SOC 321 / ECS 323 Fall 2008

Loving and Hating the West

Tu/Th 10:00 am—11.20 am
Scheide Caldwell House (SCCAH) 209 (*www.princeton.edu/~pumap/buildings/156.html*)

Professor: Mischa Gabowitsch
Society of Fellows in the Liberal Arts Mailbox: Joseph Henry House
Office: 204B Scheide Caldwell Phone: 609 258-8558
E-mail: mgabowit@princeton.edu
Office hours: Tuesdays 1.30-3.00 and by appointment

Across the world, many people feel passionately about the "West." Some love or admire the Western world; others hate or despise it. We will discuss what different people mean by "the West" and what kinds of people tend to have strong views about it, and why. We will also look at the relationship between anti-Western and anti-American views, and between pro- and anti-Western ideologies and political practice. We will explore the significance of the West for national identities by comparing European pro- and anti-Westernisms with Middle Eastern and East Asian varieties.

The purpose of this course is to make you

- understand the various meanings of the concept of "the West" and the implications of its use in different contexts (e.g. the West as a civilization, a construct, a political reality or the embodiment of cultural and economic modernity);
- gain knowledge of the development of pro- and anti-Western ideologies in different countries and periods since the French Revolution; and
- develop an informed opinion on different approaches to studying pro- and anti-Western attitudes and the ability to assess the merits and weaknesses of different research perspectives (opinion polls, modernization theory, world-systems studies, ethnographic fieldwork etc).

Requirements and grade percentages:

- class participation, including weekly response papers and online discussion 25 %
- two oral presentations: an individual one (10 mins) and a joint one (15 mins) 10 % each
- midterm exam 25 %
- final paper (4,000-5,000 words plus bibliography) 30 %

Weekly response papers to specified readings (300-500 words) should be posted on Blackboard (Communication/Discussion Board) by *Monday 4pm* at the latest. Each response should be posted as a new thread with your name as the title. In your response papers, feel free to ask questions or state difficulties you may have encountered while reading the text.
You must read *everyone's* papers for Tuesday's class and be able to comment on them. Be specific in your comments, always mentioning which passage in whose paper you are referring to. You are also encouraged to post comments directly in the forum on Blackboard. Please be frank but respectful.

Dates:

Mid-term exam: Tuesday, Oct 21

Final papers are due by Dean's Date (Jan 13). Strictly no extensions.

Readings

Please note: The syllabus is subject to change to adapt to the course of our discussions. Updated versions will be posted on Blackboard. Please make sure you always use the latest version.

List of recommended books

These books have been ordered through Labyrinth Books and should be available from Week 1 at the latest. You are under no obligation to buy a copy; all these books (and other required and optional titles used in the course) are also on reserve in the Firestone Reserve Reading Room, and critical selections will be posted on Blackboard. This is simply a selection of books you might find useful to own because they will be used extensively in the course. Aydin and Neumann especially are handy reference works on their respective topics, and Buruma/Margalit and Wallerstein are short and therefore perhaps easier to buy than look up in a library. Neumann is available as an electronic resource through the Firestone catalog. So is the first edition of the Juergensmeyer book, although it is better to use the third edition.

Cemil Aydin , The Politics of Anti-Westernism in Asia. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.
Ian Buruma, Avishai Margalit , Occidentalism: The West in the Eyes of its Enemies. London etc: Penguin Books, 2004.
Mark Juergensmeyer , Terror in the Mind of God. 3d edition, revised and updated. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003.
Peter J. Katzenstein, Robert O. Keohane (eds.) , Anti-Americanisms in World Politics. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2007.
Iver B. Neumann , Russia and the Idea of Europe: A Study in Identity and International Relations. London; New York: Routledge, 1996.
Edward Said, Orientalism. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
Immanuel Wallerstein , World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction. Durham/NC; London: Duke University Press, 2004.

A note on readings and research

The core readings will be made available through Blackboard, the Reserve Room, and/or Labyrinth Books. However, bibliographical research is an important part of the learning process. You are responsible for finding all the readings you need for your coursework, presentations, and final paper, and should plan ahead to avoid last-minute crises (e.g. by using Borrow Direct or ILL if a book is unavailable at Princeton). For your presentations and paper, I will give you initial reading suggestions, but will expect you to devise your own reading strategy and do your own research to find additional sources.
As a general rule, it is always a good idea to find background information about the authors of the texts we are reading, even if this is not provided in class.

Always bring the texts to class!

Course schedule

Week 0

Thursday, Sep 11

Introduction to the course. No required readings.

