

Syllabus

Preparatory Seminar: ENG 505: 17th Transatlantic Students Symposium:

The Future of Democratic Cultures in Europe and the United States

Winter Term and Spring Break, 2019

*For Credit: PS 402 Independent Study, ENG 505 Reading and Conference,
or Equivalent Independent Study per agreement with Instructor*

Moreland Hall 214

Dr. Philipp Kneis, Public Policy, **Dr. Allison Davis White-Eyes**, Office of Institutional Diversity,

Dr. Raymond Malewitz, Director, Graduate Program in English

Student Organizers at OSU: **Angela Nguyen, Alexis Austin, N.N.**

In cooperation with

Dr. Reinhard Isensee (Humboldt-University Berlin), and **Dr. Tomasz Basiuk** (University Warsaw)
in preparation for the **17th Transatlantic Students Symposium**. www2.rz.hu-berlin.de/transatlantic

Contact:

Dr. Philipp Kneis, Political Science Program, 310 Bexell Hall

Tel. Office: (541) 737-1325. Office Hours: per appointment.

philipp.kneis@oregonstate.edu

Syllabus Version 1.0 – 01/11/2019 - living syllabus / subject to change

1.	Course Introduction	1	10.	Final Grade Distribution	14
2.	Simplified Syllabus For Overview	2	11.	Student Learning Outcomes	15
3.	History And Outline Of The Program.....	3	12.	General Argumentation Rules	15
4.	Description of the Symposium Topic.....	4	13.	Students With Disabilities.....	15
5.	Student Organizers	4	14.	Student Conduct	15
6.	Course Philosophy & Policies.....	5	15.	Appendix I: Presentation Guidelines	16
7.	Seminar Schedule	6	16.	Appendix II: Citation Guide MLA	18
8.	Bibliography.....	10	17.	Appendix III: Citation Guide APA	19
9.	Course Assignments	12			

1. COURSE INTRODUCTION

This course serves as the preparation for the 2019 Transatlantic Students Symposium, held in cooperation with Humboldt-University, Berlin, and Warsaw University. The principal goal is to develop an understanding of cultural and political theories of transatlantic relations, nationhood, modern democracy and supranational organizations such as the European Union. Furthermore, students will be reading and presenting research articles in order to develop their own research interests and skills, and prepare for their symposium presentation. The seminar will conclude during Spring Break with the Symposium Week.

2. SIMPLIFIED SYLLABUS FOR OVERVIEW – DETAILS BELOW

UNIT I: NATION BUILDING, NATIONALISM AND DEMOCRACY

- ❖ **Assignment 1: Discussion Forum (ongoing, all weeks)**
- ❖ **Assignment 2: Presentation of Assigned Text (as per sign-up sheet)**

Week 1: *January 11: Introduction.*

Week 2: *January 18: Nationalism. Texts by Eric Hobsbawm, Benedict Anderson, Wolfgang Streeck.*

Week 3: *January 25: Cosmopolitanism Under Threat. Texts by Kwame Anthony Appiah, Claudia Postelnicescu, and Hannah Arendt.*

UNIT II: DEMOCRATIC CULTURES & IDENTITY NARRATIVES IN EUROPE AND THE U.S.

Week 4: *February 1: Identity. Texts by Shannon Latkin Anderson, Paul Taylor, and Mark Lilla.*

Week 5: *February 8: Economy and EU Identity. Texts by Ashoka Mody, Steven Levitsky & Lucan Way, Dermot Scot, Timothy Garton Ash, and Michael Mertes.*

UNIT III: DEMOCRACY UNDER ATTACK: THE RISE OF NATIONALISM IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Week 6: *Session 1: February 12: Video Conference (#TBC)*

Week 6: *Session 2: February 15: Europe and Democracy. Texts by Thomas Meany & Yascha Mounk, Andrew Moravcsik, David Edward, and others.*

- ❖ **Assignment 3: Outline of Research Topic Due**

Week 7: *February 22: Authoritarianism. Texts by Christopher Walker, Arch Puddington, Fareed Zakaria, and William A. Galston.*

Week 8: *Mar 1: The Future of Democratic Cultures. Texts by Francis Fukuyama, Timothy Stanley & Alexander Lee, Alessandro Ferrara, and others.*

UNIT IV: YOUR RESEARCH

Week 9: *March 8: Presentation Session I*

- ❖ **Assignment 4: Research Presentation**

Week 10: *March 15: Presentation Session II / Practicalities, Concluding Discussion*

- ❖ **Assignment 4: Research Presentation (continued)**

- ❖ **Assignment 5: Research Paper Due Tuesday of Week 11, March 20**

Week 11: *Mar 22: Departure for Vienna // Return March 30 or 31 (TBC)*

3. HISTORY AND OUTLINE OF THE PROGRAM

General Aim and Scope of the Symposia

The Transatlantic Students Symposia are a series of short-term graduate-level exchanges that provide a student-based and largely student-run space for the discussion of topics of contemporary relevance in an interdisciplinary, experiential and transatlantic setting.

The student-based symposia are organized in cooperation between Oregon State University, Humboldt-University Berlin (Germany), and the University of Warsaw (Poland). Faculty-led workshops and courses at all three participating universities prepare a joint field trip, the symposium week, which contains institutional visits, talks and workshops, and concludes with a final student-based and student-organized conference.

The symposia are targeted towards students of the humanities and social sciences, including Public Policy, Political Science, Cultural and Literary Studies, History, Education, and others, who are working together in order to approach political and historical topics with a strong relation to present-day cultural and public policy issues. The students are furthermore provided with an outlook into professional and practical applications of their academic training.

