INTERNATIONALIZING THE TEACHING OF EARLY U.S. HISTORY

John F. Lyons
Joliet Junior College

As I have been teaching the history of the United States for the past few years, I have increasingly come to the conclusion that my, and other, survey courses need to be revamped to internationalize the teaching of United States history and thereby situate the nation more fully into the larger transnational and global context. At the moment, most teachers of United States History since 1865 rarely consider events beyond the country's borders and when they do it is only to examine briefly America's role in the two World Wars and the Vietnam War or maybe to discuss immigration to the United States. Those teaching the early American history survey spend even less time on events outside the United States, suggesting the nation had little economic, military, or cultural influence on the rest of the world in this period. Instead, they concentrate on the history of the various English colonies and the internal political policies and practices of the new nation while rarely mentioning other countries. This approach encourages students to view the United States as isolated from the rest of the world while ignoring America's similarities with other nations and both how the United States impacted other countries and how the rest of the world helped shape the United States. For early American history this trend is particularly troubling, because it is in this period that settlers established a new nation on the continent, that arguments about the exceptionalism of the United States initially emerged, and that the government's policies first started to affect other countries. Therefore, I propose that we need to rethink early American history within a comparative, multicultural, and foreign policy framework. I will illustrate these approaches by discussing the theoretical underpinnings of the United States History to 1865 survey class that I teach at Joliet Junior College in Illinois.[1]

I am not alone in the view that the study and teaching of American history needs to be internationalized. As far back as 1895 in the first issue of the *American Historical Review*, Columbia University Professor William Sloane warned historians against focusing on narrow national history and urged them to study U.S. history in an international context.[2] In the last few years other historians have come to the same conclusion—that we need to internationalize the teaching of the nation's history.[3]

---

[1]I would like to thank Leo Schelbert for his discerning comments on a previous draft of this paper and for inspiring me to think about United States history from a tri-racial perspective. I would also like to thank those at the 45th annual Western Social Science Association Conference held in Las Vegas in April 2003 and the anonymous reviewers for *Teaching History* for their insightful thoughts.

[2]William M. Sloane, "History and Democracy," *American Historical Review*, 1 (1895), 1–19.

[3]Peter N. Stearns, "Teaching the United States in World History," *Perspectives* (April 1989), 12–16; Peter N. Stearns, "U.S. History Must Be Taught as Part of a Much Broader Historical Panorama," *The*

(continued...)

Teaching History 30(1). DOI: 10.33043/TH.30.1.3-14. ©2005 John F. Lyons

Indeed, the Organization of American Historians, the main professional organization for those teaching American history, recently gathered together a group of historians to envisage and debate the contours of an international perspective on the history of the United States.[4] Since the tragic events of September 11, 2001, even more scholars have called for teachers to pay greater attention to events abroad.[5] The editor of a special edition of the *Journal of American History* focusing on September 11 noted: "... if we learned anything from the events of September 11, we should have learned, once again, that we cannot understand American history by dwelling solely on the United States. The attacks of September 11 force us to turn outward and to see the United States not in isolation, but in and of the world."[6]

There are three reasons why I think this international approach to United States history is urgently needed now. First, I believe that the emphasis on U.S. history as a distinct entity in a national framework assumes that the country is exceptional and unique and encourages students to view America as somehow separate and isolated from the rest of the world. To internationalize the teaching of U.S. history will reveal more clearly the American experience by elucidating the character of the United States and its role in the world. Second, we need to internationalize U.S. history because the increasingly multicultural character of American society and the ethnic diversity of the student population require that students have some understanding of how other cultures that too often have been ignored have contributed to the making of American society.

---

[3](...continued)
Chronicle of Higher Education (January 3, 1990), A44; Carl J. Guarneri, "Out of Its Shell: Internationalizing the Teaching of United States History," *AHA Perspectives* (February 1997), 1, 5–8; Carl J. Guarneri, "Internationalizing the United States Survey Course: American History for a Global Age," *The History Teacher*, 36 (November 2002), 37–64; Thomas J. Osborne, "Implementing the *La Pietra Report*: Internationalizing Three Topics in the United States History Survey Course," *The History Teacher*, 36 (February 2003), 163–175; Walter LeFeber, "The World and the United States," *American Historical Review*, 100 (October 1995), 1015–1033; "Toward the Internationalization of American History: A Round Table," *Journal of American History*, 79 (September 1992), 432–542; and Louis A. Perez Jr., "We Are the World: Internationalizing the National, Nationalizing the International," *Journal of American History*, 89 (September 2002), 558–566.

