

## Term Information

Effective Term Autumn 2023  
[Previous Value](#) [Autumn 2021](#)

## Course Change Information

**What change is being proposed? (If more than one, what changes are being proposed?)**

Adding Citizenship theme to the course. Also updating writing prereq for the new GE.

**What is the rationale for the proposed change(s)?**

Faculty would like to update this course to the new GE.

**What are the programmatic implications of the proposed change(s)?**

**(e.g. program requirements to be added or removed, changes to be made in available resources, effect on other programs that use the course)?**

N/A

**Is approval of the request contingent upon the approval of other course or curricular program request?** No

**Is this a request to withdraw the course?** No

## General Information

Course Bulletin Listing/Subject Area	History
Fiscal Unit/Academic Org	History - D0557
College/Academic Group	Arts and Sciences
Level/Career	Undergraduate
Course Number/Catalog	3501
Course Title	U.S. Diplomacy, 1920-Present
Transcript Abbreviation	US Diplo 1920-Pres
Course Description	The formulation of U.S. foreign policy and foreign relations around the world from the aftermath of World War I to the modern day.
Semester Credit Hours/Units	Fixed: 3

## Offering Information

Length Of Course	14 Week, 12 Week, 8 Week, 7 Week, 6 Week, 4 Week
Flexibly Scheduled Course	Never
Does any section of this course have a distance education component?	Yes
Is any section of the course offered	100% at a distance
Grading Basis	Letter Grade
Repeatable	No
Course Components	Lecture
Grade Roster Component	Lecture
Credit Available by Exam	No
Admission Condition Course	No
Off Campus	Never
Campus of Offering	Columbus, Lima, Mansfield, Marion, Newark, Wooster
<a href="#">Previous Value</a>	<a href="#">Columbus, Lima, Mansfield, Marion, Newark</a>

---

## Prerequisites and Exclusions

### Prerequisites/Corequisites

Prereq or concur: English 1110.xx, or completion of GE Foundation Writing and Information Literacy Course, or permission of instructor.

### *Previous Value*

*Prereq or concur: English 1110.xx, or permission of instructor.*

### Exclusions

#### Electronically Enforced

Yes

## Cross-Listings

### Cross-Listings

## Subject/CIP Code

### Subject/CIP Code

54.0102

### Subsidy Level

Baccalaureate Course

### Intended Rank

Sophomore, Junior, Senior

## Requirement/Elective Designation

Required for this unit's degrees, majors, and/or minors

General Education course:

Historical Study; Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World

The course is an elective (for this or other units) or is a service course for other units

### *Previous Value*

*Required for this unit's degrees, majors, and/or minors*

*General Education course:*

*Historical Study*

*The course is an elective (for this or other units) or is a service course for other units*

## Course Details

### Course goals or learning objectives/outcomes

- Students will be introduced to historical controversies and conflicting interpretations of US foreign policy.
- Students will develop their analytical and critical thinking skills through writing, discussions, and engaging with primary sources.

**COURSE CHANGE REQUEST**  
3501 - Status: PENDING

Last Updated: Vankeerbergen, Bernadette  
Chantal  
05/01/2023

**Content Topic List**

- U.S. diplomacy
- Foreign relations
- Involvement in World War II
- Cold War
- Vietnam War
- Persian Gulf Wars
- Détente
- Truman Doctrine
- U.S. in Southeast Asia
- Berlin Wall
- Containment

**Sought Concurrence**

No

**Attachments**

- 3501 Citizenship GE Syllabus FINAL 4.7.2023.pdf: Syllabus  
*(Syllabus. Owner: Getson, Jennifer L.)*
- History 3501 GE Form FINAL 4.7.2023.pdf: GE Form  
*(Other Supporting Documentation. Owner: Getson, Jennifer L.)*

**Comments**

**Workflow Information**

Status	User(s)	Date/Time	Step
Submitted	Getson, Jennifer L.	04/07/2023 01:31 PM	Submitted for Approval
Approved	Soland, Birgitte	04/07/2023 01:53 PM	Unit Approval
Approved	Vankeerbergen, Bernadette Chantal	05/01/2023 11:49 AM	College Approval
Pending Approval	Jenkins, Mary Ellen Bigler Hanlin, Deborah Kay Hilty, Michael Vankeerbergen, Bernadette Chantal Steele, Rachel Lea	05/01/2023 11:49 AM	ASCCAO Approval

**Ohio State History Department**  
**HIST 3501: U.S. Diplomacy, 1920-Present**  
Spring 2018  
Wed/Fri, 9:35-10:55  
McPherson Lab, 2019

Dr. R. Joseph Parrott  
[parrott.36@osu.edu](mailto:parrott.36@osu.edu); Phone: TBD  
Dulles 153  
Office Hours: Monday, 12-1; Wednesday 1-3:30  
And by appointment

**Course Description:**

Since 1917, the United States has played a dominant role in international affairs due to its massive economy, military, and global cultural influence. The globe-spanning nature and interests of the United States strike many as the normal state of affairs, but this expansion and the reactions it incited across the globe were the products of policy decisions made to reflect the evolving opinions of the nation's citizens as they redefined their interests and identity amidst the fluid international environment of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Consider who and what forces make policy in the United States, how the nation expanded its military, economic and cultural footprint, and the ways this contributed to the creation of a very much contested global civil society will be the goals of this course.

While focusing on the specific policy history and structures of the United States, we will also assess the impact American actions have had across the globe, foreign responses to this, the changing contexts that transformed popular and official thinking, the decentralization of the international system, and how individual U.S. citizens have expanded their influence in foreign affairs. The course is constructed in such a way to both familiarize students with history but also to present questions about the international role of the United States that students will consider individually, research, and ultimately reach their own conclusions. The goal then is to have students develop their own worldview of how the international system operates, the role of the United States in it, and how individual citizens can shape that mission, which will be the subject of the final paper. Students will use this information and their own perspectives to act as informed citizens in the classroom, engaging in regular discussions about how they can participate in the process of guiding the conduct of the nation and its agents as voters, members of a global civil society, and/or future policymakers.

**General Education (GE)**

This course fulfills the Legacy GE category of **Historical Studies** OR the new GE Theme of **Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World**.

**Legacy GE: Historical Studies**

**Goal:**

Students recognize how past events are studied and how they influence today's society and the human condition.

**Expected Learning Outcomes (ELOs):**

1. Students construct an integrated perspective on history and the factors that shape human activity.
2. Students describe and analyze the origins and nature of contemporary issues.
3. Students speak and write critically about primary and secondary historical sources by examining diverse interpretations of past events and ideas in their historical contexts.

**This course will fulfill the Legacy GE: Historical Studies in the following ways:**

This course fulfills historical studies learning outcomes as a course centrally focused on the past one-hundred years of history. The class centers on reading, assignments, research, and writing designed to explore crucial historical issues via primary sources and in generating a deeper understanding of past events, international interactions, and the lived experiences, thoughts, and actions of individuals and groups. The class trains students in historical methods of analysis and in historical arguments and use of evidence.

**GE Theme: Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World****Goals:**

1. Successful students will analyze an important topic or idea at a more advanced and in-depth level than in the Foundations component. [Note: In this context, "advanced" refers to courses that are e.g., synthetic, rely on research or cutting-edge findings, or deeply engage with the subject matter, among other possibilities.]
2. Successful students will integrate approaches to the theme by making connections to out-of-classroom experiences with academic knowledge or across disciplines and/or to work they have done in previous classes and that they anticipate doing in future.
3. Successful students will explore and analyze a range of perspectives on local, national, or global citizenship and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that constitute citizenship.
4. Successful students will examine notions of justice amid difference and analyze and critique how these interact with historically and socially constructed ideas of citizenship and membership within society, both within the United States and around the world.

**Expected Learning Outcomes:**

Successful students are able to:

- 1.1. Engage in critical and logical thinking about the topic or idea of the theme.
- 1.2. Engage in advance, in-depth, scholarly exploration of the topic or idea of the theme.
- 2.1. Identify, describe, and synthesize approaches or experiences as they apply to the theme.
- 2.2. Demonstrate a developing sense of self as a learner through reflection, self-assessment, and creative work, building on prior experiences to respond to new and challenging contexts.
- 3.1. Describe and analyze a range of perspectives on what constitutes citizenship and how it differs across political, cultural, national, global, and/or historical communities.
- 3.2. Identify, reflect on, and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required for intercultural competence as a global citizen.
- 4.1. Examine, critique, and evaluate various expressions and implications of diversity, equity, and inclusion, and explore a variety of lived experiences.
- 4.2. Analyze and critique the intersection of concepts of justice, difference, citizenship, and how these interact with cultural traditions, structures of power, and/or advocacy for social change.