Structure of the Symposia

The student-based symposia are accompanied by faculty-led workshops and courses in the academic term preceding the field trip portion. Subsequently, the symposium week contains institutional visits, talks and workshops, and concludes with a final student-based and student-organized conference.

The symposia are structured as follows:

During the **Preparatory Phase**, decisions about the symposium theme are made by faculty organizers. During the term directly preceding the symposium, students are prepared in classroom seminars at each of the participating universities. This also includes online tools such as discussion forums and video conferencing. Student selection is based on academic merits, and lies within the discretion of the respective unit.

The **Symposium Week** will take place during Spring Break and consists of several days of joint activities at a specific location. These are:

- cultural activities (museum visits, archaeological sites, art galleries, theater, etc.)
- social activities
- academic workshops by expert speakers on several issues related to the topic of the symposium
- visits to political (both official authorities and NGOs), economic and cultural institutions related to the topic of the symposium

The symposium week concludes with student research presentations that are held in a public **Academic Conference**. The conference is organized by the student/assistant organizers with input from academic faculty. We will also maintain connections with symposium participants in order to create a community of former symposium participants.

Experiential Learning and Central Objectives of the Program

The Transatlantic Students Symposia allow us to provide graduate students with a **multi-dimensional**, both **theoretical and applied**, outlook for their field of study and their future occupation, moving **beyond traditional classroom instruction**. The symposia are conceived as a form of **experiential learning**. The classroom seminars are aimed at preparing participating students for the experiences of the symposium week. Students are also encouraged to conduct their own research, partially in a collaborative way, which will then cumulate into the final conference presentations.

The field trip portion specifically provides students with a **hands-on perspective** to otherwise rather theoretical classroom discussions. By integrating practical components into the symposium week, we are also offering an **outlook on future career opportunities and internships** (in diplomacy, politics, consulting, cultural work, etc.).

We are choosing program alumni to function as student organizers in their second year of participation. This model of **student leadership** ties in with the experiential learning methodology of the symposium.

Both in the preparatory phase and throughout the symposium week, academic faculty engage in team-teaching and in **expanding their own disciplinary boundaries** by allowing for an inter- and trans-disciplinary exchange of ideas and methods.

Furthermore, opening up an experiential space for the student organizers and the students requires faculty to shift their roles from active teaching to facilitating experiential learning. As a result, this may allow for **innovative approaches to both teaching and learning**. These are realized by also building on the following central components: (1) internationality, (2) inter-disciplinarity, (3) collegiality and collaborative learning, (4) diversity, (5) student scholarship and research, and (6) student leadership.

Further Documentation about the Program

In order to provide a more detailed overview and description of the program, we have provided a Program Report on our web site: <https://www2.hu-berlin.de/transatlantic/program/report.html>

4. DESCRIPTION OF THE TOPIC OF THE SYMPOSIUM

The current geopolitical climate appears to increasingly produce narratives suggesting that democratic governments are on a declining path, that authoritarianism is a winning proposition, and that democratic values and cultures are losing their appeal on both sides of the Atlantic.

The 17th Transatlantic Students Symposium – which will take place in selected cities in Europe – investigates this proposition from a transdisciplinary perspective and discusses the historical, political, cultural and literary dimensions of democratic cultures in the United States and Europe.

Organized in collaboration with Oregon State University, Corvallis, and the University of Warsaw the fieldtrip offers a space for a transatlantic dialog among students from different disciplines that is accompanied by institutional and cultural visits as well as workshops at the respective symposium destinations.

5. STUDENT ORGANIZERS

The Transatlantic Students Symposia utilize a model of student leadership. Student organizers are alumni that have participated in at least one previous iteration of the program. Each participating university will be represented with a contingent of organizers, who will work together.

Student organizers will take up a selection of tasks during both the class and the symposium, and will work together with the instructors. Tasks include, but may not be limited, to the following:

- Assisting in the teaching by facilitating class and online discussions
- Providing and guiding peer feedback to student research and presentations
- Facilitating student interaction across the universities
- Aiding in the organization of logistics of the symposium field trip
- Creation of a Participant Handbook
- Organizing the schedule and format of the student conference
- Conducting the student conference

6. COURSE PHILOSOPHY & POLICIES

The **main objective** of this course is to foster critical thinking on the basis of increased domain knowledge and advanced theoretical reflections on the topic of the class. The readings offered are academic articles or political documents. **Assignments** in this class are meant to develop student research, and critical reflection and discussion of the topic. Students are required to conduct own research and participate actively in the discussion in order to create a peer learning community.

General Guidelines:

- You are required to **read this syllabus in full**. Please direct any questions directly to the instructor in person or via e-mail. Please also monitor announcements in case the schedule needs to change.
- Typically, **following all instructions** will lead to successful participation in class. For more detail, see below for the schedule, as well as on p. 10 for descriptions of assignments, and p. 14 for student learning outcomes.
- A seminar thrives on the regular participation of every single member of the group. You are expected to participate actively in the discussions, and you should feel free to do so. **This is a place to learn, not a place to be perfect**. You do not need to be intimidated. Everyone is in the same boat.
- **Respect your fellow students**. Everybody should feel safe to be as honest as possible. People are indeed able to **see things differently**, even though they have the same facts. If somebody makes what could be seen a mistake, be patient and understanding. Focus any **critique** on the argument and the issue, not on the person making the statement. We are all learning, and we will never be perfect.
- Language skills should not distract from your message. I do not grade language and style per se, but if writing mistakes distract too much from your argument, so that any reasonable reader would have difficulties understanding it, your grade may be affected. Writing is difficult for everyone, and takes years of practice and skill. Feel free to ask for help if you feel that your writing needs improvement. The **Writing Center** provides students with a free consulting service for their writing assignments, see <http://cwl.oregonstate.edu/owl.php>.
- In the case that I feel **attendance and reading progress** are below reasonable expectations, I reserve the right to do a quiz in order to check on reading progress.

