submitted by the beginning of the next class meeting.

**SCHEDULE OF CLASSES AND ASSIGNMENTS**

*Note: please read items in the order in which they appear below.*

**Unit I: Historians’ Approaches**

**Week 1**, **September 6**

***The History of History***

* Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The “Objectivity Question” and the American Historical Profession* whole book

**Week 2,** **September 13**

***Science as History***

* Excerpts from Karl Popper, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery* (New York: Basic Books, 1959)
* Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962)
* Re-read Novick, *That Noble Dream*, 298–301 and 524–35

**Week 3, September 20**

***Marxism***

* Excerpts from Karl Marx, *Capital*, vol. 1 [pp. 671-715]
* Raymond Williams, “Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural History,” *New Left Review* I/82 (November-December 1973): 3–16
* E. P. Thompson, “Eighteenth-Century English Society: Class Struggle without Class?” *Social History* 3, no. 2 (May 1978): 133–65
* Excerpts from Ellen Meiksins Wood, *Democracy Against Capitalism: Renewing Historical Materialism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995)
* Excerpts from Eric Hobsbawm, *On History* (The New Press, 1998) [pp. 141-156]

**Week 4, September 27**

***Imperialism***

* John A. Hobson, *Imperialism: A Study* (London: Allen Unwin, 1954; first published 1902), Part I, Chapter 6
* Vladimir I. Lenin, *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Chapters 7 and 10
* D. K. Fieldhouse, “‘Imperialism’: An Historiographical Revision,” *Economic History Review* 14, no. 2 (1961): 187–209
* Arthur M. Eckstein, “Is There a ‘Hobson-Lenin Thesis’ on Late Nineteenth-Century Colonial Expansion?” *Economic History Review* 44, no. 2 (May 1991): 297–318
* Ronald Robinson and John Gallagher, “The Imperialism of Free Trade,” *Economic History Review* 6, no. 1 (1953): 1–15
* D. C. M. Platt, “The Imperialism of Free Trade: Some Reservations,” *Economic History Review* 21, no. 2 (August 1968): 296–306
* Eric Stokes, “Late Nineteenth-Century Colonial Expansion and the Attack on the Theory of Economic Imperialism: A Case of Mistaken Identity?” *Historical Journal* 12, no. 2 (1969): 285–301
* Fernando Cardoso, “The Consumption of Dependency Theory in the United States,” *Latin American Research Review* 12 (1977): 7-24
* Louis Pérez, “Dependency,” *Journal of American History* 77 (June, 1990): 133-142

**Week 5, October 4**

***Hegemony and Slavery***

* Eugene Genovese, *Roll, Jordan, Roll: The World the Slaves Made* (New York: Vintage Books, 1976), preface, 3–158, 585–660
* Raymond Williams, “Hegemony,” in Williams, *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), 108–114
* T. J. Jackson Lears, “The Concept of Cultural Hegemony: Problems and Possibilities,” *American Historical Review* 90, no. 3 (June 1985): 567–93

**Week 6,** **October 11**

**FIRST PAPER DUE AT BEGINNING OF CLASS**

***Postmodernism***

* Zygmunt Bauman, “Postmodernity, Or Living with Ambivalence,” in *A Postmodern Reader*, ed. Joseph Natoli and Linda Hutcheon (Albany: SUNY Press, 1993), 9–24
* Michel Foucault, “Excerpts from *The History of Sexuality*,” in *A Postmodern Reader*, 333–41
* Geoff Danaher et al., *Understanding Foucault*, Chapter 2
* Jean Baudrillard, “The Precession of Simulacra,” in *A Postmodern Reader*, 342–75
* John Toews, “Intellectual History after the Linguistic Turn: The Autonomy of Meaning and the Irreducibility of Experience,” *American Historical Review* 92, no. 4 (October 1987): 879–907
* Hayden White, “Postmodernism and Textual Anxieties,” in *The Postmodern Challenge: Perspectives East and West*, ed. Nina Witszek and Bo Strath (London: Sage, 1999), 27–45
* Gertrude Himmelfarb, “Postmodernist History,” in Himmelfarb, *Looking into the Abyss: Untimely Thoughts on Culture and Society* (New York: Knopf, 1994)
* Joyce Appleby, Lynn Hunt, and Margaret Jacob, “Postmodernism and the Crisis of Modernity,” in *Telling the Truth About History* (New York: Norton, 1995), 198–237

**Week 7,** **October 18**

***The History of Women, History of Gender, and History of Sexuality***

* Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, “Gender, Class, and Power: Some Theoretical Considerations,” *The History Teacher* 15, no. 2 (February 1982): 255–76
* Joan W. Scott, “Gender: A Useful Category of Analysis,” *American Historical Review* 91, no. 5 (December 1986): 1053–75
* Linda Kerber, “Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman’s Place: The Rhetoric of Women’s History,” *Journal of American History* 75, no. 1 (June 1988): 9–39
* Emily Rosenberg, “Gender,” *Journal of American History* 77, no. 1 (June 1990): 116–24
* Kathleen Brown, “Brave New Worlds: Women’s and Gender History,” *William and Mary Quarterly* 50, no. 2 (April 1993): 311–28
* Carolyn Dean, “The Productive Hypothesis: Foucault, Gender, and the History of Sexuality,” *History and Theory* 33, no. 3 (October 1994): 271–96
* Nancy Isenberg, “Second Thoughts on Gender and Women’s History,” *American Studies* 36, no. 1 (Spring 1995): 93–103
* Joanne Meyerowitz, “A History of ‘Gender,’” *American Historical Review* 113, no. 5 (December 2008): 1346–56
* Jane Sherron De Hart and Linda Kerber, “Introduction: Gender and the New Women’s History,” in *Woman’s America: Refocusing the Past*, ed. Linda Kerber et al. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010)