[4]*La Pietra Report: Project on Internationalizing the Study of American History* (Organization of American Historians, 2000). Thomas Bender, editor, *Rethinking American History in a Global Age* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002) is a collection of essays from the historians involved in the La Pietra Project. The *Journal of American History* devoted a special issue to "The Nation and Beyond: Transnational Perspectives on the United States History" in December 1999.

[5]Wilfred M. McClay, "American History, A Drama of Sweep and Majesty," *American Educator* (Fall 2002), 12–19; Eric Foner, "Changing History," *The Nation* (September 23, 2002); and *San Jose Mercury News* (January 2, 2002), 1.

[6]Joanne Meyerowitz, "History and September 11: An Introduction," *Journal of American History*, 89 (September 2002), 413.

Third, the United States has economic and military commitments and cultural practices that have impacted the rest of the world, and students, who increasingly operate in a global society, need to understand the role the country has played outside its borders and be better prepared for the global experience.[7]

If the "why" to internationalize U.S. history is fairly evident, historians still remain reluctant to take this transnational approach. Some teachers suggest that with the proliferation of world history courses, there is no need to internationalize the history of the nation. Others often complain that there is already too much to cover in the survey course when they teach U.S. history within a national framework, and understandably they are reluctant to spend precious time learning and teaching the history of other countries. Others caution that American historians unfamiliar with other national histories will produce speculative conclusions and paint with too broad a brush.[8] Certainly, American history textbooks offer little help to teachers in overcoming the difficulties of designing a new course. All the American history textbooks available to college teachers focus on history within the country's borders and make little connection between United States history and the rest of the world. Similarly, recent collections of essays on the internationalizing of the nation's past are highly theoretical and offer little practical help to history teachers in their endeavors.[9]

These opponents to the internationalization project, however, overstate their case. We cannot depend on proliferating world history courses to give our students an international perspective on U.S. history because most world history courses neglect American history, at least until the twentieth century, in favor of non-Western topics. The problem of learning the history of other nations and finding adequate texts to teach with an international focus are challenges to be overcome, not an impediment to attempting to internationalize United States history.

How then do we internationalize U.S. history? I propose three solutions. First we need to adopt a comparative analysis that show similarities and differences between the American experience and events in other countries. Great Britain, for example, is an

---

[7]A 2002 survey by National Geographic that examined the geographic and current affairs literacy of students from nine industrial countries found that the United States scored eighth, just above Mexico. When asked to locate the United States on a map, students from five other countries scored higher than students from the U.S.! See National Geographic's 2002 Global Geographic Literacy Test, http://www.nationalgeographic.com/geosurvey.

[8]Some of these objections were brought up in the "History Matters" forum on "United States History in Global Perspective" moderated by Thomas Bender in November 2001. See History Matters, http://ashp.listserv.cuny.edu.

[9]C. Vann Woodward, editor, *The Comparative Approach to American History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997, originally published in 1968); David J. Russo, *American History from a Global Perspective: An Interpretation* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000); and Bender, *Rethinking American History in a Global Age*.

ideal country of comparison. The language that Americans speak, their cultural traditions, and their political institutions are all transplanted from Britain, and even today there are strong political and cultural connections between the two countries.[10] By examining events in the two countries, we can understand better the peculiarities and the similarities of the American experience.[11] Second, we need to take a multicultural perspective that integrates American history into world history to highlight the influence of other nations and international events on the United States. In particular, there is a need to show the influence of other countries and continents on the United States, notably Africa, which has had a profound effect on American culture, and of course Britain which has influenced American political values. Third—and not only in the twentieth century when the United States has grown as a world power—we need to examine American foreign policy, the country's relationship with the rest of the world, and the impact of the nation's government and culture on other countries.[12]

U.S. History to 1865

To illustrate how historians can internationalize the teaching of American history, I will discuss the sixteen-week U.S. History to 1865 survey course that I teach at Joliet Junior College in Illinois. This course builds on relatively recent attempts to include the social history of women, workers, and ethnic and racial groups into the narrative, which have already revised the teaching of the nation's history. At the same time I include in the course a discussion of larger economic structures and political events so that I integrate cultural, economic, political, and social history into the course. I also use a variety of teaching methods and materials including lectures, discussions, videos, Power Point presentations, secondary readings, and primary sources.