Discussions:

- With regard to the online discussion forum: **Student participation in the discussions** tends to go down with strong instructor presence. Therefore, I will limit my contributions. I will respond whenever I feel there is a need to correct or add something, or when participation is low.
- For every assignment aimed at the group (text presentation, research presentation), there is also a mandatory **Q&A** component, which will be considered when grading.
- **Regular participation** in the class is mandatory.

Communication with Instructor:

- **Please let me know in advance** if you cannot complete assignments on time. We will find a way.
- Please send your response essay and final paper to the instructor via e-mail directly, to preempt technical issues with the online class system.
- Please feel free to contact me about any aspect of the course, or your performance. Let me know as soon as possible if there are any issues that might need my immediate attention. I'm always willing to learn myself, and improve the class whenever necessary.

7. SEMINAR SCHEDULE

UNIT I: NATION BUILDING, NATIONALISM AND DEMOCRACY

Week 1: January 11: Introduction

TraSym Intro / syllabus / organizational matters

Week 2: January 18: Nationalism

❖ **Assignment 1: Active Discussion & Online Forum (ongoing, all weeks)**

❖ **Assignment 2: Presentation of Assigned Text (as per sign-up sheet)**

❖ **Sign up to Humboldt University Online Learning Platform (Moodle)**

1. Hobsbawm, Eric. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780. Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge UP, 1990, Chapter 1: 14-45. [HU+OSU]
2. Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London/New York: Verso, 1983, 2006, 37-46 (Chapter3); 83-111 (Chapter 6). [HU+OSU]
3. Streeck, Wolfgang. "Comment on Wolfgang Merkel, "Is Capitalism Compatible with Democracy?" *Z Vgl Polit Wiss* (2015) 9:49-60, DOI 10.1007/s12286-015-0232-2. [HU+OSU]

Week 3: January 25: Cosmopolitanism Under Threat

1. Appiah, Kwame Anthony. "Global citizenship." *Fordham L. Rev.* 75 (2006): 2375. [OSU]
2. Postelnicescu, Claudia. "Europe's New Identity: The Refugee Crisis and the Rise of Nationalism". *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, May 2016, 12(2): 203-209. [HU+OSU]
3. Arendt, Hannah. "We Refugees." *Menorah Journal* 31.1 (1943): 69-77. [OSU]

UNIT II: DEMOCRATIC CULTURES & IDENTITY NARRATIVES IN EUROPE AND THE U.S.

Week 4: February 1: Identity

1. Anderson, Shannon Latkin. *Immigration, Assimilation, and the Cultural Construction of American National Identity*. New York Routledge, 2015, Chapter 1: 6-27; Chapter 7: 175-196. [HU+OSU]
2. Taylor, Paul. "Where Europe went wrong. A timely warning for both sides of the Atlantic." [Review of Drozdiak 2017.] *POLITICO* 2017-10-24. [OSU]
3. Lilla, Mark. "The End of Identity Liberalism." *The New York Times* 2016-11-18. <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/20/opinion/sunday/the-end-of-identity-liberalism.html> [OSU]

Week 5: February 8: Economy and EU Identity

1. Mody, Ashoka. *Eurotragedy: A Drama in Nine Acts*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2018, 1-28 (Introduction); 1-30 (Chapter 11). [HU+OSU]
2. Levitsky, Steven and Lucan Way. "The Myth of Democratic Recession". *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 26, No. 1 January 2015, National Endowment for Democracy and Johns Hopkins University Press, 45-58. [HU+OSU]
3. Scott, Dermot (ed.). "Europe is Our Story - Towards a New Narrative for the European Union". *Institute of International and European Affairs* 2014, 1-27. [HU+OSU]
4. Ash, Timothy Garton. "Is Britain European?" *International Affairs* 77.1 (2001): 1-13. [OSU]
5. Mertes, Michael. "Too Big for Europe, Too Small for the World? The German Question Reconsidered." *Israel Journal of Foreign Affairs* 9.3 (2015): 363-375. [HU+OSU]

UNIT III: DEMOCRACY UNDER ATTACK: THE RISE OF NATIONALISM IN THE 21ST CENTURY

Week 6, Session 1: February 12: #TBC Video Conference

Week 6, Session 2: February 15: Europe and Democracy

- ❖ **Assignment 3: Outline of Research Topic**
- ❖ **Assignment 4: Research Discussion Presentation**

1. Meany, Thomas and Yascha Mounk. "What was Democracy?" *The Nation*, June 2, 2014, 1-39. [HU+OSU]
2. "Reflections on The Future of Democracy in Europe", *Contributions to The Future of Democracy in Europe Conference*, Barcelona 17-19 Nov. 2004, Council of Europe, Strasbourg, 2005, 31-35; 37-44; 45-50. [HU+OSU]
3. Moravcsik, Andrew. "The myth of Europe's 'democratic deficit'." *Intereconomics* 43.6 (2008): 331-340. (The texts starts on page 331 resp. 17of the PDF – do look through the rest also if you like) [HU+OSU]
4. Edward, David. "The Moral Case for Europe" *Talk at Europa Institute / UACES Lecture*, University of Edinburgh, 8 March 2013. [HU+OSU]

