TIME: T, 12:10 PM-2:00 PM
PLACE: 501A, INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS BUILDING

Instructor: Steffen Rimner
Email: sr2387@columbia.edu

Office Hours: T, 3:00 PM – 5:00 PM
Office location: International Affairs Building, 906 (Weatherhead East Asian Institute)

This course charts the history of U.S.-Asian relations from the U.S. entrance into Asia as a colonial power to the legacy of the Second World War. It engages with comparisons and connections across a variety of U.S.-Asian relationships in their cultural, economic, social and political aspects. How did transnational and international forces between U.S. and Asian societies and governments shape key dynamics of the global twentieth century?

With particular attention to the social basis of transnational and international relations, we will examine how and why U.S. and Asian migrants, lobbyists, NGOs and other private actors developed a sustained impact on global politics. In terms of ideology, this period saw a stronger, if intermittent, support for U.S. overseas expansion than ever before (in the Philippines, Japan, China and elsewhere). In economic respect, U.S. business capital followed and penetrated increasingly global, Asian markets. In diplomacy, Washington became morally and strategically entangled with new enemies, competitors and partners in Asia and elsewhere. In none of these developments did the U.S. act alone or necessarily act first. In all of them, the global dimension of U.S.-Asian interactions carried lessons and warnings for the future.

On any of these issues, there were always at least two possible perspectives. Our discussions and analyses will juxtapose the perspectives, interests, actions and arguments of U.S. and Asian actors to understand social, political and cultural counterparts. The course will be sensitive to specific global configurations that connected U.S.-Asian relationships to analogous developments in the Pacific and Europe.

Each class will complement secondary source readings with original archival sources. Student teams of two will briefly present a source, drawn from either an Asian or an American archive. In office hours one week before the respective class, the team will meet with me and choose one (out of two) sources that I will make available to them.
Course Requirements

Participation & Reading Questions       20%
Three Response Papers (1,000 words each)     30%
Final Paper (5,000 words)         50%

Assignments & Expectations

Class attendance is mandatory. Absences will be excused in medical or other emergencies. Your participation consists of two activities:

a) your oral contributions to our discussion in class
b) one reading question that formulates an unsolved problem or dilemma from the readings and offers an answer to this problem.

The reading question has to be posted on the course website (“dropbox”) within 24 hrs before the beginning of the respective class (meaning by each Monday at 12:10 p.m.). This will ensure that we all are intellectually prepared for class.

Each of the four response papers (1,000 words) draws on the readings of one week of your choice and the class discussion that followed. It has to be e-mailed to me within 48 hrs after the end of the respective class (meaning by the Thursday of your choice at 2:00 p.m.). The three best papers will count toward the final grade.

The final paper (5,000 words) should discuss a question that draws on the readings but supersedes them analytically. I offer to discuss your final paper project with me during office hours. In this meeting, I will be happy to assist you with additional primary sources that will help you to tackle your analytic question of choice. DUE on December 19, 2015 at midnight (EST).

Plagiarism

Academic honesty is one of the virtues to be learned at university; it is also essential to the learning experience itself and therefore in your own interest. If an assignment adopts quotations, lines of argument or ideas from an un-credited source, the student will fail the assignment and may be reported to the Dean’s Office. Students should abide by the Faculty Statement on Academic Integrity:
http://www.college.columbia.edu/faculty/resourcesforinstructors/academicintegrity/statement

For further orientation, consult the Columbia University Undergraduate Guide to Academic Integrity at http://www.college.columbia.edu/academics/academicintegrity.
THE MENU

(1) Sept. 8: Introduction: Whose Interdependence? The Asia Pacific in Global History

(2) Sept. 15: An Imperial World: Situating the 1890s

Smith, *America’s Mission: The United States and the Worldwide Struggle for Democracy*, ch. 2. [e]
Hunt; Levine, *Arc of Empire: America’s Wars in Asia from the Philippines to Vietnam*, ch. 1. [e]
Davis, “Spectacles of South Asia at the American Circus, 1890-1940”

(3) Sept. 22: Thinking within the 1890s

Frieden, “The Economics of Intervention: American Overseas Investments and Relations with Underdeveloped Areas, 1890-1950”

(4) Sept. 29: A Junior Empire: The U.S. in Asia at the Turn of the 20th Century

McCormick, *China Market: America’s quest for informal empire, 1893-1901*, excerpts

(5) Oct. 6: Empire’s Experiments: Religion, Violence, Superiority

Gedacht. “‘Mohammedan Religion Made It Necessary to Fire’: Massacres on the American Imperial Frontier from South Dakota to the Southern Philippines,” in: McCoy; Scarano (eds.) *Colonial Crucible: Empire in the Making of the American State*, pp. 397-409. [e]
McCoy, *Policing America’s Empire*, exc. [e]
Hutchinson, “Occidentalism and critique of Meiji: the West in the returnee stories of Nagai Kafū

Iriye, ch. 1.
Smith, ch. 3. [e]

(7) Oct. 20: Economic Foundations of the American Century

Smith, ch. 5.
Israel, “Alice in Wonderland: Through the China Looking Glass and What America found There”, in: Progressivism and the Open Door: America and China, 1905-1921, pp. 3-30.