**Week 8,** **October 25**

***Nationalism***

* Anderson, *Imagined Communities*
* Ernest Gellner, “Nationalism and Modernization,” in *Nationalism* (Oxford Readers), ed. John Hutchinson and Anthony Smith (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994), 55–62
* Eric Hobsbawm, “The Nation as Invented Tradition,” in *Nationalism*, 76–82
* Excerpts from Anthony Smith, *The Nation in History: Historiographical Debates about Ethnicity and Nationalism* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2000)

**Week 9,** **November 1**

***Postcolonialism***

* Said, *Orientalism*, 1-110
* Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, “Can the Subaltern Speak?” in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, ed. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (London: Macmillan, 1988), 271–313
* Partha Chatterjee, “Whose Imagined Community?” in *Internationalizing Cultural Studies: An Anthology*, ed. Ackbar Abbas and John Nguyet Erni (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005), 406–12
* Frederick Cooper, “Postcolonial Studies and the Study of History,” in *Postcolonial Studies and Beyond*, ed. Ania Loomba et al. (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 401–422
* D. A. Washbrook, “Orients and Occidents: Colonial Discourse and the Historiography of the British Empire,” in *The Oxford History of the British Empire*, vol. 5, *Historiography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 596–611

**Unit II: The Instability of Historical Knowledge, or, Problems in the Academy**

**Week 10,** **November 8**

***The Holocaust as a Case Study***

* Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman, *Denying History: Who Says the Holocaust never Happened and Why Do They Say It?*

**Week 11,** **November 15**

**SECOND PAPER DUE AT BEGINNING OF CLASS**

***The Bellesiles Incident***

* Michael Bellesiles, “The Origins of Gun Culture in the United States, 1760–1865,” *Journal of American History* 83, no. 2 (September 1996): 424–55
* Michael Bellesiles, review of *To Keep and Bear Arms: The Origins of an Anglo-American Right*, by Joyce Lee Malcolm, *Law and History Review* 14, no. 2 (Autumn 1996): 382–84
* Joyce Lee Malcolm, “Response to Bellesiles’s Review of *To Keep and Bear Arms: The Origins of an Anglo-American Right*,” *Law and History Review* 15, no. 2 (Autumn 1997): 339–41
* Michael Bellesiles, “Reply to Malcolm,” ibid., 343–45
* “Historians and Guns,” forum in *William and Mary Quarterly* 59, no. 1 (January 2002)
	+ Robert Gross, “Introduction,” 203–4
	+ Jack Rakove, “Words, Deeds, and Guns: ‘Arming America’ and the Second Amendment,” 205–210
	+ Gloria Main, “Many Things Forgotten: The Use of Probate Records in ‘Arming America,’” 211–16
	+ Ira Gruber, “Of Arms and Men: ‘Arming America’ and Military History,” 217–22
	+ Randolph Roth, “Guns, Gun Culture, and Homicide: The Relationship Between Firearms, the Uses of Firearms, and Interpersonal Violence,” 223–40
	+ Michael Bellesiles, “Exploring America’s Gun Culture,” 241–68
* James Lindgren, “Fall from Grace: *Arming America* and the Bellesiles Scandal,” *Yale Law Journal* 111, no. 8 (June 2002): 2195–249
* Jerome Sternstein, “‘Pulped’ Fiction: Michael Bellesiles and His Yellow Note Pads,” *History News Network*
* Stanley Katz, Hannah Holborn Gray, and Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, “Report of the Investigative Committee in the Matter of Professor Michael Bellesiles,” pp. 1–19 [downloaded from http://www.emory.edu/news/Releases/Final\_Report.pdf on 20 January 2014]
* Peter Charles Hoffer, *Past Imperfect: Facts, Fictions, and Fraud—American History from Bancroft to Ambrose, Bellesiles, Ellis, and Goodwin* (New York: Public Affairs, 2007), Chapter 5

**Week 12,** **November 22**

***Thanksgiving Break--No Class Meeting***

**Week 13, November 29**

***History, Memory, and the Construction of Meaning I: Central America***

Arturo Arias, ed., *The* *Rigoberta Menchú Controversy* [skip pp. 156-170; 251-269;309-350]

**Week 14,** **December 6**

***History, Memory, and the Construction of Meaning II: The Old South***

David Blight, *Race and Reunion*

**Week 15, December 13**

***Summing Up***

Richard Evans, *In Defense of History*

**FINAL PAPER DUE DECEMBER 16 AT 5 P.M.**