Week 7: February 22: Authoritarianism

1. Walker, Christopher. "The Authoritarian Threat The Hijacking of "Soft Power". *Journal of Democracy*, Volume 27, Number 1, January 2016, 49-63. [HU+OSU]
2. Puddington, Arch: "The Return to the Iron Fist", *Journal of Democracy*, Volume 26, No. 2, April 2015, 122-138. [OSU]
3. Zakaria, Fareed. "The rise of illiberal democracy." *Foreign Affairs* (1997): 22-43. [OSU]
4. Galston, William A. "The Populist Challenge to Liberal Democracy". *Journal of Democracy*, April 2018, Volume 29, Number 2 , 5-19. [HU+OSU]

Week 8: March 1: The Future of Democratic Cultures

1. Fukuyama, Francis. "The End of History." *The National Interest* 16 (Summer 1989): 3-18. [OSU]
2. Stanley, Timothy; Alexander Lee. "It's Still Not the End of History." *The Atlantic* 09/1/2014. [OSU]
3. Ferrara, Alessandro. "Judging Democracy in the 21st Century: Crisis or Transformation?" *No Fo* 10, 2013, 1-22. [HU+OSU]
4. "What's Gone Wrong with Democracy", *The Economist*, March 1, 2014, 1-17. [HU+OSU]

UNIT IV: YOUR RESEARCH

Week 9: March 8: Presentations Session I

- ❖ **Assignment 5: Research Presentation**

Week 10: March 15: Presentations Session II / Practicalities, Concluding Discussion

- ❖ **Assignment 5: Research Presentation**
- ❖ **Assignment 6: Research Paper Due Monday of Week 11, March 18**

Week 11: March 22: Departure for Vienna // Return March 30 or 31 (TBC)

UNIT V: SYMPOSIUM WEEK (TENTATIVE SCHEDULE)

Week 11: March 22: Departure (Finals Week) (TBC)

Field Trip to Vienna and Berlin during Spring Break, details TBC

Fri	3/22/2019	Flight, 1 PM (Delta?)
Sat	3/23/2019	Vienna Arrival
Sun	3/24/2019	Vienna Field Trips
Mon	3/25/2019	Vienna Field Trips + Institutional Visits
Tue	3/26/2019	Vienna Field Trips + Institutional Visits
Wed	3/27/2019	Vienna-Berlin (Air Austria or Easyjet)
Thu	3/28/2019	Berlin Field Trips + Institutional Visits
Fri	3/29/2019	Berlin, Student Conference
Sat	3/30/2019	Berlin Field Trips + Institutional Visits
Sun	3/31/2019	Berlin, Departure 6 AM (Delta?)

March 31 or April 1: Return (TBC)

Arrival at PDX around noon (TBC)

8. BIBLIOGRAPHY

While all campuses share a core syllabus, there are curricular differences due to the interdisciplinary nature of the class. [OSU+HU]: OSU and HU class; [OSU]: only OSU class

Week.# Text

- 6.2 "Reflections on The Future of Democracy in Europe", *Contributions to The Future of Democracy in Europe Conference*, Barcelona 17-19 Nov. 2004, Council of Europe, Strasbourg, 2005, 31-35; 37-44; 45-50. [HU+OSU]
- 8.4 "What's Gone Wrong with Democracy", *The Economist*, March 1, 2014, 1-17. [HU+OSU]
- 2.2 Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London/New York: Verso, 1983, 2006, 37-46 (Chapter3); 83-111 (Chapter 6). [HU+OSU]
- 4.1 Anderson, Shannon Latkin. *Immigration, Assimilation, and the Cultural Construction of American National Identity*. New York Routledge, 2015, Chapter 1: 6-27; Chapter 7: 175-196. [HU+OSU]
- 3.1 Appiah, Kwame Anthony. "Global citizenship." *Fordham L. Rev.* 75 (2006): 2375. [OSU]
- 3.3 Arendt, Hannah. "We Refugees." *Menorah Journal* 31.1 (1943): 69-77. [OSU]
- 5.4 Ash, Timothy Garton. "Is Britain European?" *International Affairs* 77.1 (2001): 1-13. [OSU]
- 6.4 Edward, David. "The Moral Case for Europe" *Talk at Europa Institute / UACES Lecture*, University of Edinburgh, 8 March 2013. [HU+OSU]
- 8.3 Ferrara, Alessandro. "Judging Democracy in the 21st Century: Crisis or Transformation?" *No Fo* 10, 2013, 1-22. [HU+OSU]
- 8.1 Fukuyama, Francis. "The End of History." *The National Interest* 16 (Summer 1989): 3-18. [OSU]
- 7.4 Galston, William A. "The Populist Challenge to Liberal Democracy". *Journal of Democracy*, April 2018, Volume 29, Number 2, 5-19. [HU+OSU]
- 2.1 Hobsbawm, Eric. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780. Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge UP, 1990, Chapter 1: 14-45. [HU+OSU]
- 5.2 Levitsky, Steven and Lucan Way. "The Myth of Democratic Recession". *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 26, No. 1 January 2015, National Endowment for Democracy and Johns Hopkins University Press, 45-58. [HU+OSU]
- 4.3 Lilla, Mark. "The End of Identity Liberalism." *The New York Times* 2016-11-18. <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/20/opinion/sunday/the-end-of-identity-liberalism.html> [OSU]
- 6.1 Meany, Thomas and Yascha Mounk. "What was Democracy?" *The Nation*, June 2, 2014, 1-39.
- 5.5 Mertes, Michael. "Too Big for Europe, Too Small for the World? The German Question Reconsidered." *Israel Journal of Foreign Affairs* 9.3 (2015): 363-375. [HU+OSU]
- 5.1 Mody, Ashoka. *Eurotragedy: A Drama in Nine Acts*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2018, 1-28 (Introduction); 1-30 (Chapter 11). [HU+OSU]
- 6.3 Moravcsik, Andrew. "The myth of Europe's 'democratic deficit'." *Intereconomics* 43.6 (2008): 331-340. (The texts starts on page 331 resp. 17of the PDF – do look through the rest also if you like) [HU+OSU]