My U.S. History to 1865 survey course suggests that the United States as a nation was created by the interaction of three racial groups: the indigenous peoples of North America, Western Europeans, concentrating particularly on those originating in Britain, and inhabitants of Africa, particularly Western Africa. These three groups had different relations to one another and because of variance in relative power did not play an equal role in determining the character of the new nation. The indigenous peoples of North America progressively had their land and culture taken from them by Euro-Americans,

---

[10]The 2000 U.S. Census showed that 24 million people in the United States or nine percent of the population still claimed English ancestry.

[11]For recent attempts at comparative history see George Fredrickson, "From Exceptionalism to Variability: Recent Developments in Cross-National Comparative History," *Journal of American History*, 82 (September 1995), 587–604.

[12]Other attempts to internationalize the teaching of United States history are Robert Cassanello and Daniel S. Murphree, "Implementing the La Pietra Report: Globalizing United States History Instruction in Birmingham, Alabama," *OAH Newsletter* (November 2001), 5; and Guarneri, "Internationalizing the United States Survey Course."

and, although they resisted the aggressors, they eventually had to adapt. Still, many preserved a core of their original way of life. Western Europeans, the most powerful of the three groups, conquered North America, enslaved Africans, and established a neo-European Anglo-American society. Finally, those from Western Africa were enslaved and deported to America and, through the adaptation of African ways, they created a vibrant African-American culture. This model is slightly different from what I call the "Three Worlds Meet" paradigm that many U.S. history textbooks adopt, superficially at least. Although mentioning all three races, the authors of the books only briefly discuss Native American and African culture. More importantly, the "Three Worlds Meet" model downplays conflict and the relative power in the relationship among the three groups in which the British and other Europeans had greater capacity to pursue their agenda than the indigenous people of North America and Africa.[13]

I divide my course into three parts: Three Worlds in Conflict covers the period of colonial development; Creating a Nation runs from the English Restoration to the early years of the Republic; and Coming Apart concentrates on events leading up to the Civil War. With my model there is first a need to teach the history of indigenous Americans, Europeans, and Africans separately and at some length to elucidate the culture of the three groups before colonization. Therefore, I spend the first two weeks of the course describing the diversity of Native American cultures. I show how indigenous peoples adapted to the different environments of the Americas and produced diverse living quarters, work practices, and material cultures depending on the resources and climate that they encountered. But I also argue that Native Americans had a coherent world view based on religious beliefs, views of nature and the environment, political organizations, and social and gender relations.

In the third week of the course I describe the social, economic, and religious changes Western Europe was undergoing in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries and how this led to exploration and then settlement in the Americas. Here it is possible to contrast the political democracy and freedoms practiced in Britain with those that indigenous peoples of North America and Africa followed. I particularly emphasize European desires for trade routes and goods from abroad and the social, economic, and religious dislocation that affected Western Europe in the seventeenth century. Once I start to discuss the European explorations and settlement of America, I show that the occupation of Indian territory in North America was part of a colonization process that was happening in the whole of the Americas by a number of

---

[13]For example, Mary Beth Norton et al., *A People and a Nation*, sixth edition (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2001) call their first chapter the rather neutral "Three Old Worlds Create a New" but spend only the first ten pages on Indians and only three on Africans, while James A. Henrietta et al., *America's History*, fourth edition (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin, 2000) call their first chapter "Worlds Collide," and devote only eight pages to Native Americans and barely a couple of pages to Africans. Both of these are better than Alan Brinkley, *The Unfinished Nation: A Concise History of the American People*, third edition (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2000), which entitles the first chapter the even more innocuous "The Meeting of the Cultures" and devotes only seven pages to Indians and two pages to Africans.