**This course will fulfill the new GE Theme: Citizenship in the following ways:**

Through the intensive study of the U.S.’s role in and with the world since the 1910s this course will provide students the background necessary to be informed citizens who shape U.S. foreign affairs by the actions they take and individuals they elect, helping them understand the role of the United States in the world and the impact of global events, ideas, and peoples on domestic debates. It will encourage them to think critically about issues of war, peace, migration, modernization, globalization, ideology, and intervention that operate at and across the state level. Moreover, it will highlight the role that individual citizens have played in shaping these conversations, both through the articulation of intellectual ideas central to the national tradition and who makes foreign policy, and through mass movements that played roles in redefining both policies and the identities of policymaking bodies. It will demonstrate how the promotion of U.S. ideals of individual rights and democracy reshaped international politics in pursuit of a kind of global civil society, while demonstrating that the opening of borders and lionization of such ideas empowered domestic actors and movements to pursue policies to address major issues such as empire, civil rights, peace, and human rights.

**Objectives and learning outcomes:**

**This course fulfills the general requirements and expected learning outcomes for GE Themes.**

Themes: General		
Goals	Expected Learning Outcomes	In this course
<p><b>GOAL 1: Successful students will analyze an important topic or idea at a more advanced and in-depth level than the foundations.</b></p>	<p><b>Successful students are able to...</b></p> <p>1.1. Engage in critical and logical thinking about the topic or idea of the theme.</p>	<p><b>In this course, students...</b></p> <p>1.1. Examine in <i>greater factual detail</i> key developments from the 1910s onward in U.S. relations to and with the world; read and discuss <i>multiple scholarly interpretations</i> of historians, political scientists, sociologists, cultural studies scholars, writers, intellectuals, activists, film makers, artists, etc. to gain a deeper understanding of this historical period. In both exams and papers, student will then produce their own synthetic explanations of events and their impact, choosing between and going beyond scholarly interpretations to advance their own conclusions supported by concrete evidence.</p>
	<p>1.2. Engage in an advanced, in-depth, scholarly exploration of the topic or idea of the theme.</p>	<p>1.2. Read cutting-edge scholarship, participate in regular in-class discussions, and complete varied writing assignments to develop critical and logical thinking about the topic. These assignments will culminate in an independent research paper on a policy/foreign affairs topic in which students</p>

		<p>identify appropriate archives, gather pertinent evidence independently, and evaluate a specific foreign policy pursued the United States in relation to its obligations either to its own citizens or a global civil society.</p>
<p><b>GOAL 2: GOAL:</b>  <b>Successful students will integrate approaches to the theme by making connections to out-of-classroom experiences with academic knowledge or across disciplines and/or to work they have done in previous classes and that they anticipate doing in future.</b></p>	<p>2.1. Identify, describe, and synthesize approaches or experiences as they apply to the theme.</p>	<p>2.1. Engage in the exploration of each weekly topic through a combination of lectures, readings, films, discussions, and writing assignments to learn how to identify and describe an issue, articulate an argument, find evidence, and synthesize views or experiences orally and in writing. Virtually every assignment in the class requires students to actively identify, describe, and synthesize, from in-class participation and the midterm examination to the final research paper and the reflection paper topics, which all engage various historical dimensions of developing ideas, policies, and practices of American and global citizenship.</p>
	<p>2.2. Demonstrate a developing sense of self as a learner through reflection, self-assessment, and creative work, building on prior experiences to respond to new and challenging contexts.</p>	<p>2.2. Students will develop their sense of self as a learner in two specific ways. First, they will use the exploration of past foreign affairs to reflect on contemporary issues and challenges. Class themes and assignments will encourage students to think critically about the policy assumptions and ideologies that underlay U.S. international policy and American citizen’s engagement with the wider world, exploring topics such as the meaning and role of ideology, faith, protest, economic instability, violence, physical and social mobility, human agency, historical memory, citizenship, and identity. Second, the course is designed to strengthen student’s individual research and analytical skills. The main element demonstrating this ELO is focused on the research paper, which offers a structured opportunity to practice and develop the research process, through identifying a source base, wading through conflict, isolating and assessing the relevance of sources, identifying trends across documents and media, conceiving, constructing, and revising an argument (thesis), using this thesis to guide research, and ultimately producing an argument that makes sense of this information to reach a conclusion about a topic of meaning to them. The ability to function as a learner through reflection and to meet new challenges through synthetic understanding is a central task for the informed citizen who must increasingly be a critical consumer of information.</p>

**This course fulfills the specific requirements and expected learning outcomes for the GE Theme: Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World.**

Themes: Citizenship for a Diverse and Just World		
Goals	Expected Learning Outcomes	Related course content
<p><b>GOAL 1: Citizenship:</b> Successful students will explore and analyze a range of perspectives on citizenship, across local, national, and global, and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that constitute it.</p>	<p><b>Successful students are able to...</b></p> <p>1.1. Describe and analyze a range of perspectives on what constitutes citizenship and how it differs across political, cultural, global, and/or historical communities.</p>	<p><b>In this course, students...</b></p> <p>1.1. Study diverse manifestations of citizenship in the United States since the 1910s as they had a bearing on American relations with the world, including analyzing U.S. political, socioeconomic, cultural values, assumptions, and approaches to and in comparison with people, groups, communities, and nations around the world. In particular we will consider the strategies, institutions, and ideologies that have shaped how citizens have directly influenced U.S. foreign policy through – for example – protests and lobbying of congressional representatives, and we will also consider how international events shaped domestic concepts of citizenship and the relation to the state. For example, we will look at how reaction against Wilsonianism fueled anti-immigrant ideas and how civil rights activists gained ground by appealing to Cold War ideology.</p>
	<p>1.2. Identify, reflect on, and apply the knowledge, skills and dispositions required for intercultural competence as a global citizen.</p>	<p>1.2. Analyze and reflect on American institutions, identities, and values in a global perspective through a study of the interactions between the U.S. and a wide array of other nations and across regions, including, international organizations and governments, transnational actors, local communities, and ordinary people. Specifically, students will address how the United States is perceived in the world based on its historic actions and how the concept of what the United States and its people owe the world has changed over time to reflect a more globalized understanding of the nation, its citizenry, and their commitments to a wider global community. For example, across a range of readings the class identifies, reflects on, discusses, and then applies critical insights related to the idea of a global civil society and the ways that individuals can participate through local democratic action, multinational corporations, government service, and non-governmental organizations.</p>



<p><b>GOAL 2: Just and Diverse World: Successful students will examine notions of justice amidst difference and analyze and critique how these interact with historically and socially constructed ideas of citizenship and membership within societies.</b></p>	<p>2.1. Examine, critique, and evaluate various expressions and implications of diversity, equity, inclusion, and a variety of lived experiences.</p>	<p>2.1. Study multicultural aspects of the United States across geographical regions and in international dimensions, socioeconomic status, or racial, ethnic, and religious background to understand conflicting ideas of diversity, equity and inclusion as both policy and lived experience. In particular, the course focuses on definitions of citizenship in a heterogenous country, and how the U.S. ideological engagement with the world has both constricted but more often expanded ideas of citizenship to reflect more universal, cosmopolitan ideas of U.S. identity. Moreover, the course emphasizes the ways that the United States has interacted with the world and how its dominant culture has both influenced and been influenced by its contact with differing perspectives, especially in terms of the influence of anti-Western ideas articulated in the global South. The result is a course that while focused on the United States, encourages students to think critically about how ideology gets formed within the United States at the intersection of diverse transnational influences and how the nation's actions have been perceived in ways that go beyond the intentions of the policymakers and citizenry that initially formed it.</p>
	<p>2.2. Analyze and critique the intersection of concepts of justice, difference, citizenship, and how these interact with cultural traditions, structures of power and/or advocacy for social change.</p>	<p>2.2. Analyze and evaluate the history, current political and social status, cultural identity, and activism of U.S. diplomats and citizens in shaping the nation's engagement to and with the world. Specifically, it will look at how the creation of a permanent national security state since World War II in ways diluted the power of citizens, while the variety and identity of citizens groups claiming roles in the foreign policy process have grown dramatically. We will explore this dichotomy and what the debate about policymaking and who makes it has meant for questions of U.S. democracy, citizenship, and U.S. grand strategies. It will also consider how both changing concepts of a global civil society and the diversification of the U.S. policymaking process has transformed U.S. approaches to key parts of the globe such as Latin American and Africa, moving from ideas of empire and racial superiority toward contrasting approaches based both on hegemony and on such ideas as human rights and global interdependence.</p>

### **Additional Course Goals:**

By the end of the course, successful students will:

- Develop a familiarity with the primary elements of U.S. foreign relations, including major political, social, and economic figures and trends
- Analyze how American foreign policy has evolved over the last century, and what this has meant for domestic and international perceptions of the United States
- Analyze how concepts of national security and interest have changed, and explain what this means to historical and contemporary discussions of American international priorities
- Assess the United States' international role in its historical context, as well as the impact world events have had on domestic politics, ideologies, and the economy
- Utilize diverse secondary and primary sources to construct cogent historical arguments that include a thesis, supporting themes, and strong use of concrete evidence

### **Texts:**

All required texts are available from the University Bookstore and online booksellers:

Barbara J. Keys, *Reclaiming American Virtue: The Human Rights Revolution of the 1970s*  
(Harvard, 2014)

Melvyn Leffler, *The Specter of Communism* (Hill and Wang, 1994)

Christopher McKnight Nichols, *Promise and Peril: America at the Dawn of the Global Age*  
(Harvard, 2011)

NB: All other readings are available on Carmen

### **Assignments: Discussion/Participation (10%)**

Students should be prepared to discuss the texts on the day they are assigned and for the rest of the semester. Please consider any media as seriously as you would the written documents. The class will analyze images and videos together in lecture, and I expect you to treat this and any other material distributed in class as required reading for use in essays and on exams. During class discussions, you should reference texts, documents, and media when making points. I expect you to argue your informed opinions cogently and concisely but remember to maintain a respectful and civil attitude toward opposing viewpoints. Contributions to class discussion will be noted. Given the class size, I also retain the right use impromptu in-class assignments to supplement discussion and gauge student engagement with the material intermittently throughout the semester.