- 3.2 Postelnicescu, Claudia. "Europe's New Identity: The Refugee Crisis and the Rise of Nationalism". *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, May 2016, 12(2): 203–209. [HU+OSU]
- 7.2 Puddington, Arch: "The Return to the Iron Fist", *Journal of Democracy*, Volume 26, No. 2, April 2015, 122-138. [OSU]
- 5.3 Scott, Dermot (ed.). "Europe is Our Story - Towards a New Narrative for the European Union". *Institute of International and European Affairs* 2014, 1-27. [HU+OSU]
- 8.2 Stanley, Timothy; Alexander Lee. "It's Still Not the End of History." *The Atlantic* 09/1/2014. [OSU]
- 2.3 Streeck, Wolfgang. "Comment on Wolfgang Merkel, "Is Capitalism Compatible with Democracy?" *Z Vgl Polit Wiss* (2015) 9:49–60, DOI 10.1007/s12286-015-0232-2. [HU+OSU]
- 4.2 Taylor, Paul. "Where Europe went wrong. A timely warning for both sides of the Atlantic." [Review of Drozdiak 2017.] *POLITICO* 2017-10-24. [OSU]
- 7.1 Walker, Christopher. "The Authoritarian Threat The Hijacking of "Soft Power". *Journal of Democracy*, Volume 27, Number 1, January 2016, 49-63. [HU+OSU]
- 7.3 Zakaria, Fareed. "The rise of illiberal democracy." *Foreign Affairs* (1997): 22-43. [OSU]

Recommended:

Citrin, Jack and John Sides. "Immigration and the Imagined Community in Europe and the United States." *Political Studies*, Vol. 56, 2008, 33–56.

<http://home.gwu.edu/~jsides/imagined.pdf>

Fukujama, Francis. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Free Press, 2006.

Fukujama, Francis. *Identity: The Demand for Dignity and the Politics of Resentment*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2018.

Krustev, Ivan. *After Europe*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2018.

Levitsky, Steven. *How Democracies Die*. New York: Crown, 2018.

Luce, Edward. *The Retreat of Western Liberalism*. London: Little Brown, 2017.

Murray, Douglas. *The Strange Death of Europe: Immigration, Identity, Islam*.

London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2017.

Reich, Robert B. *The Work of Nations: Preparing Ourselves for 21st Century Capitalism*. New York, Vintage Books, 1992.

Snyder, Timothy. *On Tyranny: Twenty Lessons from the Twentieth Century*. New York: Tim Duggan Books, 2017.

"The European Union and the Challenge of Extremism and Populism. How to Protect Democracy and the Rule of Law in Europe". European Humanist Federation, Policy Paper, 2013, 1-10.

<http://humanistfederation.eu/ckfinder/userfiles/files/our-work/Populism/The%20EU%20and%20the%20challenge%20of%20extremism%20and%20populism-%20EHF%20.pdf>

Zakaria, Fareed. *The Future of Freedom: Illiberal Democracy at Home and Abroad*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2003.

Zielonka, Jan. *Counter-Revolution. Liberal Europe in Retreat*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2018.

9. COURSE ASSIGNMENTS

The objective of all assignments is to lead you step by step to the creation of your research paper and presentation.

1) *Discussion Board*

Students will have to participate in the Forum.

Location: # TBA (# OSU Canvas or HU Moodle)

- Introduce yourself initially to the forum by saying who you are, what your study interests are, and whatever else you would like people to know about yourself.
- You then need to write at least 5 posts for the forum of substantial length and quality. This cannot just be a brief response of twitter length, or a link, but has to be a contribution for discussion of at least 2 paragraphs of length which opens up a possible discussion topic and/or discusses or introduces a topic and/or provides a thoughtful response to a post opened by someone else earlier.

Grading: 5 points total

- 1 point per substantial post, but only a maximum of 5 points

2) *Presentation of an Assigned Text (Weeks 2-7)*

In the beginning of the quarter, the texts will be distributed amongst all participants. Texts will be presented by 1 or 2 students (see schedule below). The presentation should introduce the main arguments of the text and briefly explain the historical background. The duration of the presentation should be **approx. 5 minutes**. During the discussion, the presenters will then also be responsible for facilitating the class discourse by being the experts on the text. Whether you are presenting or not, **everybody is required to read all the texts**, unless they are marked as additional. If you share a presentation with another student, both of you must speak for an equal portion of the time. A summary of the presentation is to be posted on blackboard after the session.