Western European powers. Here I emphasize that the English were not the only, or even the first, to colonize North America and spend time discussing the French, Dutch, Russian, Spanish, and Swedish experiences.

Having discussed the world context of European settlement in the Americas, I then make clear that the United States was an extension of English society and the developing British Empire in a transatlantic world. The nation and culture of the United States can only be understood as one built upon the extension of British institutions, laws, and religious beliefs. The similarities with the experience of colonization in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand are salient here. Therefore, I still keep a strong focus on events in Britain such as the English Civil War and the Glorious Revolution and discuss how these events impacted the ebb and flow of migration to America and political developments in the colonies.

I introduce the third racial group that contributed to the formation of the American nation by focusing on the political, economic, and social structure of West Africa. In particular, I show how the Atlantic slave trade developed and describe the differences between African and American slavery. Slavery in the American colonies and later in the United States must be taught as part of the Atlantic slave trade and as an institution that had profound consequences for race relations in colonial and post-colonial America. The uniqueness of American slavery—especially its racial component—can only be understood if we compare slavery in the United States with slavery in Africa and world history.

The second part of my course focuses on creating a new nation from the English Restoration of 1660, when the Crown sought greater economic and political control over its colonies, to the early years of post-colonial independence. I still keep a strong focus on events in Great Britain such as the Restoration of the monarchy after the English Civil War and the Glorious Revolution to show how these impacted relations between Great Britain and the British colonies in America. I focus on the French and Indian War, known as the Seven Years War in Europe, as a War for Empire between Britain and France. The American Revolution itself is seen in the context of the Enlightenment and the Age of Revolution. I suggest here comparisons with the French Revolution that will help us understand the radical nature of the American Revolution and with Latin American independence movements to discover how the republic forged in North America prospered and how those in Latin America faltered.

Rather than forget about our tri-racial perspective, during this period of nation building I emphasize the role Indians and Africans played in the conflict. I argue that hostility between English settlers and Native Americans partly contributed to the outbreak of the French and Indian War and that Britain's unwillingness to let the settlers move west and take Indian lands contributed to colonial demands for independence. I also show how Indians and African Americans fought on both sides during the war, each group trying to claim its own freedom. Finally, I encourage my students to analyze the U.S. Constitution to understand how the existence of Native Americans and Africans

within the borders of the nation shaped some constitutional debates and the nature of the young Republic.

The final part of the course, Coming Apart, deals with the period from the so-called Market Revolution to the Civil War. The Market Revolution affected the North far more than the South and further divided the two sections of the country that were already beginning to separate over the issue of slavery. In terms of multicultural history, we need to understand the story of immigration and the way it began to change America during this period. Migration to the United States was part of an international movement of labor brought on by dislocations in European homelands and demand for labor in America. By focusing on Irish immigration in particular, I examine the push-and-pull factors that led nearly two million Irish to cross the Atlantic between 1820 and 1860, the reception they received in America, and the nature of the conflict between Catholics and Protestants during the early Republic. I then show how westward expansion led to further debate over the unsolved question of whether the United States should be free or slave.

My U.S. History to 1865 course spends little time discussing American foreign policy because, quite simply, the United States had little cultural, economic, military, or diplomatic impact on the rest of the world. However, we discuss the post-revolutionary policy toward Native Americans, the British, and the French, and the events that led to the War of 1812. This helps us understand the problems the United States faced in maintaining an independent foreign policy and the expansionist policies of the new nation. The significance of the Mexican-American War, especially in Western expansion and in understanding later relations between the United States and its nearest and most influential southern neighbor, is also highlighted here.

Antebellum slavery and the Civil War are covered in the last three weeks of the course. I discuss the development of an African-American culture and slave resistance by contrasting the U.S. experience with that of the Caribbean. Finally, I show the role African Americans and Native Americans played in the Civil War and the impact of the war on all of the groups involved in the war. The Civil War united the white-controlled nation, abolished slavery for African Americans, and opened up the West for the final conquest of Native Americans.