Week 1: What is a Civilization? Is the West a Civilization?

Tuesday, Sep 16

required:
Bernard Lewis: "The Roots of Muslim Rage," Atlantic Monthly, September 1990 (vol. 266, no. 3), p. 47-60.
Samuel Huntington: "The Clash of Civilizations?", Foreign Affairs, Summer 1993
Edward Said: "The Clash of Ignorance," The Nation, Oct. 22, 2001

optional:
responses to Huntington in the Sep/Oct 1993 issue of *Foreign Affairs*: see the articles by Ajami, Mahbubani, Bartley, Binyan, Kirkpatrick, Weeks, and Piel at http://fullaccess.foreignaffairs.org/1993/4.html, and Huntington's reply at http://fullaccess.foreignaffairs.org/1993/5.html

Your first response paper is due Monday, Sep 15, by 4pm. Assess the arguments advanced by Lewis, Huntington, and Said. Does the concept of a "civilization" improve our understanding of the contemporary world? Is it something that has recently become relevant, or a timelessly valid term? Is the "West" a civilization, and if so, is it one civilization among many others, or is it somehow special? These questions are a guideline. You should consider them, but you do not need to structure your response around them.

Thursday, Sep 18

four short excerpts and two longer ones (all on Blackboard):
Aristotle: Politics. Book Seven. Chapter VII
Charles de Montesquieu, The Spirit of Laws. Book XVII: "How the Laws of Political Servitude Bear a Relation to the Nature of the Climate"
Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel: The Philosophy of History. Introduction. (1) The Abstract Characteristics of the Nature of Spirit
Nikolai Danilevskii: Russia and Europe. Chapter V: Cultural-historical types and some laws of their movement and development (first section)
Arnold Toynbee: two excerpts from vol. 1 of "A Study of History"

Questions to consider (please bring your notes to the class discussion):

- How does each of these five authors define a "civilization"?
- If the term itself is not used, does the text develop a concept that is equivalent to "civilization"?
- Does any of these authors provide a useful way of locating and defining the "West"?
- Who is the intended audience of these texts? What is their historical context? *(Answering this question will require some background research.)*

- Are these authors making political statements or scholarly arguments? (*You should be able to support your answer with examples from the texts.*)
- Does Toynbee convincingly establish civilizations as the basic units of historical study?

Presentation on Oswald Spengler
Presentation on Ibn Khaldun

Week 2: Orientalism

Note: *This week the response paper is due on* ***Wednesday*** *(at 4pm). Tuesday will be devoted to summing up our discussions on "civilization".*

The response paper should be about Said and Orientalism. Read the required part of the book, and as many of the optional readings as you feel you need to write your response paper (reading any **one** text from the reading list, or from one of the collections on the reading list, will give you some sense of the debate)**.** The paper should address the following questions (in the form of a short essay rather than three individual answers):

- What is Orientalism? How does Said redefine the term?
- How have "Orientalist" scholars responded to Said's argument, or tried to take it on board?
- Can Western knowledge about the "East" ever be "neutral"? What about Eastern knowledge about the "West"?

Required reading:
Edward Said, Orientalism. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.
Introduction (p. 1-28)
sections I-II of chapter 1 (p. 31-73)
section IV of chapter 3 (p. 284-328)

Optional readings on Said and the discussion on Orientalism:

the rest of the book

the Lewis-Said debate:
Bernard Lewis, "The Question of Orientalism," The Ne w York Review of Books, vol. 29, no. 11 (June 24, 1982)
Edward Said, Oleg Grabar, Bernard Lewis, "Orientalism: An Exchange," The Ne w York Review of Books, vol. 29, no. 13 (Aug 12, 1982)

guides to the debate:
Gyan Prakash, "Orientalism Now," History and Theory, Vol. 34, No. 3 (Oct., 1995), pp. 199-212 (available through JSTOR)
Alexander Lyon Macfie (ed.), Orientalism: A Reader. New York: NYU Press, 2001

recent criticisms:
Daniel Martin Varisco, Reading Orientalism: Said and the Unsaid. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2007
Ibn Warraq, Defending the West: A Critique of Edward Said's Orientalism. Amherst/NY: Prometheus Books, 2007

Thursday, Sep 25

Presentation on Larry Wolff, Inventing Eastern Europe

Week 3: Nationalism, Occidentalism, and "Enemies in the West"

The response paper is due on Monday!

Tuesday, Sep 30

Ian Buruma, Avishai Margalit , Occidentalism: The West in the Eyes of its Enemies. London etc: Penguin Books, 2004.