Grading: 10 points total

- complexity of the argument (up to 5 points)
- correct rendition of the argument (1 point)
- clarity of the argument (1 point)
- adequate use or non-use of technology and/or visual aids and/or handout (1 point)
- handling your responses to questions (1 point)
- pose and clarity of speaking (1 point)

3) *Outline of your Research Topic (Week 5)*

Elaborate on your project description to allow for a discussion. Students will discuss their research process in class. Students need to find additional research beyond the texts provided by the instructor, at least 3 scholarly articles or books. These can be the same that you will use for the research presentation. Specifically, the text should contain the following:

- a) a more elaborate description of your topic (1 page, 1.5-spaced, 12 point)
- b) a tentative structure of your argument (half a page)
- c) a tentative outline of research texts you are thinking of using – provide brief justification/explanation

- d) a brief reflection on what you are expecting with respect to the contact with the European students, and from travelling abroad (max. 1 page)

Grading: 10 points total

- 3 points for complexity of the argument (Part a)
- 1 point for structure (Part b)
- 2 points for research outline (Part c)
- 3 points for complexity of the argument (Part c)
- 0.5 points for correct bibliography and correct citation (choose either MLA or APA, see Appendices II and III, page 18, and stick to one method throughout your paper).
- 0.5 points for spelling and language

Penalties for turning it in later (unless there is a legitimate reason – tell me in advance to negotiate an individual turn-in date):

- Turning in the assignment late: -.1 points per day
- if you turn it in on the same day but later, -½ a point

4) Research Presentation (Weeks 9-10)

Students will work on their own and present a topic of their own choice. The presentation must not be longer than **15 minutes**. Students need to find additional research beyond the texts provided by the instructor, at least 3 scholarly articles or books. These can be the same that you already found for the response paper. The presentations are the preparation for the symposium presentation. A summary of the presentation is to be posted on blackboard after the session.

Guidelines:

- Justify why you think your topic is of relevance.
- Put your own topic into its proper historical and/or political context.
- Structure your argument clearly.
- Time yourself, you only have 15 minutes. PRACTICE.
- Spell-check your powerpoint / visual aids / handout. Manually. REALLY.
- Prepare up to 3 questions for class discussion.
- Prepare to be interrupted if your time is up.

Grading: 10 points total

- complexity of the argument (up to 5 points)
- adequate use of your research articles (1 point)
- clarity of the argument (1 point)
- adequate use or non-use of technology and/or visual aids and/or handout (1 point)
- handling your responses to questions (1 point)
- pose and clarity of speaking (1 point)

For general remarks, see the presentation guidelines in Appendix I, page 14.

5) Research Paper (due Beginning of Week 11, via e-mail – or individual schedule)

This is the final written version of your presentation paper, based on your **Response Paper** and your **Presentation**. You need to use at least 5 scholarly articles or books, including the 3 scholarly research articles or books you have already identified on your own, and may also use any texts already assigned. Standard citation methods apply. The paper should be **approx. 6 pages** of text (12 point Times, 1.5-

spaced, 1 in. margins) plus bibliography. **Due Date: Monday 03/11, by 12:00 PM noon, via e-mail.** I will fly to Germany in advance to prepare for the symposium, and will need to grade the papers by the end of that week in order to give you credit.

Grading: 15 points total

- 5 points for complexity of the argument
- 2 points for correct bibliography and correct citation (choose either MLA or APA, see Appendices II and III, page 18, and stick to one method throughout your paper).
- 1 point for spelling and language
- 1 point for structure
- 1 point for fulfilling formal criteria (formatting, length, etc.)
- 1 point per cited article or book that you individually researched (min. 3 articles, max. 3 points)
- 1 point per other cited article or book, which may or may not have been assigned for class (min. 2 articles or books, max. 2 points)

Penalties for turning it in later (unless there is a legitimate reason – tell me in advance to negotiate an individual turn-in date):

- Turning in the assignment late: -.1 points per day
- if you turn it in on the same day but later, -½ a point

10. FINAL GRADE DISTRIBUTION

Maximum possible points:	50 points
1) Discussion Forum:	5 points
2) Presentation of Assigned Text:	10 points
3) Research Outline:	10 points
4) Research Presentation:	10 points
5) Final Research Paper:	15 points

A	95% to under or equal	100%	47.5	to under or equal	50	points
A-	90% to under	95%	45	to under	47.5	points
B+	87% to under	90%	43.5	to under	45	points
B	83% to under	87%	41.5	to under	43.5	points
B-	80% to under	83%	40	to under	41.5	points
C+	77% to under	80%	38.5	to under	40	points
C	73% to under	77%	36.5	to under	38.5	points
C-	70% to under	73%	35	to under	36.5	points
D+	67% to under	70%	33.5	to under	35	points
D	63% to under	67%	31.5	to under	33.5	points
D-	60% to under	63%	30	to under	31.5	points
F	0% to under	60%	0	to under	30	points

11. STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

The course seeks to develop in students...

- an understanding for the central issues relevant to the symposium theme, which includes knowledge in international policy, and is measured through coursework
- an interdisciplinary outlook, combining methods of political science and cultural studies, which is measured through coursework
- an understanding of the necessity to theorize culture and politics, and to apply different theoretical models to different circumstances, which is measured through coursework
- the ability to present the basic argument of a scholarly text and use it as a resource, which is measured through coursework
- the ability to work collaboratively and collegially, which is measured through coursework and the public presentation
- the ability to develop own scholarly approaches to a topic, and to conduct own research and write a response paper based upon what was discussed in class, and the student's own research interest, which is measured through coursework and the public presentation
- the ability to reflect critically on the encounter with another culture, and on one's own identity, which is measured through coursework and applied throughout the field school
- the ability to hold a presentation in an international student conference setting
- the ability conduct serious and original research following ethical guidelines, which is measured through coursework