Because of time restraints and the attempt to internationalize the teaching of United States history, I condense the coverage of some important topics that other historians often include in survey classes. At the outset I believe that racial divisions were far more important for the colonies, the new nation, and for subsequent history than the regional differences that most survey courses emphasize. Many of these regional differences had melted away by the time of the American Revolution, and the sectional differences that led to the Civil War were largely a response to later political and economic developments. Therefore, I condense, but do not omit entirely, discussions of the social history of colonial America and especially the traditional overemphasis on the Puritans. As historian Edmund Morgan pointed out many years ago, the foundation of the nation evolved more from the Chesapeake region than from the New England

colonies. I also condense coverage of military history and the political leadership and reforms of the new nation. The Great Awakening and utopian reform movements of the early republic are two other topics that can be compressed while overlong coverage of military campaigns in the American Revolution and the Civil War can safely be excluded.[14]

Course Materials and Assignments

There is, at present, no textbook that takes an international perspective on U.S. history. As a reference tool, I adopt the first volume of Gary B. Nash et al., *The American People: Creating a Nation and a Society*, which does introduce a multicultural approach to early American history. John Mack Faragher et al., *Out of Many: A History of the American People*, also makes a valiant attempt to do this.[15] On a more regular basis I use Gerald Michael Greenfield and John D. Buenker, *Those United States: International Perspectives on American History*, which is the only book of primary documents that looks at the United States in transnational perspective by collecting observations on American history from all over the world. The first volume of this collection is excellent, but the second volume disappointingly starts at the Gilded Age and therefore fails to include important topics such as Reconstruction and Westward expansion.[16]

Some other readings are available that help us to internationalize the American survey. One place to start is C. Vann Woodward's edited collection entitled *The Comparative Approach to American History*, a collection of essays by leading scholars that puts classic topics in American history such as slavery, immigration, and the World Wars in a comparative context. The book originally appeared in the 1960s and is therefore somewhat out of date.[17] More recently Carl J. Guarneri's collection of essays entitled *America Compared: American History in International Perspective* utilizes newer material to cover many of the same topics.[18]

---

[14]Edmund S. Morgan, *American Slavery, American Freedom: The Ordeal of Colonial Virginia* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1975).

[15]Gary B. Nash et al., *The American People: Creating a Nation and a Society*, fifth edition (New York: Longman, 2001), and John Mack Faragher et al., *Out of Many: A History of the American People*, fourth edition (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2003).

[16]Gerald Michael Greenfield and John D. Buenker, *Those United States: International Perspectives on American History*, Volumes I and 2 (Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace, 2000).

[17]C. Vann Woodward, editor, *The Comparative Approach to American History*.

[18]Carl J. Guarneri, *America Compared: American History in International Perspective*, Volumes 1 and 2 (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1997).

For books that concentrate on integrating other cultures into American history, I recommend *Albion's Seeds: Four British Folkways in America* by David Hackett Fischer that concentrates on the influence of British regional cultures on America and *Emigrants and Exiles: Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America* by Kerby Miller that examines Irish immigration to America.[19] Barbara W. Tuchman's *The First Salute: A View of the American Revolution* places the American Revolution in the context of conflict between Britain, France, and Holland.[20] *Stand the Storm: A History of the Atlantic Slave Trade* by Edward Reynolds examines the slave trade in Africa and in the West.[21] John Thornton's *Africa and Africans in the Making of the Atlantic World* covers similar ground.[22] Edward Countryman, *Americans: A Collision of Histories*, discusses Indians, Europeans, and Africans from the late colonial period to Reconstruction.[23] Recent books on the Atlantic World that emphasize connections between the Americas and Europe include David Hancock, *Citizens of the World: London Merchants and the Integration of the British Atlantic Community, 1735-1785*, and Marcus Rediker, *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic*.[24]

Increasingly, historians are adopting a comparative approach to the study of history. Among the finest studies that take a comparative approach to United States history is William Cronon's *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and Ecology of New England* that compares Native American and English cultures.[25] Among the best books on slavery is *Slavery in the Americas* by Herbert S. Klein that compares slavery

---

[19]David Hackett Fischer, *Albion's Seeds: Four British Folkways in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989) and Kerby Miller, *Emigrants and Exiles: Ireland and the Irish Exodus to North America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985).

[20]Barbara W. Tuchman, *The First Salute: A View of the American Revolution* (New York: Ballantine, 1989).