You must read the whole (short) book. It introduces a number of themes that we will discuss throughout the course. Questions to ponder:

- *What exactly is Occidentalism?*
- *Is Occidentalism a response to Orientalism, and if so, in what way?*
- *Do Buruma and Margalit believe that the West is an Eastern construct?*
- *In your opinion, is it possible to criticize the West without being Occidentalist? Do Buruma and Margalit provide convincing evidence that it is?*

Thursday, Oct 2

Selected readings on "Eastern" and "Western" nationalism (Kohn, Greenfeld, Anderson, Gellner, Hobsbawm) – will be posted on Blackboard

Week 4: Modernization Theory and its Critics

Tuesday, Oct 7

Talcott Parsons, Structure and Process in Modern Societies. Part II ("Social Structure and Economic Development"), p. 98-168

Alex Inkeles, David Horton Smith, Becoming Modern: Individual Change in Six Developing Countries. Cambridge/MA: Harvard University Press, 1976. Part I ("The Fundamentals") and chapter 21 ("Summary and Conclusions on the Social Significance of Individual Modernization")

Thursday, Oct 9

Nils Gilman, Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America. Baltimore; London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003. Chapters 3 and 6.

Week 5

Tuesday, Oct 14

Immanuel Wallerstein , World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction. Durham/NC; London: Duke University Press, 2004.

Thursday, Oct 16

Wallerstein, *cont'd*, and general discussion before the exam

Week 6

Tuesday, Oct 21

mid-term exam

Thursday, Oct 23

Classroom discussion of final paper projects

* * * FALL BREAK * * *

Week 7: Social Structure and Attitudes Toward the West

Tuesday, Nov 4

Diego Gambetta, Steffen Hartog, "Engineers of Jihad". Oxford University Department of Sociology Working Paper no. 2007-10

Thursday, Nov 6

Gunnar Heinsohn: "Population, Conquest and Terror in the 21st Century"
Anne Hendrixson: "Angry Young Men, Veiled Young Women: Constructing a New Population Threat." The Corner House Briefing 34. December 2004

Week 8: Russia, part I

Tuesday, Nov 11

Pëtr Chaadaev, "Letters on the Philosophy of History. First Letter"
Ivan Kireevskii, "On the Nature of European Culture and Its Relation to the Culture of Russia"

Thursday, Nov 13

Iver B. Neumann , Russia and the Idea of Europe: A Study in Identity and International Relations. London; New York: Routledge, 1996. Chapters 1-5

Week 9: Russia, part II

Tuesday, Nov 18

Iver B. Neumann , Russia and the Idea of Europe: A Study in Identity and International Relations. London; New York: Routledge, 1996. Chapters 6-7

Alexander Lukin, Political culture of the Russian "democrats". Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. Chapter 7: "The Bi-polar World: Soviet Totalitarianism and Western Civilization" (p. 228-245)

Thursday, Nov 20

Hilary Pilkington et al.: *Looking West? Cultural Globalization and Russian Youth Cultures*. University Park, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2002.

Elena Omel'chenko and Moya Flynn, "Through Their Own Eyes: Young People's Images of "the West"," pp. 77-100.

Hilary Pilkington and Elena Omel'chenko: "Living with the West," pp. 201-215.

Hilary Pilkington: "Conclusion," pp. 216-226.

Week 10: Anti-Westernism in Asia

Tuesday, Nov 25

Cemil Aydın, The Politics of Anti-Westernism in Asia: Visions of World Order in Pan-Islamic and Pan-Asian Thought. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007.

required:

- introduction (pp. 1-13)
- ch. 3 (pp. 39-69)
- ch. 4, section "Defining an Anti-Western Internationalism" (pp. 83-88)
- ch. 5 (pp. 93-125)

optional:

- ch. 2 (pp. 15-38)

* Thanksgiving recess *

Week 11: Anti-Westernism and Anti-Americanism

Tuesday, Dec 2

film class: Valley of the Wolves

Thursday, Dec 4

Peter J. Katzenstein, Robert O. Keohane (eds.), Anti-Americanisms in World Politics. Ithaca/NY: Cornell University Press, 2007.

required:

- Introduction }
- ch. 1 } all by Katzenstein and Keohane
- conclusion }
- ch. 2 (Kennedy)
- ***at least one*** *of chs. 5, 6, 7 (on France, China, and the Arab world)*

optional:

- ch. 8 (Bowen)

Week 12: Religious Anti-Westernisms

Tuesday, Dec 9

Mark Juergensmeyer: Terror in the Mind of God. The Global Rise of Religious Violence. Third edition, revised and updated. Berkeley; Los Angeles: 2003. Chs. 7-11: pp. 121-249.