12. GENERAL ARGUMENTATION RULES

- If you refer to somebody or a text, always provide a detailed source. Never say "As Aristotle has said, ..." but provide a concrete source. You will find that many quotes are continually misattributed. Do the research.
- Be respectful of others' opinions and arguments, no matter how harshly you may disagree. Any criticism must be aimed at the argument or subject matter ("*argumentum ad rem*"), not at the person ("*argumentum ad hominem*").
- If you disagree with a certain position, make sure you represent it accurately in all its scope, and not as a distorted caricature ("straw man argument").
- Base your argument on a solid database, not just on your own experiences or things you have heard ("anecdotal evidence").
- Just because a famous or influential person made a certain argument, does not automatically provide it with legitimacy ("argument from authority").
- Just because something occurs in nature, does not make it good ("naturalistic fallacy").
- See also: www.fallacyfiles.org

13. STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Accommodations for students with disabilities are determined and approved by Disability Access Services (DAS). If you, as a student, believe you are eligible for accommodations but have not obtained approval please contact DAS immediately at 541-737-4098 or at <http://ds.oregonstate.edu>. DAS notifies students and faculty members of approved academic accommodations and coordinates implementation of those accommodations. While not required, students and faculty members are encouraged to discuss details of the implementation of individual accommodations.

14. STUDENT CONDUCT

Please review and adhere to the Expectations for Student Conduct, as posted on oregonstate.edu/studentconduct/offenses.

15. APPENDIX I: PRESENTATION GUIDELINES

15.1. When Introducing a Text

These questions need not be answered verbatim or in that order– but address them or be kept in mind.

- What is it about?
- Who is the author? (relevant if important person of history -- but no extended biographies)
- What is the context?
- What is the line of argument?
- What are the theoretical assumptions? Does the text speak to a specific school of thought?
- How is it written? What can you derive from the structure of the text?
- How was it perceived? What has it achieved? (relevant if this text is a historical source or has had a deep impact on a field of research)
- Provide own evaluations and analysis, briefly.

15.2. When Presenting Your Own Analysis or Argument

These questions need not be answered verbatim or in that order– but address them or be kept in mind.

- Be transparent: name your sources, provide a handout with a bibliography and a structure of your presentation.
- Provide a clear line of argument
- Prefer analysis over opinion, personal experiences and anecdotal knowledge
- Be clear to differentiate between your own analysis and someone else's.

15.3. Q&A Rules

- Welcome critique as an opportunity to better yourself.
- When critiquing others, aim the argument at the issue, not the person, and remain respectful.
- When you don't know what to answer, offer to follow up with them later -- don't improvise.

15.4. General Presentation Rules

- Everybody is nervous. EVERYBODY.
- Everybody makes mistakes.
- Preparation always helps.
- Practice.
- A class presentation is supposed to help you to learn, you are not expected to be perfect.

15.4.1. Content

- The presentation is not about you. It is about the content.

15.4.2. Structure

- You are *communicating*, not talking *at* somebody.
- Make sure you do everything to get your message across in the short time you have.
- Tell them what you're about to tell them. -- Tell them. -- Tell them what you've just told them.
- Intelligent redundancy is good.
- Patronizing is bad.

15.4.3. Modes of Presenting

- Do what you feel is most comfortable to you.
- Talk loudly and clearly.
- Make eye contact as much as possible.
- Provide a handout with your most important points, central quotes or data (brief!), works cited, and your contact information.

Reading out a written text:

- pro: safety, you tend to forget less, you can formulate better
- contra: inflexible, less communicative

Speaking freely (without notes):

- pro: flexible, can adapt to audience quickly, communicative
- contra: needs experience, you may forget things, imperfect formulations
- you may compensate with a handout

Speaking freely with notes

- possibly best of both worlds
- you may even write an introduction & a closing to read out

15.4.4. Time

- Time yourself. You have limited time allotted. Test out your presentation beforehand; then add 2-3 minutes. You will always take longer than planned.
- Provide a handout collating your most important findings, central quotes, a bibliography, and your contact information. If you forget to say something important in the presentation, it'll be there.

15.4.5. Technology

- Use technology only if necessary.
- Only use technology that you know how to handle.
- Be sure to have reliable equipment. If possible, bring your own computer. Apple computer owners: bring an adapter cable for VGA. Assume no HDMI compatibility.
- Make backups of your presentation. Make a backup of the backup.
- Be only as fancy as absolutely necessary. Anything flashy that distracts from your message can go.
- Sometimes, a blackboard is enough.
- A paper handout may substitute or supplement a visual presentation. It gives people something to take away.
- Be prepared for tech to break down.

15.4.6. Attire

- Appear professional. This is work, it should look like that. Respect your audience.
- There will always be a question from the audience you won't like. Be cordial. Admit if you don't know something; promise to get back with more information.
- Know how to react: "Never answer the question that is asked of you. Answer the question that you wish had been asked of you." (Robert S. McNamara, *The Fog of War*, 87:11-87:19)

15.4.7. Remember Murphy's Law

- Nothing is as easy as it seems. -- Everything takes longer than expected. -- And if something can go wrong it will, -- at the worst possible moment.
- Well, hopefully not. But be prepared anyway. Presentations are always a test of how to react to unforeseen circumstances, and the more you practice, the more experienced you'll be. Good luck!

15.5. Netiquette: How to Present Yourself Online

- Always remember you are still talking to human beings – it is very easy to lose sight of that online.
- Try to build community with your fellow students by being active in the discussion, by responding to their posts, and by taking part in the Q&A peer critique process after uploaded assignments.
- Check your spelling --- mistakes in writing are unnecessary distractions from what you want to say.
- Name your sources.
- Be concise but substantial. Remember that people tend to read in an F-pattern online: first paragraphs are read, then beginnings oftentimes just scanned (sadly). Make it interesting.