[21]Edward Reynolds, *Stand the Storm: A History of the Atlantic Slave Trade* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1985).

[22]John Thornton, *Africa and Africans in the Making of the Atlantic World, 1400-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

[23]Edward Countryman, *Americans: A Collision of Histories* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1996).

[24]David Hancock, *Citizens of the World: London Merchants and the Integration of the British Atlantic Community, 1735-1785* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995) and Marcus Rediker, *The Many-Headed Hydra: Sailors, Slaves, Commoners, and the Hidden History of the Revolutionary Atlantic* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2000).

[25]William Cronon, *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and Ecology of New England* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1983).

in the United States and Cuba.[26] Peter Kolchin's *Unfree Labor* compares American slavery and Russian serfdom.[27] Eric Foner's book on post-emancipation societies, *Nothing But Freedom*, is particularly useful for understanding the United States after emancipation.[28]

My assignments and in-class course materials reflect and reinforce an international perspective. All my classes are writing intensive so students have to compose weekly essays as homework, do regular writing assignments in class, and take three essay exams. Students write short weekly essays from the collection of readings edited by Greenfield and Buenker, the first volume of *Those United States: International Perspectives on American History*. The purpose of this assignment is to allow students to spend quality time understanding the viewpoints of observers of the United States from all over the world. After students complete the essays, we discuss issues relating to the documents in small groups. I also try to get students to examine comparative statistics and visual material in the classroom and then discuss or write short reaction papers on their findings. For example, I show the class figures on comparative population growths in Europe to illustrate the ebbs and flows of English migration to Europe and paintings and cartoons to convey the native reactions to Irish immigration and Manifest Destiny.[29]

Even though it is difficult to obtain videos that offer an international focus on United States history, the videos I show in class reflect my tri-racial and international perspective. I show clips from *The Native Americans* series to elucidate the culture of the indigenous people before the Europeans arrived and from *500 Nations* to outline the conflict between the Indians and the English settlers. The first and second episodes of the television series *Roots* are excellent for opening up discussions on the nature of African slavery. *The World at War*, episode 4 from the excellent *The American Revolution* series, is one of the few videos on the Revolution to illustrate the international context of the Revolution. *Cauldron of War*, episode 5 of *500 Nations*, shows the role Native Americans played in the Revolution. Clips from *Not for Ourselves Alone: The Story of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony* stimulate discussions on the role of women in the nineteenth century. *The Irish in America: Long*

---

[26]Herbert S. Klein, *Slavery in the Americas: A Comparative Study of Virginia and Cuba* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 1967).

[27]Peter Kolchin, *Unfree Labor Compares American Slavery and Russian Serfdom* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987).

[28]Eric Foner, *Nothing But Freedom: Emancipation and Its Legacy* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1983).

[29]For good introductions to cooperative learning in the history classroom, see Tom Morton, *Cooperative Learning and Social Studies: Towards Excellence and Equity* (San Clemente, CA: Kagan Cooperative Learning, 1998) and Robyn Hallowell Griswold and Audrey Green Rogers, *Cooperative Learning Basics: Strategies and Lessons for U.S. History Teachers* (Amawalk, NY: Golden Owl, 1995).

Journey Home and *Prairie Tides: The Building of the Illinois and Michigan Canal* demonstrates the Irish immigrant experience, and finally the wonderful film *Glory* helps students to understand the role of African Americans in the American Civil War.[30]

In addition to writing assignments and videos, I play music in the classroom to illustrate the multicultural character of North America and to evoke feelings and emotions about the experiences of slaves, immigrants, and Native Americans. It is extremely difficult to know precisely the music played in early American history, but I try to find old songs that evidence suggests Africans, Indians, and immigrant Europeans performed or at least songs that sound like music that people in North America probably played. I play music from the wide-ranging *American Roots Music* compilation to illustrate the ceremonial nature of Native American music. Old English folks songs such as "Scarborough Fair," sung by Simon and Garfunkel, and the English drinking song, "To Anacreon in Heaven," which later became the music to the "Star Spangled Banner," demonstrate the influence of the British on the United States. I also play drum and chant music from West Africa and "Go Down Moses" by Paul Robeson to illustrate African influences in American music. Minstrel and folk songs from Mick Moloney's excellent *Far From the Shamrock Shore: The Irish-American Experience in Song* also illuminates the Irish experience in America.[31]