Three to four times during the semester I will conduct ten-minute reading quizzes at the beginning of class. They will consist of either ten multiple choice/fill-in-the-blank or five of the previous and a short answer. The quizzes are not scheduled for specific dates, but I will give you at least a week notice. They will cover the readings for the week immediately prior. I will drop the lowest grade.

Attendance is not required but you will not be allowed to make up missed quizzes/participation assignments unless you have provided a valid reason for missing the class in advance (or in rare cases, within 24 hours). I expect students to arrive to class on time and remain for the entire class unless given permission in advance.

Finally, there will be one optional film screening outside of class on Monday, February 27 (*Dr. Strangelove*) at 6pm. You are not required to attend, but you will need to watch the film if you choose to complete one of the paper assignments and we will discuss it in class. If you cannot attend the events, the film is available on reserve at the library and on some streaming services (check HBO+ and Kanopy).

### **Midterm Exam (25%)**

There will be one mid-term during the semester. It will consist of two sections: multiple choice and an essay. There will be a choice of two essay questions, and you will be expected to complete one. You should craft a cogent, well-articulated response to the prompt that presents a clear thesis and uses evidence drawn from the primary and secondary readings (you do not have to quote), material presented in class, and discussions. I will distribute three potential essay questions, each of which draws on key course concepts and historical examples, including related to concerns regarding the tensions between national citizenship and international engagement, a week advance to help you prepare. There is no final exam.

### **Reflection Paper (25%)**

You will write a short reflection paper on ONE of the following topics: Wilsonianism, postwar national security, nuclear warfare and the Cold War, or human rights. These assigned topics connect to learning outcomes related to the close analysis of historical evidence and the construction of arguments that provide crucial insights into the development of and debates over global citizenship from the early twentieth century to the present.

Papers should be approximately 3-4 pages double-spaced (800-1000 words) in length, include a word count at the end, and have footnote citations including author (of book or document), title, and page number. You do not need outside sources, but you should cite any using the full Chicago/Turabian style. Choose ONE of the prompts below and submit your response on or before the assigned date for that topic number (See Course and Reading Schedule below). You should write responses with a clear thesis statement and make direct references to secondary texts and primary sources from class.

1. How did Wilsonianism re-articulate the United States' place in the world and what it owed to other countries, and how did this either reflect or challenge traditions of US identity and foreign policy? Consider in your answer both the ideological and strategic goals advocated by Woodrow Wilson, notably ideas about constructing a community of nations and conceptions of international citizenship via the League of Nations, as well as the opposition's alternative view of a small "r" republican foreign policy.
2. To what extent did definitions of national interest and/or national security change in the World War II/postwar period, and how did this change the national conceptions of citizenship, both

internationally and domestically? How did these calculations influence the origins of the Cold War and/or the pursuit of varied forms of containment?

3. Answer the following question after watching the film *Dr. Strangelove* (Kubrick, 1964) either with the class or on reserve at the library. How did the official logic of nuclear warfare contrast with its perception by the average citizen, and what does the popularity of *Dr. Strangelove* reveal about the public perception of and engagement with the Cold War more broadly?
4. Assume the role of a policy adviser for President Jimmy Carter or the newly elected Ronald Reagan. Write a memo answering the question, “Why should the United States adopt a foreign policy attentive to international human rights, and how would that reflect the popular will of citizen groups?” – specifically referencing either Eastern Europe or the Third World (Asia, Africa, Latin America). Include an executive summary instead of an introductory paragraph, then write a persuasive essay using primary and secondary sources with attention to the political and security contexts of the era, as well as evolving ideas of a global civil society. When crafting your argument, consider both the ideological justifications for an expanded role for the United States within broad discussions of global rights and citizenship, as well as the specific domestic constituencies that might support such a policy.

### **Final Paper (40%)**

Your final assignment will be to produce a medium-sized research paper utilizing primary documents and secondary sources. In consultation with myself, you will individually research a topic on a specific country, region, or event in a bounded time period – generally a single presidential administration for the sake of simplicity. The specifics of the topic will be at your discretion, with the instructor’s approval, and will allow you to explore specific examples of how the United States has operated in specific regions and ways over the past century. The paper will have a clear thesis, supporting themes, and evidence that will generally answer the following questions:

How do you as a citizen of the country and/or the world understand the international role of the United States, and how did the nation and its people justify increasingly expensive and expansive policies? When making this argument you should consider your own understanding of how the world operates alongside the United States’ economic, political, and security interests with regard to the region or country you selected, and how the policy it pursued sought to advance these interests? Did it achieve its goals or make progress toward doing so in the period examined by your paper? If you focus on individuals and groups, diplomats, activists, or others, engage with contested ideas of citizenship and how they shaped understandings and advocacy related to the U.S.’s “proper” role in the world. Students interested in researching beyond this specific prompt may consult with me individually.

Beginning after the midterm, you will conduct research to complete the essay using primary and secondary sources. Several class periods will introduce you to available digital and print resources, but the majority of this work should be completed outside of class. You should make sure to discuss with me your specific topic before spring break and receive official approval. Each student should email me two updates on the completed research, which will be graded. The first update is due March 30, when you will explain your research plan: the sources you are using, the secondary reading(s) you have identified,

and general thoughts on the direction of your paper and argument. The second update is due April 13; you should provide a working thesis and a provisional sentence outline that develops the argument of the paper by listing possible topic sentences of your individual paragraphs.

The final paper should be 8-12 pages in length, double spaced, in a normal sized font (2200-3200 words). It should include full footnote citations in Chicago/Turabian format, with a word count at the end. There is no minimum number of sources you should reference, but the majority of the paper should be based on primary material, though you should include references to at least two secondary sources – either academic articles or books. The paper will be due April 25 at noon. No extensions will be provided except for extreme circumstances.

While we will discuss potential avenues for research, you should focus primarily on three sets of printed/digital archives for the purpose of this class:

State Department Foreign Relations of the United States (also available at library)

1945-1980s: <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments>

Pre-1945: <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/pre-truman>

Papers of the Presidents, UCSB American Presidency Project

<http://presidency.proxied.lsit.ucsb.edu/ws/>

Proquest Historical Newspapers

Available Via Library Database

### **Assignment Due Dates and Grading:**

Discussion/Participation: 10%

Reflection Essay (Varies – dates below): 25%

Midterm Exam (Feb. 23): 25%

Final Paper Updates (March 30/April 13): 5%

Final Paper (April 25): 35%

A: 93-100

A-: 90-92

B+: 87-89

B: 83-86

B-: 80-82

C+: 77-79

C: 73-76

C-: 70-72

D+: 67-69

D: 63-66

D-: 60-62

F: <60

### **REQUIRED SYLLABUS ELEMENTS:**

#### **Disability Services**

The University strives to make all learning experiences as accessible as possible. In light of the current pandemic, students seeking to request COVID-related accommodations may do so through the university's request process, managed by Student Life Disability Services. If you anticipate or experience academic barriers based on your disability (including mental health, chronic or temporary medical conditions), please let me know immediately so that we can privately discuss options. To establish

reasonable accommodations, I may request that you register with Student Life Disability Services. After registration, make arrangements with me as soon as possible to discuss your accommodations so that they may be implemented in a timely fashion. SLDS contact information: [slds@osu.edu](mailto:slds@osu.edu); 614-292-3307; [slds.osu.edu](http://slds.osu.edu); 098 Baker Hall, 113 W. 12th Avenue.

### **Academic Misconduct**

It is the responsibility of the Committee on Academic Misconduct to investigate or establish procedures for the investigation of all reported cases of student academic misconduct. The term “academic misconduct” includes all forms of student academic misconduct wherever committed; illustrated by, but not limited to, cases of plagiarism and dishonest practices in connection with examinations. Instructors shall report all instances of alleged academic misconduct to the committee (Faculty Rule 3335-5-487). For additional information, see the Code of Student Conduct <http://studentlife.osu.edu/csc/>.

### **Additional Policies:**

Please notify me of any pending absence at least fourteen days prior to the date of observance of a religious holiday. If you must miss a class or assignment in order to observe a religious holy day, you will be given an opportunity to complete the missed work within a reasonable time after the absence.

