Course Description
We survey the central debate in Russian culture since 1700, between the Slavophiles and Westernizers, through political philosophy, literary criticism, literature, history, religion, philosophy, and film. With a focus on nineteenth-century responses by the intelligentsia to the Peter the Great’s Europeanization of Russia, we trace the issues and myths around which elites sought to build a national identity around continuity with a contested past, beginning with Peter the Great up through Putin. In addition to works by Catherine the Great, Radishchev, Karamzin, Chaadaev, Pushkin, Gogol, Dostoevsky, Belinsky, Dobroliubov, Solzhenitsyn, and Sakharov, we read perhaps the greatest nineteenth-century Russian memoir, Alexander Herzen’s My Past and Thought. We will examine the special position of the elite and intelligentsia in Russian culture and politics, with particular attention to the institutional role of publications and journals, through the framework of debates in political theory about civil society. In particular, since the 1980s, ideas about the special role of elites and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) took on a new role in Russia’s political transitions towards democracy and its relationship with the United States. However, in a new development, Putin and his supporters are using the nineteenth-century debates among Slavophiles and Westernizers to justify the recent dramatic turn of Russian foreign policy to aggressively attempt to reunify a Russian empire. Russian history keeps change as this debate continues.

Goals
Students should learn the following information and skills:

1. Key figures, texts, and their arguments in a major Russian cultural debate over the past 3 centuries about Russia’s relationship to the West, and how it relates to current issues.

2. A historical understanding of debates on civil society and their relationship to current relations between the United States and Russia.

3. How to interpret primary texts from diverse disciplines (literature, film, history, political theory, religion, and philosophy).

4. How to identify key arguments in Russian culture and political theories of civil society and write a précis: a summary, analysis and critique of ideas in concise, articulate paragraphs.

Requirements
This course includes five short writing assignments, two papers and no final exam. All papers can be revised for a better grade and I will average the grades. Please submit papers to me by email; late papers may not be revised. Please number pages and include the word count, which for weekly responses are the precise number of words allowed. Papers can be creative or traditional expository prose, but whatever format and voice you choose, there must be an argument.
• 5 responses to study questions comparing positions of political theorists (in bold) with Russian authors and directors (400 words), due Monday, Aug. 30, Sept. 28, Nov. 2, Nov. 9, and Nov. 30, as email attachments. (25%)

• 5-page midterm paper (1,250 words) due Monday, Oct. 26th that is a comparison of 2 works in different genres or media (such as a letter and an essay, or a film and a memoir, respectively) and examines the relations between form and content. (30%)

• 8-page final paper (2,000 words) due Monday, Nov. 23rd, that examines an important debate between two or more authors or directors in the context of arguments in political theory about civil society. (35%)

• Class participation includes listening as well as speaking. (10%)

Required Texts at Bookstore and on Reserve under RUS494


• Other readings will be posted on Blackboard

Recommended Texts and Films in Library


  o Part I: Voyage, PR 6069 T6 V69X 2002
  o Part II: Shipwreck, PR 6069 T6 S55X 2002
  o Part III: Salvage, PR 6069 T6 S255 2002

**Websites**
Brockhaus and Efron, *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar’* (Moscow, 1890-1906)
http://www.ovguide.com/the-coast-of-utopia-9202a8c04000641f800000000005be283
http://creees.stanford.edu/about/utopia-coast.html

**Attendance**
Attendance is mandatory. I take formal attendance. Let me know ahead of time if you cannot come to class. After 4 unexcused absences, your grade for the course drops a half grade.

**Syllabus**

1R Aug 18 Introduction: important dates in Russian history and the problem of continuity in a discontinuous past; Peter the Great and Europeanization; historiography of a debate that begins in the nineteenth-century; the role of the intelligentsia; and Putinism

2T Aug 25 Slavophiles and Westernizers: A Nineteenth-Century Idea; Who are the Elite?