Students, in general, have responded well to the internationalization of my survey course. Many of my students are taking their first U.S. history class at the college level and have limited knowledge of how other teachers teach the subject and little to compare my class with. In end-of-semester anonymous evaluations, students often offer vague comments such as "he offers a unique viewpoint of American History to 1865." Others suggest that I "put an interesting twist on things" and "it's interesting to hear his point of view," while one student noted that "his take on American History is funny." Students have suggested to me that they are happy to see more focus on Indian and African American cultures in my class than they did in high school history courses. "I don't think history is all a fun subject but I am so much more interested in it now," commented one student. The only real complaints on the international perspective concern what one or two students consider the overly critical comments on America

---

[30]*The Native Americans* (Turner Entertainment, 1994); *500 Nations* (Warner Home Video, 1995); *Roots* (Warner Home Video, 1994); *The American Revolution* (A&E Home Video, 1997); *Not for Ourselves Alone: The Story of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony* (PBS Home Video, 1999); *The Irish in America: Long Journey Home* (Walt Disney, 1998); *Prairie Tides: The Building of the Illinois and Michigan Canal* (Prairie Tides Productions, LLC, Chicago, 2002); and *Glory* (Columbia Tristar, 1994).

[31]Various Artists, *American Roots Music* (Palm, 2001); "Scarborough Fair" from *Simon and Garfunkel's Greatest Hits* (Sony, 1990); "To Anacreon in Heaven" from Douglas Jimerson, *George Washington Portrait in Song* (Amerimusic, 1999); Various Artists, *Africa: Drum, Chant and Instrumental Music* (Nonesuch, 2002, originally released in 1976); "Go Down Moses" by Paul Robeson, *The Essential Paul Robeson* (ASV Living Era, 2001); and Mick Moloney, *Far From the Shamrock Shore: The Irish-American Experience in Song* (Shanachie, 2002).

displayed by the international authors of the documents in the edited collection of Greenfield and Buenker. Overall, however, most student complaints are less on the content of the course and more on what they see as the excessive writing requirements of the course and their difficulty in understanding the arcane language of the documents.[32]

My international perspective continues in the second part of the United States history survey, but in this course I put greater emphasis on America's role in the world. The focus of this course is to examine how the United States grew from an insignificant power in 1865 to become the dominant economic, cultural, diplomatic, and military global influence by the end of the twentieth century. This course is also divided into three parts: Becoming a World Power examines the period from Reconstruction to the outbreak of World War I in 1914, concentrating on industrialization and imperialism; the second part, the Rise to Globalism, covers the period from World War I to the Cold War and the increasing economic, cultural, and military influence of the United States; and the third part, Cultural and Social Change, examines the social and cultural ferment in the United States since the 1950s.

Although I pay more attention to foreign policy in the second half of the survey, I do not neglect the comparative or multicultural perspective. The civil rights movement is taught in the context of the effect of decolonization in Africa on inspiring African-American demands for equality and the impact of the American civil rights movement on social movements in the rest of the world. I propose that the social movements of the 1960s in the United States, particularly feminism and the counterculture, were part of an Anglo-American phenomenon and even Western phenomenon. The Vietnam War is taught in the framework of Vietnamese history and the Cold War, and the movement against the Vietnam War in America is put in the context of a world antiwar student movement. Finally, I focus on the concept of globalization and Latino immigration into the United States that profoundly influenced the economy and culture of the nation.

For too long historians have emphasized the unique and exceptional character of the American experience and have often ignored the way the United States was part of wider global patterns and processes. The comparative, multicultural, and foreign policy approach outlined here helps us to internationalize the teaching of early United States history and puts the American experience into greater context. In particular, by taking a tri-racial perspective on the nation's history we can see how the development of the United States is both different and similar to that of other countries, how other countries have influenced American culture, and how the United States has shaped other nations. Without the international perspective portrayed here, American history remains insular, incomplete, and unclear.

---

[32]Student evaluations for spring 2003 in the possession of the author.