As a student you may experience a range of issues that can cause barriers to learning, such as strained relationships, increased anxiety, alcohol/drug problems, feeling down, difficulty concentrating and/or lack of motivation. These mental health concerns or stressful events may lead to diminished academic performance or reduce a student’s ability to participate in daily activities. The Ohio State University offers services to assist you with addressing these and other concerns you may be experiencing. If you or someone you know are suffering from any of the aforementioned conditions, you can learn more about the broad range of confidential mental health services available on campus via the Office of Student Life’s Counseling and Consultation Service (CCS) by visiting [ccs.osu.edu](http://ccs.osu.edu) or calling [614-292-5766](tel:614-292-5766). CCS is located on the 4th Floor of the Younkin Success Center and 10th Floor of Lincoln Tower. You can reach an on call counselor when CCS is closed at [614-292-5766](tel:614-292-5766) and 24 hour emergency help is also available 24/7 by dialing 988 to reach the Suicide and Crisis Lifeline.

---

### **Course and Reading Schedule:**

Please note that the readings and topics listed below are subject to change. I reserve the right to adjust the syllabus based on guest discussions and unforeseen events. I will announce any changes in class and through email. I will then post an updated syllabus on the course website.

---

### **Week 1: Introduction & Traditions of American Foreign Policy**

[65pp]

This week introduces the themes of the class and provides a brief roadmap to the foundational ideas of U.S. foreign policy and the idea of a democratic, republican empire. It considers key questions that we will ask for the remainder of the course including: What is the relationship of the citizen, the nation, and its system of government to foreign affairs? Who decides foreign affairs, and to what ends? How did the

increase in both size and power of the nation begin to transform these relationships? How does the expansion of interests and actions abroad effect the democracy and republicanism at the heart of the U.S. socio-political compact? What role does the United States have to play in the world, and what does it owe other nations if anything at all?

January 10 – Introduction

January 12 –Nichols, Introduction; Chapter 2 “A Better Nation Morally”

Washington’s Farewell Address (1796)

Monroe Doctrine (1823)

John L. O’Sullivan, “The Great Nation of Futurity” (1837)

Rudyard Kipling, “The White Man’s Burden” (1899)

## **Week 2: Wilsonian Internationalism and its Discontents**

[115pp]

American Citizenship and global citizenship in comparative context(s). This week explores the progressive vision of internationalism and its role promoting a domestic view of national cohesion, responsibility, and democratic compromise onto the world stage. We consider these issues both in the organization of the peace movement pioneered by women and small “r” republicans as well as the vitally important articulation of a global but ultimately limited vision of international citizenship offered by Woodrow Wilson. It contrast this expansive vision of Wilsonianism with the imperial tendencies the United States followed in Latin America. It concludes with a discussion of the League of Nations that saw Americans interrogate their relationship as citizens to the wider world, and what connections and debts they owed to other nations, with Wilson’s vision ultimately being curtailed by traditional republican ideas of small government, the citizen soldier, and maximum U.S. autonomy.

January 17 – Nichols, Chapter 3 “Toward a Transnational America,” Chapter 5 “Voices of the People”

Primary: “A Jane Addams Peace,” *New York Times*, 28 June 1915.

Wilson’s Fourteen Points (1918)

January 19 – Nichols, Chapter 6 “The Irreconcilables”

Primary: William Borah “Little Americans” Speech to U.S. Senate (1919)

Wilson Speech in Pueblo Colorado (1919)

## **Week 3: America First**

[107pp]

This section takes as its title Warren G. Harding’s campaign slogan. A renewed American nationalism and inward focus represented both a walking back of the U.S. conception of its international role during this

period and a popular backlash against a global engagement that challenged the inclusive ideas of citizenship that emerged after decades of immigration from Southern Europe. The result was a period of deep ambiguity both internationally and domestically, marked by violent policing of a white, protestant national identity that coexisted alongside a flirtation with global leadership that maintained maximum American flexibility and ultimately collapsed with the onset of the Depression. The fact that the United States still wrestled with both the identity of its citizenry and its role in the broader global society shaped its initial reaction to World War II, only gradually inching toward war as U.S. borders and priorities came under threat. This week provides food for thought about how national understandings of citizenry and mission change over time, and how these domestic debates both reflected and informed international policy.

January 24 – Nichols, Chapter 7 “New Internationalism”; Conclusion

Primary: Warren Harding, Jr. “America First” (1920)

Nye Report Selection (1936)

January 26 – Emily S. Rosenberg, *Spreading the American Dream* (1985) Chapter 6 “Economic Expansion” and Chapter 7 “The Cooperative State”

Primary: Charles Lindbergh Speech in Des Moines, Iowa (1941):

<http://www.charleslindbergh.com/americanfirst/speech.asp>

Optional: Selection, Dr. Seuss Political Cartoons

### Reflection Paper 1 Due

#### **Week 4: World War II and the National Security State**

[100pp]

This week addresses the rise of the United States to unquestioned world power status during World War II, and the transformation of its relationship to its citizens as a result. Specifically, it considers how the definition World War II as an ideological struggle for the survival of democracy reinvigorated the idea of a heterogeneous citizenry while completely transforming the relationship of the citizen to the military. First, it explores the forced reckoning with the contested role of hyphenated Americans who died for country while being discriminated against and/or imprisoned, and how this dichotomy threatened to undermine both the war effort and evolving postwar diplomacy. Second, it follows the mass mobilization and subtle militarization of society, which initially drew upon the tradition of the citizen soldier only to move towards an institutionalized militarism undergirded by a new concept of permanent insecurity that challenged long-held conceptions of the nation’s isolation and republican identity. Students will consider how these two factors changed U.S. conceptions of itself, and whether the latter was fully justified in light of changing international contexts.

January 31 – Ronald Takaki, *Double V*, Chapter 6 “Diversity and its Discontents: Who is An American?”



Or, watch documentary, "The Depression Episode 4" Selection

Primary: Henry Luce, "The American Century" Excerpts (1941)

A. Philip Randolph, "A Call to Negro American to March on Washington" (1941)

Superman, Daily Newspaper Strip, March 1941

February 2 – Sherry, *In the Shadow of War*, "The Militarization of America: Triumph"

Primary: Harold Lasswell, "The Garrison State" Excerpt (1941)

### **Week 5: Global America and the Origins of the Cold War**

[95pp]

This week addresses the new U.S. vision for its role in the world, and how expansive ideas of security and insecurity helped produce a Cold War internationally and justify the creation of a permanent security state domestically. It will consider how ideas of democratic participation and an aspirational rights-based citizenship during the Depression laid the groundwork for attempts to build a global civil society through political and economic institutions like the United Nations and World Bank, respectively. This expansive vision of an Americanized world reinforced a growing conflict with an insecure Soviet Union, which led to a spiraling of tensions and the creation of new institutions to firm up a Western bloc dedicated nominally to capitalism and democracy. While some domestic resistance existed, the government worked with public institutions to firm up support for this expansive foreign policy by linking the Cold War to core ideas of American identity and citizenship, selling both the idea of insecurity and new responsibilities for its citizens abroad as diplomats, soldiers, consumers, and even tourists.

February 7 – Leffler, Chapter 1 "Background," Chapter 2 "From Allies to Adversaries"

Elizabeth Borgwardt, *New Deal for the World* "An Expanding Vision of the National Interest"

Primary: Churchill Iron Curtain Speech (1946)

February 9 – Primary: The Truman Doctrine (1947); Hoover Gibraltar Speech (1950)

\*\*\*Discussion of Primary Sources\*\*\*

### Reflection Paper 2 Due

### **Week 6: Containment Abroad and at Home**

[80pp]

This week defines the broad strategy of containment that the United States used to fight the Cold War, and the combination of tactical demands and domestic political calculations that shaped its manifestations over multiple decades. More broadly, it considers how containment reshaped the domestic security structure and the federal government's relationship to its citizens, policing social and political boundaries in ways it had not done before – exemplified by the Red Scare. Yet in so doing, it

launched new debates about who could and should create foreign policy, and who should be able to claim the full rights of citizenship. The ability to make ideological and transnational appeals empowered existing movements like those for civil rights – though in a very specific form that fit the needs of the state – while targeting those who transgressed national norms, such as the Lavender Scare’s persecution of LGBTQ+ public servants.

February 14 –Leffler, Chapter 3 “Assuming Hegemony”

Primary: George Kennan, X Article Excerpt (1947)

NSC-68 Excerpt (1950)

February 16 – Keys, 1-31; Watch, *Lavender Scare* Documentary (Selections)

Primary: McCarthy Speech Against the State Department (1950)

FBI Investigation into Mattachine Society Excerpts (1953)

Paul Robeson’s Appearance Before the House Un-American Activities Committee (1956)

### **Week 7: Nuclear Strategy and the Military Industrial Complex**

[42pp]

The first part of this week addresses the role of nuclear weapons in warfare and the advent of mutually assured destruction, along with the popular reaction to it. It uses this topic as a case study for the high science of modern warfare and the creation of the military-industrial complex, which directly challenged U.S. traditions of democratic control over the military apparatus and further distanced the decision making on military matters from the average citizen via the construction of a massive professional bureaucracy.