**R Aug 27** Historians and various narratives of the Russian noble elite: service, power of feelings, dialogue between ruler and advisors, mythmakers
- Raeff (1966), *Origins*, introduction (3-13) BB
- Wortman (1995), *Scenarios*, introduction (3-10) BB
- Whittaker (2003), *Monarchy*, introduction and Ch. 1 (3-32) BB

**M Aug 31** Critical response #1 to Ferguson due

**3T Sept 1** Peter I (1672, reigned 1682-1689-1725)
- Mikhail V. Lomonosov (1711-1765), “Panegyric to the Sovereign Emperor Peter the Great” (1755) (Raeff, No. 2, 31-48)
- Prince Mikhail M. Shcherbatov (1733-90), “Petition of the City of Moscow on Being Relegated to Oblivion” (1787; pub. 1860); “Approximate Evaluation of the Length of time Russia would have Required, in the Most Favorable Circumstances, to Attain by Her Own Efforts, without the Autocratic Rule of Peter the Great, Her Present State of Enlightenment and Glory” (pub. 1890), (Raeff, No. 3, 49-60)

**R Sept 3** Catherine II (1729, reigned 1762-96)
- Empress Catherine the Great (1729-96), *Nakaz* (1768), *Documents of Catherine the Great*, ed. by W. F. Reddaway (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1931), 215-35. BB
- Princess Catherine Dashkova (1743-1810), *Memoirs*, ch. 22-23 (198-216), ch. 26-28 (234-55) BB

- Nikolai Mikhailovich Karamzin (1766-1826)
  - “Notes of Old and New Russia in her Political and Civic Relations” (1811, 1861) (Riha, v. 2, 280-94) BB

**R Sept 10** Alexander I (1777, reigned 1801-25)
- Alexander Pushkin, “The Bronze Horseman” (1833) BB
• **G.F.W. Hegel**, from *Philosophy of Right* (1821) (Hodgkinson & Wiley, *Reader*, 76-95) BB

M Sept 14 Critical response 2 to Hegel due

5T Sept 15 Slavophile/Westerner debate today in Russian culture


6T Sept 22 Nikolai I (1796, reigned 1825-55)
• Alexander Sergeevich Pushkin (1799-1837), “Letter to Chaadaev” (Oct. 19, 1836) BB
• Ivan Kireevsky (1806-56), “European Culture: Its Relation to the Culture of Russia,” (1852) (Raeff, No. 9, 174-207)
• Alexei Stepanovich Khomiakov (1804-60), “On Humboldt” (1849; pub. 1861-73) (Raeff No. 10, 208-29)

R Sept 24 1840s
• Vissarion Grigor’evich Belinsky (1811-48)
  o “Thoughts and Notes on Russian Literature” (*Otechestvennye zapiski* 1846) (Matlaw 3-33)
  o “A Survey of Russian Literature in 1847: Part Two” (1847) (Matlaw 33-82)
  o “Letter to N. V. Gogol” (1847; pub. *Poliarnaia zvezda*, 1855) (Raeff No. 12, 252-61), or (Matlaw 83-94)
• Nikolai Vasil’evich Gogol (1809-52), *Selected Passages from Correspondence with Friends* (1847) BB
• Ivan Turgenev (1818-83), *A Huntsman’s Sketches* (1847-51, 1852, 1872-74). “Khor i Kalinich” (1847) BB

M Sept 28 Critical response #2 to Hegel due

7T Sept 29 Alexander II (1818, reigned 1855-81)
• Konstantin Sergeevich Aksakov (1817-60), “On the Internal State of Russia” (1855; pub. *Rus’*, 1881) (Raeff, No. 11, 230-51)
• Nikolai Aleksandrovich Dobroliubov (1836-61), “What is Oblomovitis?” (*Sovremennik*, 1859) (Matlaw, 133-75)