(8) Oct. 27: Cultural Foundations of the American Century

Emily S. Rosenberg. “Consuming the American Century”, in: Bacevich, pp. 38-58. [e]
Iriye, exc. [e]

**Please note: Columbia does not hold classes on Nov. 3 (Election Day / University Holiday)**

(9) Nov. 10: Choosing Allies?

Iriye, exc. [e]
Shimazu, Japan, Race and Equality: the racial equality proposal of 1919, pp. 1-37, 89-116, 137-163. [e]

(10) Nov. 17: Choosing Enemies?

Martin, Japan and Germany in the Modern World, ch. 8.
Conrad, The Quest for the Lost Nation: Writing History in Germany and Japan in the American
Century, ch. 3 [e]


Ngai, chs. 5-6. [e]
Yamamoto et al. Race, Rights, and Reparation: Law and the Japanese American Internment
(Gaithersburg: Aspen Law and Business, 2013), exc.

(12) Dec. 1: America’s Iron Curtain

Tucker, The China Threat: Memories, Myths, and Realities in the 1950s, chs. 4, 10
Armstrong, Tyranny of the Weak: North Korea and the World, 1950-1992, ch. 4 [e]

(13) Dec. 8: The U.S. and Postwar Societies, 1: Japan and India Compared

Totani, Justice in Asia and the Pacific Region, 1945-1952, chs. 4 (In the Name of Asian Co-Prosperity), 5 (Kalogon and Singapore), Conclusion. [e].
Hess, “Accommodation amid Discord: The United States, India, and the Third World”
Fravel, “Territorial and Maritime Boundary Disputes in Asia,” in: Saadia M. Pekkannen; John Ravenhill; Rosemary Foot, ed., Oxford Handbook of the International Relations of Asia, pp. 524-546. [e]

KEY READINGS:

[All available at Book Culture, 536 W 112th St, Phone: 212-865-1588 and as Library Reserves at the C.V. Starr East Asian Library, Kent Hall]
PAPER EXPECTATIONS

Adapted, with minor re- phrasings, from the Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning, Harvard University (in cooperation of Lewis Hyde, Sue Lonoff and Richard Marius.) © 2002-2006 by the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

The Unsatisfactory Paper

The D or F paper either has no argument or else it has one that is strikingly vague, broad, or uninteresting. There is little indication that the student understands the material being presented. The sentences/paragraphs do not hold together; ideas do not develop from one sentence/paragraph to the next. This paper usually repeats the same thoughts again and again, perhaps in slightly different language but often in the same words. The D or F paper is filled with mechanical faults, errors in grammar, and errors in spelling.

The C Paper

The C paper has an argument, but it is vague and broad, or else it is unoriginal or obvious. It does not advance an argument that anyone might care to debate. “Henry James wrote some interesting novels.” “Modern cities are interesting places.”

The argument in the C paper often hangs on some personal opinion. Such an expression of personal taste may be noteworthy, but writers gain authority not merely by expressing their tastes but by justifying them. Personal opinion is often the engine that drives an argument, but opinion by itself is never sufficient. It must be defended and substantiated in a chain of logic.

The C paper rarely uses evidence for its arguments; sometimes it does not use evidence at all. Even if it has a clear and interesting argument, a paper with insufficient supporting evidence is a C paper.

The C paper often has mechanical faults, errors in grammar and spelling, but please note: a paper without such flaws may still be a C paper.

The B Paper

It is clearly intelligible in a B paper what exactly the student wants to state. The B paper is well organized, it presents a worthwhile and interesting idea. The idea is supported by sound evidence (such as references to the text discussed) and presented in a neat and orderly fashion. Some of the sentences may not be elegant, but they are clear and their logic flows naturally. The sentences/paragraphs are organized around the central argument. The reader does not have to read a sentence/paragraph two or three times to grasp the meaning of what the student is trying to convey.
The B paper is mechanically correct: the spelling is good, the punctuation is accurate. Above all, the paper makes sense throughout. It has a thesis/argument that is limited and at the same time original. It does not contain unexpected digressions, and it ends by keeping the promise of the original argument.

The A Paper

The A Paper has all the good qualities of the B paper, but in addition it is well-crafted, offers a new perspective and delivers its arguments in an illuminating way. Everything in it fits the argument exactly. Reading the paper, we can sense a mind at work. We are convinced that the student cares for his/her ideas, about the relevance of the argument and about the language chosen to convey them. The sure mark of an A paper is that its fascination stimulates the instructor to tell someone else about it.