February 21 – Leffler, “Limited War and Global Strategy”

Primary: Albert Wohlstetter, “The Delicate Balance of Terror” Excerpts (1959)

Eisenhower Farewell Address (1961)

February 23 – Mid-Term

### **Week 8: The Challenge of Decolonization**

[65pp]

This week explores the ways that decolonization changed U.S. calculations regarding the Cold War and its broader engagement with the Global South. Besides offering new strategic challenges, the proliferation of new states and leaders deeply critical of empire and global economic structures offered new critiques of a Euro-American dominated diplomatic and cultural globalizations that directly informed domestic social movements ranging from Black Power to the anti-war movement. These two

phenomena cultivated with the Vietnam War. While multiple presidents justified escalation in of the war not only along Cold War lines but also in terms of the U.S. commitment to developing postcolonial states, it ultimately demonstrated the limits of US power and did so by creating deep domestic divisions within the United States. These divisions manifested in the form of citizen protest and the election of a new generation of politicians interested in constraining what they viewed as an imperial presidency increasingly un beholden to democratic processes. The week will ask students to consider the limits of U.S. interests, its role in the Global South, and how international ideas influence domestic movements.

Film Screening: February 26 at 6pm, Dr. Strangelove (Kubrick, 1964)

February 28 – Optional for paper: Watch *Dr. Strangelove*

Primary: Henry Byroade Speech (1953)

Jawaharlal Nehru Speech to Bandung Conference (1955)

Richard Wright, *The Color Curtain: A Report on the Bandung Conference* Excerpt (1956)

March 2 –Keys, Chapter 2 “Managing Civil Rights at Home,” Chapter 3 “The Trauma of the Vietnam War”

Primary: Lyndon Johnson American Policy in Vietnam Speech (1965)

Martin Luther King, Jr. “Beyond Vietnam” (1967)

Brian Resnick, “Protest Posters from the Vietnam Era,” *The Atlantic* (4 August 2011):  
<http://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2011/08/protest-posters-from-the-vietnam-era/243029/#slide1>

Reflection Paper 3 Due

### **Week 9: Debating the Cold War – Grand Strategies and Limited Means**

[86pp]

This week tackles two major topics: the reorientation of policy in the wake of the Vietnam War and the domestic debates that this produced over the role of U.S. power and what the nation owed the world. It explores the Nixon administrations’ policy of détente that accommodated popular demands to moderate the Cold War while addressing the rise of China, all while balancing a new assertion of Soviet power. But more broadly it looks at how citizen’s groups, from both right and left, sought to use the events of the 1970s to advance specific policies tied closely to U.S. ideology, the identities of individual civil groups, and their visions for how the U.S. should operate on the global stage, with attention to the proliferation of new civil organizations and congressional allies they made to advance these proposals. Examples of these civil society groups that jockeyed for influence on foreign affairs included anti-war activists, segregationists, and the first inklings of the neo-conservative movement.

March 7 – Keys, Chapter 4 “The Liberal Critique of Right Wing Dictatorships,” Chapter 5 “The Anticommunist Embrace of Human Rights”

Primary: The Nixon Doctrine (1969)

NSSM 39 “Tar Baby Option” Excerpts (1969)

March 9 – Keys, Chapter 6 “A New Calculus Emerges”

Primary: House Foreign Affairs Committee, Report on War Powers Resolution of 1973, Excerpt (1973)

Committee on the Present Danger, “Common Sense and Common Danger” (1976)

*\*\*Students should have discussed and receive permission for their projects by this point in semester\*\**

**\*\* Spring Break: March 12-16 \*\***

### **Week 10: A Global Civil Society**

[125pp]

This week extends the discussion of domestic debates from the week prior to look specifically at a theme that became a meeting ground for various civil society groups: human rights. While the term and its implications for policy differed depending on who championed it, the idea provided competing movements with a useful way of rethinking U.S. traditions of world leadership while articulating a vision for a global civil society that seemingly existed beyond narrow U.S. interests. Human rights in effect defined a kind of international individual citizenship that came with certain rights and sought to designate the United States as their protector, though the exact constitution of these rights and what threatened them differed according to individual agendas. Prominent among groups on all sides were ethnic lobbies, whose campaigning for relatives and co-religionists abroad demonstrated powerfully how hyphenated citizenship continued to define foreign policy while creating new political coalitions. As congressional pressure mounted, human rights entered executive politics when Jimmy Carter adopted this rhetoric and sought to pursue policies based on it, only to discover that traditional Cold War concerns and the new challenges of an increasingly borderless world made enacting such policies more difficult than many domestic constituencies hoped. Students will consider the role that ethnicity and religion play in foreign affairs, both in terms of domestic politics and broad global trends.

March 21 – Keys, Chapter 7 “Insurgency on Capitol Hill,” Chapter 8 “The Human Rights Lobby”

Primary: Congressional Report on Human Rights Excerpts (1974)

March 23 – Keys, Chapter 9 “A Moral Campaign for President”

Primary: Jimmy Carter Speech at Notre Dame Excerpts (1977)

Ayatollah Khomeini, “We Shall Confront the World with Our Ideology” Excerpts (1980)

Reflection Paper 4 Due

**Week 11: Cold War Ends and Means**

[30pp]

This week focuses on the end of the Cold War, both the high politics of diplomacy and the grassroots movements that challenged official calculations. Among others, it considers the transnational citizenry that maintained elements of détente and began campaigning around issues of disarmament (the nuclear freeze movement in particular), helping to permanently undermine rigid Cold War calculations. This allowed world leaders like Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan to respond more flexibly when opportunities for negotiation emerged, with the latter specifically breaking with grassroots Cold Warriors who defined confrontation with the Soviet Union as a policy goal itself. The result is an exploration of the ways that citizens often shape the contexts for high-level discussions – in democracies and beyond – and how world leaders respond to competing constituencies.

March 28 – Keys, Chapter 10 “We Want to be Proud Again,” Conclusion

Primary: Randal Forsberg, “Building a Social Movement for Disarmament” (1979)

Ronald Reagan Radio Address to the Nation on Nuclear Weapons (1982)

Ronald Reagan’s Evil Empire Speech Excerpt (1983) – full audio available:  
<http://millercenter.org/president/speeches/speech-3409>

March 30 – Sarah B. Snyder, “Principles Overwhelming Tanks: Human Rights and the End of the Cold War,” in Goedde, et. al. *The Human Rights Revolution* (2012), 265-284

Primary: Mikhail Gorbachev Address to the United Nations Excerpt (1988)

New York Times Op-Ed, “The Cold War is Over” (1989)

First Project Update Due

**Week 12: The Unipolar Moment, or Global Citizenship in a “Flat” World**

[80pp]

This week tackles the popular euphoria created by the ending of the Cold War. It heralded the seeming victory of democracy while coinciding with unprecedented changes in communication technology and economic integration that challenged the centrality of the nation state in foreign affairs. The ideas of a global citizenry, collapsed borders, and democratic peace theory empowered new actors from internet-savvy activists to multinational corporations that increasingly asserted their influence over global agendas. The United States government sought to co-opt some of these trends with its proposal for a New World Order but ran headlong into the stubborn inequities and stark ideological differences that remained hallmarks of the international system. These hinted at future challenges to both national foreign policy and the wave of U.S.-led globalization while events in places like Somalia and battles over foreign aid demonstrated the limits of American citizens’ commitment to the vision of expansive foreign affairs inherited from the Cold War.

April 4 – Hal Brands, *The Unipolar Moment*, 274-297

Thomas Friedman, *World is Flat 3.0*, 51-77

Primary: George H.W. Bush New World Order Speech Excerpts (1990) – full audio available:  
<http://millercenter.org/president/bush/speeches/speech-3425>

Francis Fukuyama, “The End of History” Excerpts (1989)

Michael Hauben, Ronda Hauben *Netizens*, “The Net and Netizens” Excerpts (1997)

April 6 – Joseph Stieglitz, *Globalization and its Discontents*, 23-53

Primary: Samuel P. Huntington, “The Clash of Civilizations?” Excerpts (1993)

### **Week 13: The War on Terror**

[30pp]

This week considers the origins of global terrorism as a major U.S. policy concern, and the way this issue rocketed to the top of the national agenda after 9/11. Specifically, it looks at how debates over a more measured U.S. foreign policy and a peace dividend that would devolve key foreign policymaking powers back to the citizenry were shelved by the reassertion of the national security state after 9/11. As had happened in prior moments, national mobilization blurred the lines between foreign and domestic security, with initiatives like the PATRIOT Act defining constraints for a heterogeneous citizenry while pushing policies that potentially transgressed individual rights in the international sphere. While initially popular, the War on Terror lost support in the wake of the prolonged occupation of Iraq and the extended conflict in Afghanistan, even as the debt-driven funding of these wars and volunteer army prevented the kind of mass protest that surrounded Vietnam. The topic therefore lends itself to discussion of the citizenry’s role in waging modern wars and the ways that the security state has evolved since Vietnam to compartmentalize conflict in ways that insulate it from popular opinion while asserting a visible presence in daily lives.

April 11 – Primary: George W. Bush Address to Joint Session of Congress (2001)

Authorization to Use Military Force (AUMF) 2002

Barbara Lee, “Why I Opposed the Resolution to Authorize Military Force” (2002)

Music Video Selections on Carmen (Petey Pablo, Toby Keith, etc).