R Oct 1 Emancipation 1861/Assassination 1881
- Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky (1821-81), *Winter Notes on Summer Impressions* (1863)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8T Oct 6</td>
<td>Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky, “Pushkin: A Sketch” (<em>Dnevnik pisatel’ia</em>, 1880) (Raeff, No. 14, 288-300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Oct 8</td>
<td>Ivan Turgenev, <em>Smoke</em> (1867)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9T Oct 13</td>
<td>Fall Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Oct 15</td>
<td>Ivan Turgenev, <em>Smoke</em> (1867)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10T Oct 20</td>
<td>Alexander Ivanovich Herzen (1812-70) <em>My Life and Thought</em> (1852-68), Isaiah Berlin, intro (xix-xliv), (3-79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Oct 22</td>
<td><em>My Life and Thought</em> (1852-68) (79-166)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Oct 26</td>
<td>Paper #1 due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11T Oct 27</td>
<td><em>My Life and Thought</em> (1852-68) (166-253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Oct 29</td>
<td><em>My Life and Thought</em> (1852-68), (253-330)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Nov 2</td>
<td>Critical response #3 to Marx due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12T Nov 3</td>
<td><em>My Life and Thought</em> (1852-68) (330-444)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13T Nov 10</td>
<td><em>My Life and Thought</em> (1852-68) (445-524)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Nov 12</td>
<td><em>My Life and Thought</em> (1852-68) (529-586)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14T Nov 17</td>
<td><em>My Life and Thought</em> (1852-68) (591-676)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical response #4 to Gramsci due

1917 to Leonid Brezhnev (1906, ruled 1964-82)

Thanksgiving holiday

Critical response #5 to Walzer due

1991: Tom Stoppard (born Tomáš Straussler, 1937-) & Alexander Herzen
- *The Coast of Utopia* (2002), *Voyage, Shipwreck*
- *The Coast of Utopia* (2002), *Salvage*

Paper #2 due

Disability Accommodations: Qualified students with disabilities who will require disability accommodations in this class are encouraged to make their requests to me at the beginning of the semester either during office hours or by appointment.

Plagiarism
Plagiarism is bad scholarship with serious consequences. Do not do it. It is the equivalent of being caught doping in athletics: an attempt to gain a competitive advantage by illegal means. Here are some ASU guidelines that you will have covered or will cover in ASU101:
- [http://provost.asu.edu/academicintegrity](http://provost.asu.edu/academicintegrity)
- [http://clte.asu.edu/firstYrSeminar/core/integrity/](http://clte.asu.edu/firstYrSeminar/core/integrity/)
We will review proper ways to acknowledge ideas and quotations by others before you write your first paper. Papers for this course do NOT require research, just that you read the texts carefully, think about how they work and what that means, and articulate YOUR ideas clearly.

Guidelines for Papers
Papers must be double-spaced and responsive to all aspects of the assignment, including length (provide a word count on the first page), and prepared according to the
Modern Language Association or Chicago Manual of Style. Make sure you document every reference—*in quotation or paraphrase*—including page numbers whenever possible. Feel free to write in the first person. Most important, a paper is an argument: no argument, no paper. Support your thesis with evidence. Please read the handouts on writing.

**Paper grades**

An “A” paper demonstrates that the writer has not only mastered the concepts of the course, but also has applied them in an imaginative and incisive way. The paper shows a command of language that allows the writer to express worthwhile ideas or perceptions clearly, effectively, *in detail* and with virtually no mechanical errors. There is grace to the sentence structure, which is clear and varied throughout. The paper consistently includes adequate documentation. The “A” grade is reserved for exceptional papers; “A-” papers tend to be exceptional in part but marred by one or two problems.

A “B” paper demonstrates that the writer has understood the concepts of the course, and has applied them with some originality. The paper shows the writer can organize a coherent essay with few mechanical errors. The thesis statement is clear and is responsive to the assigned topic. It is supported with strong, logical argumentation and use of evidence. The paper for the most part includes adequate documentation.

A “C” paper demonstrates that the writer has understood most of the concepts of the course, but needs to pay more attention to detail in reading or writing. Thesis statement and topic sentences are weak, and documentation is erratic.

A “D” paper demonstrates that the writer has only a minimal understanding of the concepts of the course. Significant gaps in the writer's comprehension indicate the need for more study. Moreover, the writer's basic compositional skills are below satisfactory for university work. Documentation is unsatisfactory.

An “F” paper demonstrates that the writer has little, if any, understanding of the concepts of the course. Because of the writer's lack of skill or concern, the work includes gross errors as well as a conspicuous lack of content. Documentation is negligible. The paper may also fail to address parts of the assignment.

**A paper may combine different levels of work.** In that case, the grade will depend on the paper's overall demonstration of knowledge of the material and of writing skills.

**Emails**

You should regard all writing for this class as professional writing, including your emails to me. You can address me as “Dear Professor Hoogenboom,” and you should put your name at the end. My emails to you will have this format too.