Thursday, Dec 11

Mark Sedgwick: Against the Modern World. Traditionalism and the Secret Intellectual History of the Twentieth Century *(see selections on Blackb0ard)*

Attendance and classroom rules

Attendance is mandatory. Let me know ahead of time if you cannot come to class and/or will be late or leave early for health reasons or due to a *bona fide* emergency. *Two* unexcused absences will make your overall grade drop by a full point (e.g. from B to C).

Please ***do not eat*** in class. Drinking is OK.

Laptop use during class is strongly discouraged. Our classroom discussions require your full attention. Making hand-written notes when needed and transferring them to a computer after class is an excellent mnemonic technique. If you feel you must check something online or in your electronic notes, please do so after class and tell us the result at our next meeting.
The only acceptable exceptions are:

- using your laptop for your presentation (if you must)
- using it to view readings or response papers that are being discussed in class

Communication

If there is a problem, talk about it. If you are having trouble understanding the material, talk to your classmates and try to do some additional research on your own. If that does not solve your problem, or if you are having more general difficulties with your work, please do not hesitate to talk to me.
I will do my best to answer all course-related e-mail enquiries within two working days. However, if you have a question about the readings or assignments, please make an honest effort to do your research *before* contacting me with your questions.

Please discuss your final paper with me well ahead of the submission deadline. You should have an initial idea of the topic and the argument you wish to make by Oct 23. On that day everyone will briefly present their ideas in class, and the others in the group will have a chance to comment. Do not worry if you think your ideas are "half-baked": presenting and discussing work in progress is an important part of the writing process. Feel free to discuss your ideas with me before presenting them in class.

Princeton has fantastic resources available to help you with almost any imaginable problem. Talk to your college advisers, the Writing Center, and Firestone's specialist librarians. They are there to assist you.

Do not let academic work depress or frustrate you. If it does, come see me and I will give you a list of more important things to worry about.

Grading standards: written work

Princeton's grading standards reserve the "A" grade for "work that is exceptional (A+), outstanding (A), or excellent (A-). Grades in the B range signify work that is very good (B+), good (B), or more than adequate (B-). Grades in the C range signify work that is acceptable in varying degrees."

A

"A" work is compelling, complex, sophisticated, original, and to the point. It displays confident grasp of the topic and the materials read as well as class discussions, and marshals ideas and evidence to argue persuasively in favor of the author's own central idea. It takes a complex approach to the question answered, and shows awareness of a range of intellectual implications of the ideas, authors, or questions discussed, as well as a profound understanding of social and historical context. It shows that the author has done enough research on the question to gain a firm understanding of the debate on it, and has developed an original position based on analysis, not whim. It clearly addresses the most persuasive counter-arguments to its own position, and presents the strongest possible case against them.

An "A" paper presents a clear and well-argued conclusion which plainly follows from the main body of the essay. In reading every line, the reader should be able to understand its function in the essay's overall architecture.

"A" work is clearly structured, accurate in its choice of words, and sophisticated in its style. ("Sophisticated" is not the same as "complicated.") In sum, it shows that the author has engaged with the question asked, the material used, and the paper's intended audience on multiple levels.

B

A "B" paper meets an assignment's expectations completely. It is clear and well-argued, but lacks the compelling approach, close organization, or complexity of analysis displayed in "A" work. It demonstrates the author's ability to respond intelligently to the question asked, to present an unambiguous thesis, to structure and focus his or her arguments clearly, to synthesize the material read while remaining aware of the central question asked, to choose words accurately, and to offer illuminating insights into the topic under consideration. The paper focuses on the question addressed and displays an awareness of its relevance to the topic of the course. It has no substantial flaws with regard to selection and analysis of sources, organization, or presentation.

C

"C" work is entirely adequate but not more. It does not stray from the question asked, has a structure that conveys the author's intent, presents enough analysis and relevant examples to make its central thesis appear plausible, and does so in a way that is easy to understand, even though the thesis may be weak or fuzzy. Its sentences are usually well-crafted, and its paragraphs usually coherent. Nevertheless, C work lacks the sharp focus, the full and purposeful development, or the analytical depth necessary for a higher grade. It may remain very general, relying more on summary and repetition than analysis. It may use straw man arguments instead of refuting opposing views.