*Dixie Chicks: Shut Up and Sing* Documentary (Excerpts)

April 13 – Sarah Kreps, *Taxing Wars: The American Way of War Finance and the Decline of Democracy* (2018), chapter 6

*Second Project Update Due*

## **Week 14: New Threats, or Old Foes?**

[50pp]

This final week considers recent events in light of the history we discussed over the preceding weeks. It addresses Russia's annexation of Ukrainian territory and its more distant wars, U.S. responses to them, and the broad impact on the post-1945 conception of war and peace. It also considers the rise of China, and how both these countries have challenged the U.S.-led global order and offered alternative visions of a global integration often stripped of the right-based discourse that underlay the idea of a global civil society. More broadly, we discuss contemporary attitudes toward foreign affairs and the recent retrenchment away from the integrated, borderless world envisioned in the 1990s, typified by surprisingly transnational movements that nonetheless champion nationalist policies and identities. The ultimate goal is to consider the stability of the U.S. led international order created in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the current state of the national security state that enforced this order, and the question of who and what approaches will guide U.S. policy in the future based on these long and short-term trends. Finally, we will conclude with a discussion on how understand the nature of the present international system, the United States' place in it, and the central role citizens play in shaping the direction of their nation's foreign policy.

April 18 – Fareed Zakaria, *The Post-American World 2.0* (Norton, 2012 ), 100-141

April 20 – Bruce Ackerman, "Obama's Unconstitutional War," *Foreign Policy*, 24 March 2011

Joshua Keating, "Actually, U.S. presidents have been going to war without Congress since the beginning." *Foreign Policy*, 9 May 2013

Samuel Charap and Jeremy Shapiro, "How to Avoid a New Cold War," *The Brookings Institution*, 25 September 2014

Mara Mordecai and Moira Fagan, "Americans' views of key foreign policy goals depend on their attitudes toward international cooperation," *Pew Research Center*, 23 April 2021

David Allen, "A Foreign Policy for the American People?" in *Every Citizen a Statesman* (2023)

*Final Paper – Due Wednesday, April 25 at Noon*

# GE Theme course submission worksheet: Citizenship for a Just & Diverse World

## Overview

---

Courses in the GE Themes aim to provide students with opportunities to explore big picture ideas and problems within the specific practice and expertise of a discipline or department. Although many Theme courses serve within disciplinary majors or minors, by requesting inclusion in the General Education, programs are committing to the incorporation of the goals of the focal theme and the success and participation of students from outside of their program.

Each category of the GE has specific learning goals and Expected Learning Outcomes (ELOs) that connect to the big picture goals of the program. ELOs describe the knowledge or skills students should have by the end of the course. Courses in the GE Themes must meet the ELOs common for **all** GE Themes and those specific to the Theme, in addition to any ELOs the instructor has developed specific to that course. All courses in the GE must indicate that they are part of the GE and include the Goals and ELOs of their GE category on their syllabus.

The prompts in this form elicit information about how this course meets the expectations of the GE Themes. The form will be reviewed by a group of content experts (the Theme Advisory) and by a group of curriculum experts (the Theme Panel), with the latter having responsibility for the ELOs and Goals common to all themes (those things that make a course appropriate for the GE Themes) and the former having responsibility for the ELOs and Goals specific to the topic of **this** Theme.

Briefly describe how this course connects to or exemplifies the concept of this Theme (Citizenship)

---

In a sentence or two, explain how this class “fits’ within the focal Theme. This will help reviewers understand the intended frame of reference for the course-specific activities described below.

*(enter text here)*

The course will introduce students to how citizens of the United States have directly informed foreign policy, as well as how the concept of global citizenship in a diverse world has evolved as new technologies created more fluid borders and the country became more deeply involved in international affairs. It demonstrates that who shapes foreign policy and to what ends has changed dramatically over the last century, as globalization has opened new avenues for interpersonal connection while empowering citizens to articulate new, transnational understandings of national security, human rights, and social justice. At the same time, international migrations and ideologies have reshaped domestic debates. The result has been a transformation and to some extent democratization of the foreign policymaking process, which includes greater roles for legislators, non-state actors, businesses, activists, refugees, and supranational institutions. Ultimately the goal is to encourage students to reflect on how they as citizens can shape foreign policy – through public service, social organizing, or the leaders they elect – while illustrating how the international system has transformed in the last century partly in response to popular demands and the actions of motivated organizers.



## Connect this course to the Goals and ELOs shared by *all* Themes

---

Below are the Goals and ELOs common to all Themes. In the accompanying table, for each ELO, describe the activities (discussions, readings, lectures, assignments) that provide opportunities for students to achieve those outcomes. The answer should be concise and use language accessible to colleagues outside of the submitting department or discipline. The specifics of the activities matter—listing “readings” without a reference to the topic of those readings will not allow the reviewers to understand how the ELO will be met. However, the panel evaluating the fit of the course to the Theme will review this form in conjunction with the syllabus, so if readings, lecture/discussion topics, or other specifics are provided on the syllabus, it is not necessary to reiterate them within this form. The ELOs are expected to vary in their “coverage” in terms of number of activities or emphasis within the course. Examples from successful courses are shared on the next page.

**Goal 1:** Successful students will analyze an important topic or idea at a more advanced and in-depth level than the foundations. In this context, “advanced” refers to courses that are e.g., synthetic, rely on research or cutting-edge findings, or deeply engage with the subject matter, among other possibilities.

**Goal 2:** Successful students will integrate approaches to the theme by making connections to out-of-classroom experiences with academic knowledge or across disciplines and/or to work they have done in previous classes and that they anticipate doing in future.

	Course activities and assignments to meet these ELOs
<b>ELO 1.1</b> Engage in critical and logical thinking.	<p>The course will build skills around critical and logical thinking about foreign affairs and its components through: weekly readings that feature debates within academic scholarship and primary sources from the era, which feature contrasting perspectives that students will need to synthesize, compare, and evaluate in class discussion. In both exams and papers, student will then produce their own synthetic explanations of events and their impact, choosing between and going beyond scholarly interpretations to advance their own conclusions supported by concrete evidence.</p> <p>These assignments will culminate in an independent research paper on a policy/foreign affairs topic in which students identify appropriate archives, gather pertinent evidence independently, and evaluate a specific foreign policy pursued the United States in relation to its obligations either to its own citizens or a global civil society.</p>
<b>ELO 1.2</b> Engage in an advanced, in-depth, scholarly exploration of the topic or ideas within this theme.	<p>Students will read cutting-edge scholarship on US foreign affairs that highlights the historiographical debates that address major issue of foreign affairs, the creation of a global civil society, and the role both domestic and global citizens have played in their construction. Early assignments asking students to identify with specific perspectives and defend their points using general evidence and primary sources will provide a scaffolding for them to move toward their own individual research projects.</p> <p>For example, one short paper option asks students to use a prominent book on social organizing around human rights to assess the ways that conceptions of global citizenship changed by occupying the role of a policy advisor in the 1970s, and using</p>

	<p>evidence of historical events and the changing attitudes of the country to argue for a rights-based foreign policy.</p> <p>For the final paper, students will be expected to go a step further by finding appropriate literature, assess the state of the field on that topic, then prepare their own scholarly intervention using primary source material that they will identify and research using a variety of online databases. The final product will be a 10-15 page research paper. This will compel students to face the complex, sometimes contradictory relationships between diplomacy and democracy as they assess the effectiveness of specific policies and historical moments that also allow them to indulge personal interests.</p> <p>Past examples of these projects have included topics such as the Kellogg-Briand Pact to outlaw war and its effects on norms of global warfare, the relationship between the 1950s anti-communist Red Scare and the Lavender Scare that saw LGBTQ+ individuals removed from government positions, the influence of the non-proliferation movement on U.S. nuclear arms policy, and the U.S. (non)-response to the Rwandan genocide, all of which highlighted students using primary source research to explore topics such as international law, the influence of populist organizing on state policy, and the expectations surrounding foreign intervention to preserve human rights.</p>
<p><b>ELO 2.1</b> Identify, describe, and synthesize approaches or experiences.</p>	<p>Students will be presented with a variety of conflicting perspectives and medias, which they will analyze on their own merits, synthesize, and compare in order to arrive at their own, individual conclusions about the nature of the international system, the obligation of national and global citizens to the wider world, and the role of the United States in supporting these efforts.</p> <p>Secondary sources will represent competing positions within broad scholarly debates while primary sources highlight the individual experiences and ambitions of a variety of actors. These primary sources highlight a variety of perspectives including U.S. policymakers and politicians, foreign diplomats, domestic peace activists, religious leaders, Soviet apparatchiks, and anti-imperial revolutionaries from the Middle East, Asia, and Latin America.</p> <p>We will explore these ideas during discussions in which students will be expected to stake out positions by synthesizing and comparing these contrasting perspectives, while staking out their own positions in these debates. Broad examples include exploring and debating what tasks such as security that nations must perform for their citizens and how these either contribute to or conflict with broader obligations to the international community.</p> <p>Exams will ask students to weigh in on specific debates, utilizing both this secondary reading and primary sources to support their points. Specific questions ask students, for instance, to fairly synthesize and</p>

