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Syllabus

Course Description:
This course introduces recent scholarship on the scientific and medical practices in the transnational network of knowledge circulation between China and Europe during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It focuses on history of science and related issues of Chinese modernity, colonialism, and nation building through various knowledge domains, including natural history, geology, medicine, public health, psychiatry, ethnology, cartography, and applied linguistics. Situating scientific knowledge and practices across boundaries of geographical spaces, social groups, and disciplines, this course takes knowledge in these disciplines as a participant in history, and as engaged in dispositions to govern and manipulate societies, to form and remold the actions and ideas of historical actors.

Expectations & Assignments:
This course combines reading and discussion in scholarly books, as well as individual investigation of primary sources. One or more students, acting as the discussant, take responsibility for each session beginning in week 2. In the first part of the session, we devote our discussion to the critical assessment of the arguments, the organization, the writing in these books or articles, as well as situating the work within the relevant historiography, which can be based on what the work cited. The discussant(s) should introduce the assigned work by identifying its main argument, describing a few published reviews of the work, then raising questions or issues that seem most worth discussing. The second part of the session focuses on the analysis of the primary sources, in which we assess whether the author have used them appropriately. Furthermore, we discuss if there is a way to use these sources to support other kind of research and in which topic. The discussant is expected to meet with the instructor before each class to identify the main themes and issues for the discussion.

Students will submit printed weekly responses, a short critical review, and a research proposal as the written assignments for the course. A weekly response is about 1-2 pages on the assessment of the assigned reading each week. Prompts will be posted on the course website one week ahead of the meeting. Since the responses are prepared for the discussion, late submission will not be accepted. The critical review is based on analysis of the work assigned for the course and the research proposal takes off from the work that you have presented and the sources that you have investigated. The critical review is about 5-7 pages, due on Friday, February 8, 2019, and the research proposal 8-10 pages (double-spaced, font 12, 1 inch margin), due on Monday, March 18, 2019.

Grading criteria:
Class attendance and participation– 30%; Presentation and leading discussion – 30%; Critical Review; 20%; Research Proposal– 20%

Weekly Themes and Readings:

Week 01: Introduction - Historiography of “Science” vs. “Knowledge” in Modern China (January 11)
**Week 02: Natural History (January 18)**

**Week 03: Geology (January 25)**

**Week 04: Medicine/Public Health (February 1)**

**Week 05: Research Session at YRL (February 8)**

**Week 06: Psychiatry (February 15)**

**Week 07: Ethnology (February 22)**
Mullaney, Thomas. 2011. *Coming to Terms with the Nation: Ethnic Classification in Modern China* Berkeley: University of California Press.

**Week 08: Cartography (March 1)**

**Week 09: Language (March 8)**

**Week 10: Student Research Project Presentations (March 15)**

**Some words on reading and reviewing:**
Writing good reviews is an art, demonstrating critical thinking and effective reading. Assuming you are already keen to the subject, your interest is leading you ways to sniff out the value, the originality, the weaknesses, and the significance of an article or a book. You can even do this when you know nothing about the topic except what you learn from the work itself. First of all, you start considering what the main arguments are, whether they make sense and how they are supported or not by the evidence shown in the work. What sources does the author use, including both primary and secondary sources? How does the author use these sources into supporting (or not so supporting) evidence? Can you think of any other ways that the author might have used the sources more convincingly? What is the scope of the work and how does the author decide such a scope? Are
there questions or approaches that the authors might have introduced but did not, or are there of which might have been better off omitted? Also, is there something in method or style that might serve as a model for someone writing a work on a different topic? And finally, situate the work in scholarship. This will help us understand better the significance of the work. Does the work seem to be following with some standard line of interpretation? What is its contribution in its related field(s), and in what field(s)?

**Writing and research resources:**

You are encouraged to take advantage of the History Writing Center in all stages of the writing process. Here is the link to more information and to book an appointment: [http://www.history.ucla.edu/academics/undergraduate/history-writing-center](http://www.history.ucla.edu/academics/undergraduate/history-writing-center)

Here is the link UCLA Library page on history of science: [http://guides.library.ucla.edu/history-of-science](http://guides.library.ucla.edu/history-of-science)