D

“D” papers are clearly inadequate in at least one way. Although D work may demonstrate competence in other facets, its strengths will be outweighed by one or two pervasive weaknesses: failure to engage meaningfully with an important aspect of the question or to maintain a focus; skimpy or illogical development; significant errors in writing; no discernible thesis or argument; no analysis of the materials.

Grading standards: participation

A high grade for participation is not a reward for talking a lot and voicing any thought that happens to pop into your head. Someone who talks only two or three times during a class session may well get an “A” if her contributions are exceptionally intelligent and relevant and help move the discussion in a fruitful and rewarding direction.

Note. *Feminine personal pronouns are used to make this text easier to read, not to discriminate against male students.*

A

An “A” student will have studied all the materials assigned and engaged with them on more than one level, using additional study tools such as reference works to clarify opaque points ahead of class meetings. She will schedule her work to allow time for going through her notes carefully, rethinking the texts and putting them into context before writing the position paper and posting it on time.

Her position paper will display knowledge of all the texts read, showing how they are relevant to the specific argument the student chooses to make about a particular author or problem. It will not rely on summary, and devote just enough space to reiterating the texts read to make it clear which arguments and portion of the text it is addressing. It will discuss the readings with reference to the central topic of the course, explain its choice of perspective on them, and present a well-argued opinion or intelligent question on the aspect of the materials that the student decides to address.

She will come to class with a clear idea of how the assigned texts relate to the topic of the course. She will actively use class discussions to argue and clarify her stance on the week’s topic. During discussions, an “A” student will engage with the other participants’ positions, displaying independence of thought and supporting her arguments with relevant evidence from the materials read, rather than anecdotes or reference to authority or “simple common sense.” An “A” student will have noted relevant passages from the texts assigned for use in class discussions.

An “A” student will always keep her contributions relevant to the central topic under consideration, trying to steer class discussions back to the main theme if she feels they are moving in a wrong direction.

In his or her oral presentation, an “A” student will provide a contextualized and analytical summary of the additional texts read, choosing examples and distributing emphasis judiciously to give the audience a clear idea of the topic presented, its relevance to the course, and the presenter’s own perspective on it.

B

A “B” student will display most of the qualities of an “A” student with regard to class participation. She will have read all the texts and engaged with them, submitted the position paper on time and presented a well-argued, analytical point of view rather than pure summary. However, her analysis of the texts will

be less complex than an “A” student’s, and she may not have done much to try and clarify any opaque points prior to class discussions.

A “B” student will regularly make relevant contributions to class discussions and stick to the central themes of the course, though she may frequently omit to respond to others’ points of view. She will support her arguments with evidence from the texts read, although she may be unspecific about the passages referred to. The points she makes will be solidly argued, although she may display less independence of thought than an “A” student vis-à-vis arguments of an author she “sides” with (or the professor).

A “B” student’s oral presentation will provide a good overview of its topic and convey a sense of its relevance to the other students, although there may be minor factual inaccuracies or a somewhat unbalanced choice of quotes and examples.

C

A “C” student will have read all the texts assigned. However, her position paper and her class contributions may reveal that she read some of the relevant material so cursorily as to be unable to grasp its central points. Her position papers may be worded carelessly. They rely heavily on summarizing, fail to convey her main thesis or question clearly, or stray far from the topic of the course. Her response to the texts, as displayed in both the position papers and class discussions, may constitute a simple gut reaction rather than an attempt to grapple with the authors’ ideas and take into account alternative interpretations.

Her contributions to class discussions may be frequent and interesting, but tend to be fuzzy. She may be unspecific in her references to authors, texts, and ideas from the readings. She may frequently stray from the central topic of the class, or fail to give consideration to other participants’ points of view.

Her talk will give an adequate presentation of the topic discussed, but may be inaccurate, strongly unbalanced, or overly descriptive.

D

A “D” student frequently skips some of the readings assigned and merely reacts to what she has read without trying to insert the texts into a broader picture or forming an original and grounded judgment on them.

He or she submits the position paper over two hours after the 4pm deadline more than twice in the semester. Her position papers may be written so sloppily that the points made are difficult to grasp, or may present striking misinterpretations of the texts. They rely heavily on summarizing, do not explain the choice of aspects focused on, and present only whimsical judgments rather than well-argued opinions on the texts.

A “D” student is clearly uninterested in many class discussions.

While he or she may occasionally contribute interesting ideas to discussions, her participation will be erratic and her input often beside the point.

Her oral presentation is ill-prepared and does not convey a clear idea of the topic or its relevance to the course.