	<p>assess two readings of U.S. foreign policy – William Borah’s isolationist-leaning unilateralism and Wilson’s liberal view of collective security – and explain why one triumphed either in the short term or the long term. Later questions ask students to assess the broad evolution of U.S. foreign policy and provide their own recommendations on future directions using their understandings of specific ideologies and the results of historical precedents to support their arguments.</p>
<p><b>ELO 2.2</b> Demonstrate a developing sense of self as a learner through reflection, self-assessment, and creative work, building on prior experiences to respond to new and challenging contexts.</p>	<p>Students will develop their sense of self as a learner in two specific ways. First, they will use the exploration of past foreign affairs to reflect on contemporary issues and challenges. Class themes and assignments will encourage students to think critically about the policy assumptions and ideologies that underlay U.S. international policy and American citizen’s engagement with the wider world. The goal is to encourage students to use the framework of historical study to derive their own worldviews regarding the nature of the international system and what it means to be a global citizen in the contemporary world. This will be the subject of the mandatory final essay question on the take-home exam, in which students are asked to describe the nature of the international system over the last 50 years and the proper role of the United States in light of changing conceptions of border fluidity, human rights, and national security.</p> <p>Second, the course is designed to strengthen student’s individual research and analytical skills. The research paper offers a structured opportunity to practice the research process of identifying a source base, wading through conflict and irrelevant sources, identifying trends across documents and media, developing and revising an argument (thesis), using this thesis to guide research, and ultimately producing an argument that makes sense of this information to reach a conclusion about a topic of meaning to them. This after all is a central task for the informed citizen who must increasingly be a critical consumer of information. Specific checkpoints will exist throughout including updates on research progress, mandatory individual consultation with the professor, and a sentence outline that is deigned to help students form their paper around specific arguments rather than just regurgitation of facts. The goal will be to compel students to engage with the process of knowledge production from the ground up, while reflecting on how best to asses sources, organize data, and organize their conclusions into convincing argument. A final reflection will ask them to assess their research process, asking how they made judgements between conflicting sources and how they translated broad research into cohesive claims. The goal is to teach them how to be critical consumers of information and how to incorporate new knowledge into existing frameworks in order to better prepare them for their role as informed citizens.</p>

Example responses for proposals within "Citizenship" (from Sociology 3200, Comm 2850, French 2803):

<p><b>ELO 1.1</b> Engage in critical and logical thinking.</p>	<p>This course will build skills needed to engage in critical and logical thinking about immigration and immigration related policy through:          Weekly reading response papers which require the students to synthesize and critically evaluate cutting-edge scholarship on immigration;          Engagement in class-based discussion and debates on immigration-related topics using evidence-based logical reasoning to evaluate policy positions;          Completion of an assignment which build skills in analyzing empirical data on immigration (Assignment #1)</p>
	<p>Completion 3 assignments which build skills in connecting individual experiences with broader population-based patterns (Assignments #1, #2, #3)          Completion of 3 quizzes in which students demonstrate comprehension of the course readings and materials.</p>
<p><b>ELO 2.1</b> Identify, describe, and synthesize approaches or experiences.</p>	<p>Students engage in advanced exploration of each module topic through a combination of lectures, readings, and discussions.</p> <p><u>Lecture</u>          Course materials come from a variety of sources to help students engage in the relationship between media and citizenship at an advanced level. Each of the 12 modules has 3-4 lectures that contain information from both peer-reviewed and popular sources. Additionally, each module has at least one guest lecture from an expert in that topic to increase students' access to people with expertise in a variety of areas.</p> <p><u>Reading</u>          The textbook for this course provides background information on each topic and corresponds to the lectures. Students also take some control over their own learning by choosing at least one peer-reviewed article and at least one newspaper article from outside the class materials to read and include in their weekly discussion posts.</p> <p><u>Discussions</u>          Students do weekly discussions and are given flexibility in their topic choices in order to allow them to take some control over their education. They are also asked to provide information from sources they've found outside the lecture materials. In this way, they are able to explore areas of particular interest to them and practice the skills they will need to gather information about current events, analyze this information, and communicate it with others.</p> <p>Activity Example: Civility impacts citizenship behaviors in many ways. Students are asked to choose a TED talk from a provided list (or choose another speech of their interest) and summarize and evaluate what it says about the relationship between civility and citizenship. Examples of Ted Talks on the list include Steven Petrow on the difference between being polite and being civil, Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's talk on how a single story can perpetuate stereotypes, and Claire Wardle's talk on how diversity can enhance citizenship.</p>

<p><b>ELO 2.2</b> Demonstrate a developing sense of self as a learner through reflection, self-assessment, and creative work, building on prior experiences to respond to new and challenging contexts.</p>	<p>Students will conduct research on a specific event or site in Paris not already discussed in depth in class. Students will submit a 300-word abstract of their topic and a bibliography of at least five reputable academic and mainstream sources. At the end of the semester they will submit a 5-page research paper and present their findings in a 10-minute oral and visual presentation in a small-group setting in Zoom.</p> <p>Some examples of events and sites:  <i>The Paris Commune, an 1871 socialist uprising violently squelched by conservative forces</i></p>
	<p><i>Jazz-Age Montmartre, where a small community of African-Americans—including actress and singer Josephine Baker, who was just inducted into the French Pantheon—settled and worked after World War I.</i>  <i>The Vélodrome d’hiver Roundup, 16-17 July 1942, when 13,000 Jews were rounded up by Paris police before being sent to concentration camps</i>  <i>The Marais, a vibrant Paris neighborhood inhabited over the centuries by aristocrats, then Jews, then the LGBTQ+ community, among other groups.</i></p>

Goals and ELOs unique to Citizenship for a Just & Diverse World

---

Below are the Goals and ELOs specific to this Theme. As above, in the accompanying Table, for each ELO, describe the activities (discussions, readings, lectures, assignments) that provide opportunities for students to achieve those outcomes. The answer should be concise and use language accessible to colleagues outside of the submitting department or discipline. The ELOs are expected to vary in their “coverage” in terms of number of activities or emphasis within the course. Examples from successful courses are shared on the next page.

**GOAL 3:** Successful students will explore and analyze a range of perspectives on local, national, or global citizenship, and apply the knowledge, skills, and dispositions that constitute citizenship.

**GOAL 4:** Successful students will examine notions of justice amidst difference and analyze and critique how these interact with historically and socially constructed ideas of citizenship and membership within societies, both within the US and/or around the world.

	Course activities and assignments to meet these ELOs
<p><b>ELO 3.1</b> Describe and analyze a range of perspectives on what constitutes citizenship <u>and</u> how it differs across political, cultural, national, global, and/or historical communities.</p>	<p>These issues are at the heart of the class. As described elsewhere, students will be exposed to a variety of actors whose individual views on the United States and its foreign affairs will be highlighted by extensive primary source reading. These individual perspectives will come from presidents, bureaucrats, senators, peace activists, civil rights activists, cultural critics, revolutionaries, prominent business leaders, NGOs, and artists. Students will be encouraged to reflect how these different actors and sectors within international civil society understood international concepts of citizenship and how they engaged with the United States and broad transnational issues. At the same time, we will consider how changes in things like technology, ideology, international law, and other factors have changed the status quo and empowered new voices in the past 100 years that expanded foreign affairs from state-based diplomacy to a more nuanced discussion of power, ideology, economics, and cultural exchange.</p>

	<p>Specific topics will look at, for instance, how Global South nationalists sought to redeploy Wilsonian rhetoric on self-determination and Euro-American concepts of modernization to challenge empire after World War II, how the ideological Cold War and international decolonization empowered the domestic civil rights movement, the extent to which the threat of nuclear warfare produced a transnational peace movement, how improved communication technology helped coordinate human rights activism in the 1970s, and how contemporary artists interpret the use of drones in the US. War in Afghanistan.</p> <p>These themes also directly inform the short paper options, in which students will pick a specific topic to analyze competing perspectives and make an argument about how their interaction ultimately produced specific results, for example how Wilsonianism challenged ideas of a “little America” or how the creation of the national security state after World War II transformed the already contested concepts of good American citizenship related to ethnic identity, civil rights, gender roles, and/or military service.</p>
<p><b>ELO 3.2</b> Identify, reflect on, and apply the knowledge, skills and dispositions required for intercultural competence as a global citizen.</p>	<p>Students will analyze and reflect on American institutions, identities, and values in a global perspective through a study of the interactions between the U.S. and a wide array of other nations and across regions, including, international organizations and governments, transnational actors, local communities, and ordinary people. Specifically, students will address how the United States is perceived in the world based on its historic actions and how the concept of what the United States and its people owe the world has changed over time to reflect a more globalized understanding of the nation, its citizenry, and their commitments to a wider global community.</p> <p>These topics are touched upon in two of the main short paper options, asking students to consider how Wilsonianism changed American conceptions of an international community as well as the discussion of human rights that expanded ideas of domestic citizenship to a global scale. Indeed, the class discusses the idea of a global civil society and the way that individuals can participate through local democratic action, multinational corporations, government service, and non-governmental organizations.</p> <p>The course culminates with a concluding essay that ask students to articulate their own personal conception of the international system, the relationship between global citizens, and the obligations of the United States to the</p>