16. APPENDIX II: CITATION GUIDE MLA

You can use MLA or APA style for citations, see: owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01. The major rules MLA style are summarized here, as follows:

Page/font format:

- Font Size 12 pt (use a normal system font like Times New Roman, Arial, Cambria, etc.)
- Line spacing 1.5
- Footnotes: 10 pt, Line spacing 1
- Indent quotations longer than 3 lines, with 10 pt size font
- Mark omitted parts of a quotation with squared brackets to distinguish them from possible (round) brackets within the quotation:

"Falling Down is a smart film, but it struggles [...] to convince viewers that [the hero] represents an ultimately (mythologically) redundant model of white masculinity." (Kennedy 2000: 122)

Bibliographical reference in parentheses (Author Year: Page):

Blabla blabla (Soja 1989: 37).

When Works Cited holds more than one title of the same author and from the same year, specify text by adding letters to the publication date:

Blabla blabla (Soja 1989a: 37).

Blabla blabla (Soja 1989b: 1).

Footnotes should be used only for further comments, not as bibliographical reference.

The **Works Cited** appears at the end of your paper. The format is the following:

For articles in collective volumes:

Name, First Name. "Article". In: Name, First Name, ed. *Larger Volume*. Publishing Place: Publishing House, Year. Pages.

e.g. Kennedy, Liam. "Paranoid Spatiality: Postmodern Urbanism and American Cinema." In: Balshaw Maria, Liam Kennedy, eds. *Urban Space and Representation*. London: Pluto, 2000. 116-30.

(use ed. for one Editor, eds. for multiple Editors)

For articles in journals or magazines:

Name, First Name. "Article". *Magazine Title*. Magazine Number (Year): Pages.

e.g. Foucault, Michel. "Of Other Spaces." *Diacritics* 16.1 (1986): 22-27.

For monographs:

Name, First Name. *Larger Volume*. Publishing Place: Publishing House, Year. Pages.

e.g. Soja, Edward. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London: Verso, 1989.

For internet articles: Name, First Name. "Article." *Main Web Site Title*. URL. Retrieved MM/DD/YYYY.

(or variations, such as organization name or alias in the first place, depending on nature of the web site)

e.g. Edmunds, R. David. "The US-Mexican War: A Major Watershed." *PBS*. pbs.org/kera/usmexicanwar/war/major_watershed.html. Retrieved 09/01/2009.

e.g. World Health Organization (WHO). *Active Ageing: A Policy Framework*. Geneva: WHO, 2002. who.int/ageing/publications/active/en. Retrieved 08/25/2011.

Some publication guides say you do not need to list the URL any more – I require you to do this nevertheless.

17. APPENDIX III: CITATION GUIDE APA

You can use MLA or APA style for citations, see: owl.english.purdue.edu/owl/resource/560/01. The major rules for APA style are summarized here, as follows:

Page/font format:

- Font Size 12 pt (use a normal system font like Times New Roman, Arial, Cambria, etc.)
- Line spacing 1.5
- Footnotes: 10 pt, Line spacing 1
- Indent quotations longer than 3 lines, with 10 pt size font
- Mark omitted parts of a quotation with [squared] brackets to distinguish them from possible (round) brackets within the quotation:

"Falling Down is a smart film, but it struggles [...] to convince viewers that [the hero] represents an ultimately (mythologically) redundant model of white masculinity." (Kennedy, 2000, p. 122)

Bibliographical reference in parentheses (Author Year: Page):

Blabla blabla (Soja, 1989, p. 37).

When Works Cited holds more than one title of the same author and from the same year, specify text by adding letters to the publication date:

Blabla blabla (Soja, 1989a, p. 37).

Blabla blabla (Soja, 1989b, p.1).

Footnotes should be used only for further comments, not as bibliographical reference.

The **Works Cited** appears at the end of your paper. The format is the following:

For articles in collective volumes:

Name, First Name. (Year). Article. In: Editor1FirstName Editor1LastName & Editor2FirstName Editor2LastName Editor (Eds.). *Larger Volume* (pages of chapter). Publishing Place: Publishing House.

e.g. Kennedy, Liam. (2000). Paranoid Spatiality: Postmodern Urbanism and American Cinema. In: Balshaw Maria & Liam Kennedy (Eds.). *Urban Space and Representation* (pp. 116-30). London: Pluto.

(use Ed. for one Editor, Eds. for multiple Editors)

For articles in journals or magazines:

Name, First Name. (Year). Article. *Magazine Title*. Magazine Number, Pages.

e.g. Foucault, Michel. (1986). Of Other Spaces. *Diacritics* 16.1, 22-27.

For monographs:

Name, First Name. (Year). *Larger Volume*. Publishing Place: Publishing House. Pages.

e.g. Soja, Edward. (1989). *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London: Verso.

For internet articles: Name, First Name. (Date of Publication). Article. *Main Web Site Title*. Retrieved from URL on MM/DD/YYYY.

(or variations, such as organization name or alias in the first place, depending on nature of the web site)

e.g. Edmunds, R. David. (n.d.). "The US-Mexican War: A Major Watershed." *PBS*. Retrieved from pbs.org/kera/usmexicanwar/war/major_watershed.html on 09/01/2009.

e.g. World Health Organization. (2002). *Active Ageing: A Policy Framework*. Geneva: WHO. Retrieved from who.int/ageing/publications/active/en on 08/25/2011.

Some publication guides say you do not need to list the URL any more – I require you to do this nevertheless.