	world.
<p><b>ELO 4.1</b> Examine, critique, and evaluate various expressions and implications of diversity, equity, inclusion, and explore a variety of lived experiences.</p>	<p>Students will study multicultural aspects of the United States across geographical regions and in international dimensions, socioeconomic status, or racial, ethnic, and religious background to understand conflicting ideas of diversity, equity and inclusion as both policy and lived experience. In particular, the course focuses on definitions of citizenship in a heterogenous country, and how the U.S. ideological engagement with the world has both constricted but more often expanded ideas of citizenship to reflect more universal, cosmopolitan ideas of U.S. identity. Moreover, the course emphasizes the ways that the United States has interacted with the world and how its dominant culture has both influenced and been influenced by its contact with differing perspectives, especially in terms of the influence of anti-Western ideas articulated in the global South.</p> <p>The result is a course that while focused on the United States, encourages students to think critically about how ideologies form within the country at the intersection of diverse transnational influences and how the nation’s actions have been perceived in ways that go beyond the intentions of the policymakers and citizenry that initially formed it.</p> <p>The first text, Christopher Nichol’s Promise and Peril, considers traditions of American isolationism that formed at the intersection of a great diversity of perspectives that included American republicanism, protestant internationalism, the women’s peace movement, and Pan-African conceptions of racial justice, all of which defined global citizenship in different ways while arguing for constrained forms of U.S. engagement with the world.</p> <p>An example of students applying their own analyses to these processes is present on the midterm, where one essay questions asks students to explain how the ideological nature of the Cold War and the articulation of a national anti-communism simultaneously bolstered domestic civil rights movements while creating federal restrictions on LGBTQ+ service. Students often note that while these distinctions had much to do with changing global and social norms, the example of the former became an inspiration for LGBTQ+ activists to respond to their experience of official and social ostracism, identifying ways in which the lived experiences of individuals informed their challenge government policies.</p>

<p><b>ELO 4.2</b> Analyze and critique the intersection of concepts of justice, difference, citizenship, and how these interact with cultural traditions, structures of power and/or advocacy for social change.</p>	<p>Students analyze and evaluate the history, current political and social status, cultural identity, and activism of U.S. diplomats and citizens in shaping the nation’s engagement to and with the world. Specifically, they look at how the creation of a permanent national security state since World War II in ways diluted the power of citizens, while the variety and identity of citizens groups claiming roles in the foreign policy process have grown dramatically. We will explore this dichotomy and what the debate about policymaking and who makes it has meant for questions of U.S. democracy, citizenship, and U.S. grand strategies. Specific examples include the proliferation of transnational organizations in the interwar period aimed largely at creating cultural exchange and preventing war, as well as the growth of mass protests after the 1960s that targeted war, colonialism, apartheid, and – most broadly – nuclear weapons. It will also consider how both changing concepts of a global civil society and the diversification of the U.S. policymaking process has transformed U.S. approaches to key parts of the globe such as Latin American and Africa, moving from ideas of empire and racial superiority toward contrasting approaches based both on hegemony and on such ideas as human rights and global interdependence.</p> <p>An extended example of both these elements comes in the text from Barbara Keys, <i>Reclaiming American Virtue</i>. It considers how politicians on both left and right articulated distinct concepts of human rights and international justice based on their distinct ideological traditions and concepts of international power relations, creating often antagonistic but occasionally overlapping movements that successfully argued for the incorporation of human rights issues into U.S. policy.</p> <p>One short paper option asks students to engage with these specific ideas, justifying the adoption of such policies based on power relations in the international system and the influence of domestic advocates.</p>
--	--

Example responses for proposals within “Citizenship” (Hist/Relig. Studies 3680, Music 3364; Soc 3200):

<p><b>ELO 3.1</b> Describe and analyze a range of perspectives on what constitutes citizenship <u>and</u> how it differs across political, cultural,</p>	<p><i>Citizenship could not be more central to a topic such as immigration/migration. As such, the course content, goals, and expected learning outcomes are all, almost by definition, engaged with a range of perspectives on local, national, and global citizenship.</i></p>
--	--



<p><i>national, global, and/or historical communities.</i></p>	<p><i>Throughout the class students will be required to engage with questions about what constitutes citizenship and how it differs across contexts.</i></p> <p><i>The course content addresses citizenship questions at the global (see weeks #3 and #15 on refugees and open border debates), national (see weeks #5, 7-#14 on the U.S. case), and the local level (see week #6 on Columbus). Specific activities addressing different perspectives on citizenship include Assignment #1, where students produce a demographic profile of a U.S.-based immigrant group, including a profile of their citizenship statuses using U.S.-based regulatory definitions. In addition, Assignment #3, which has students connect their family origins to broader population-level immigration patterns, necessitates a discussion of citizenship. Finally, the critical reading responses have the students engage the literature on different perspectives of citizenship and reflect on what constitutes citizenship and how it varies across communities.</i></p>
<p><b>ELO 3.2</b> <i>Identify, reflect on, and apply the knowledge, skills and dispositions required for intercultural competence as a global citizen.</i></p>	<p><i>This course supports the cultivation of "intercultural competence as a global citizen" through rigorous and sustained study of multiple forms of musical-political agency worldwide, from the grass-roots to the state-sponsored. Students identify varied cultural expressions of "musical citizenship" each week, through their reading and listening assignments, and reflect on them via online and in-class discussion. It is common for us to ask probing and programmatic questions about the musical-political subjects and cultures we study. What are the possibilities and constraints of this particular version of musical citizenship? What might we carry forward in our own lives and labors as musical citizens Further, students are encouraged to apply their emergent intercultural competencies as global, musical citizens in their midterm report and final project, in which weekly course topics inform student-led research and creative projects.</i></p>
<p><b>ELO 4.1</b> <i>Examine, critique, and evaluate various expressions and implications of diversity, equity, inclusion, and explore a variety of lived experiences.</i></p>	<p><i>Through the historical and contemporary case studies students examine in HIST/RS 3680, they have numerous opportunities to examine, critique, and evaluate various expressions and implications of diversity, equity, and inclusion, as well as a variety of lived experiences. The cases highlight the challenges of living in religiously diverse societies, examining a range of issues and their implications. They also consider the intersections of religious difference with other categories of difference, including race and gender. For example, during the unit on US religious freedom, students consider how incarcerated Black Americans and Native Americans have experienced questions of freedom and equality in dramatically different ways than white Protestants. In a weekly reflection post, they address this question directly. In the unit on marriage and sexuality, they consider different ways that different social groups have experienced the regulation of marriage in Israel and Malaysia in ways that do not correspond simplistically to gender (e.g. different women's groups with very different perspectives on the issues).</i></p> <p><i>In their weekly reflection posts and other written assignments, students are invited to analyze the implications of different regulatory models for questions of diversity, equity, and inclusion. They do so not in a simplistic sense of assessing which model is</i></p>

	<p><i>"right" or "best" but in considering how different possible outcomes might shape the concrete lived experience of different social groups in different ways. The goal is not to determine which way of doing things is best, but to understand why different societies manage these questions in different ways and how their various expressions might lead to different outcomes in terms of diversity and inclusion. They also consider how the different social and demographic conditions of different societies shape their approaches (e.g. a historic Catholic majority in France committed to laicite confronting a growing Muslim minority, or how pluralism *within* Israeli Judaism led to a fragile and contested status quo arrangement). Again, these goals are met most directly through weekly reflection posts and students' final projects, including one prompt that invites students to consider Israel's status quo arrangement from the perspective of different social groups, including liberal feminists, Orthodox and Reform religious leaders, LGBTQ communities, interfaith couples, and others.</i></p>
<p><b>ELO 4.2</b> <i>Analyze and critique the intersection of concepts of justice, difference, citizenship, and how these interact with cultural traditions, structures of power and/or advocacy for social change.</i></p>	<p><i>As students analyze specific case studies in HIST/RS 3680, they assess law's role in and capacity for enacting justice, managing difference, and constructing citizenship. This goal is met through lectures, course readings, discussion, and written assignments. For example, the unit on indigenous sovereignty and sacred space invites students to consider why liberal systems of law have rarely accommodated indigenous land claims and what this says about indigenous citizenship and justice. They also study examples of indigenous activism and resistance around these issues. At the conclusion of the unit, the neighborhood exploration assignment specifically asks students to take note of whether and how indigenous land claims are marked or acknowledged in the spaces they explore and what they learn from this about citizenship, difference, belonging, and power. In the unit on legal pluralism, marriage, and the law, students study the personal law systems in Israel and Malaysia. They consider the structures of power that privilege certain kinds of communities and identities and also encounter groups advocating for social change. In their final projects, students apply the insights they've gained to particular case studies. As they analyze their selected case studies, they are required to discuss how the cases reveal the different ways justice, difference, and citizenship intersect and how they are shaped by cultural traditions and structures of power in particular social contexts. They present their conclusions in an oral group presentation and in an individually written final paper. Finally, in their end of semester letter to professor, they reflect on how they issues might shape their own advocacy for social change in the future.</i></p>