

## POLS 326. Governing Diversity: Politics of Race and Ethnicity

Professor Joseph Yi ([yi@gonzaga.edu](mailto:yi@gonzaga.edu))

TA: Hyun ([hchoi@gonzaga.edu](mailto:hchoi@gonzaga.edu))

Political Science AD 417, x 323-3610, Cell 714 308 8515

*Class meets:* Tue/Thurs 11:00-12:15pm in College 316

*Office hours:* Mon/Wed 930-1030am; other times by appointment, or when my door's open.  
You can also call me (office/cell) on mornings (9-11am) and evenings (5-11pm).

---

---

### COURSE DESCRIPTION

The seminar examines the politics of racial and ethnic diversity in the United States. Americans publicly celebrate diversity and its benefits to society. At the same time, we acknowledge that differences based on race, religion and other identities have divided our nation and undermined key democratic ideals. The old divisions between blacks and whites, and Catholics and Protestants, have given way to controversies surrounding new immigrants--a historic dilemma with global security implications since 9/11. We discuss the challenges of integrating and governing a modern, plural society in a global era. We focus on the United States, but welcome comparisons to other countries.

**TEXTS** Texts are available for purchase at the Bookstore and at the Library Reserve. The Huntington book is our first priority. (Many used books can be bought cheaply on-line.)

#### REQUIRED:

\*\* Michael Emerson with Rodney Woo, *People of the Dream* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006). 0691124515

\*\* Samuel P. Huntington. *Who are we? The challenges to America's identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2004.

\*\* Swain, Carol M. 2002. *The New White Nationalism in America: its challenge to integration*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

\*\* William J. Wilson, *When Work Disappears: The New World of the Urban Poor* (Knopf, 1996)

#### RECOMMEND:

\*\*Philip Kasinitz, John H. Mollenkopf, Mary C. Waters and Jennifer Holdaway, *Inheriting the City: The Children of Immigrants Come of Age* (Harvard University Press, 2008). 0674028031

\* Moskos, Charles C. and John Sibley Butler. 1996. *All that we can be: Black leadership and racial integration the Army way*. New York, NY: Basic Books. 0465001130

### TEACHING STATEMENT

The course meets every Tuesday and Thursday, unless otherwise noted. I am available during office hours, after class or by appointment. You can drop off papers in the box outside my office (CG 417) or at the main Social Science Office (CG 406). If you cannot come to office, please call me or email me your phone number and convenient times to call you back.

The most important thing to learn in our class is to CRITICALLY assess the arguments and data of different authors, and to develop coherent arguments and examples of your own. What are the author's key arguments and evidence? Do you find them to be persuasive? What are some plausible *contrary* arguments and examples?

The course requirements are midterm project, final project, and regular participation. Team participation includes six weekly commentaries and peer reviews. The grade evaluation relies on the following approximate weights.

Class Participation & Mini-Quiz	10%
Team Participation & Peer Review	10%
Midterm Project	35%

Final Project	45%
Extra Credit activities	2-5%

**Class participation.** The first requirement is thoughtful participation in class. I encourage you to participate actively, but please do not dominate class discussion. Come prepared and come on time. Your final evaluation asks whether you missed any class activities, and for what reason. Missing more than two required classes will lower your grade.

Starting the second week, you shall submit a short, written “**mini-quiz**” (summary of reading and one current event, and optional comments) at the beginning of EVERY class to check your attendance and preparation: you receive full credit for complete summary. Each student also takes turns leading class discussion: you sign-up as a “point person” (discussant) and email your mini-quiz to the professor by 10am before class.

To encourage participation, I shall post my lecture notes via email or blackboard: this way, you can participate without worrying about copying everything I say. The lecture notes are rough draft and subject to revision every couple of weeks. If the notes are not clear, you can ask me. You are encouraged to skim through my notes, and the course readings, to find research topics of interest. The lectures are only supplements to the primary course materials. For writing commentaries, exams and the optional research paper, you should cite primary texts and sources, not my lecture notes.

**Team Participation.** Each student joins a small group (approx. 4 students) to review key readings and commentaries, prepare for exams and write research papers. Learning is a collective process, and you benefit from discussion with others who are well informed about an issue and who can bring different perspectives. Teamwork also teaches us the challenges and benefits of working together in a plural, individualistic society. Students volunteer to be team leaders, and discuss their general backgrounds and research interests. Thenceforth, fellow students join with team leaders based on shared interests.

Each group selects a team name, and designates one leader to coordinate its activities. (I encourage creative group names relevant to your topic.) Your team meets outside of class, for at least six times during the semester. Students who actively participate in all team sessions shall receive extra points. Students who miss a required session or do not participate actively shall receive a lower grade. You shall spend 45-60 minutes per team meeting during free class day listed on syllabus: you can meet at our regular classroom or outside (e.g. café).

Please take the time to get to know and help each other. Along with her commentary, the team champion prepares a brief group progress report for the professor. I want to know how the team, and each member, is doing. The team leader should inform me if a member is not participating actively, so I can discuss the matter with him or her. You are welcome to invite the professor to any team meeting.

**Critical Commentary.** To prepare for exams, each student writes five *critical commentaries* on the weekly readings, i.e., a short ID or essay (at least half are essays). The essay makes a sufficiently coherent, critical claim for class discussion; it defends the claim with analytical arguments and factual evidence, with links to key readings and current events. Please review the highest quality journals and newspapers (e.g. New York Times), for at least 30 minutes everyday. For local news, the *Spokesman Review* is acceptable. Please attach the relevant news article to your commentary. If you are the team champion, please email me the article as well.

**Peer Review.** You write the commentaries individually, but discuss each other’s work with your small group. Please get your commentary reviewed and *signed* by team members. You write a thoughtful, detailed critique on another commentary, with the option of giving a sample numeric grade. Peer review allows students to learn from each other and to receive feedback. I collect all

the peer-reviewed commentaries at end of semester: please write clearly or TYPE your peer review, so I can give you proper credit.

Please have required team meetings and peer review *before* Friday 2pm. (I recommend Thursday after class or Friday lunch.) All the peer-reviewed commentaries (hard copy) are due Friday 2pm (professor office box). Each team member also takes turns summarizing group discussion, and sharing her commentary with the entire class: the team rep (**champion**) emails (Prof/TA) a brief group report, and posts her personal commentary on the Blackboard Discussion Board ("Commentary & Peer Review") by Friday 2pm.

**Midterm Project:** Exam (2 ID, 1 essay), 2 Revised Commentaries (at least one essay), Peer Evaluation. 1) Exam includes questions on the readings, current events and class discussions. 2) Revise two of your commentaries (at least one is essay). Please do not repeat same item for exam and revised commentary. 3) Midterm evaluation (see below).

**Final Project:** Exam (2 ID, 1 essay), 2 Revised Commentaries (second half of course, at least one essay), Final Evaluation. For the midterm and final evaluation, each student discusses how he contributed to, and learned from, the group and the class. It includes three components: 1) Personal participation: number of commentaries, peer reviews, team meetings, and classes. Did you miss any, and why? 2) Team/Peer evaluation (see appendix). 3) Class: general comments about the class, and perhaps suggestions about how to improve it for the future.

**Extra-Credit:** 1) Read and critique *Extra* readings or the Yi book; week 2 extra-credit commentaries (ID or Essay); extra peer reviews, point discussions, etc. 2) Optional group research paper on any topic relevant to our course (e.g. Proposition 8, faith-based organizations, immigration). If you get B+ or more, the paper grade can substitute for a low exam grade.

**Honor Code.** Cheating and plagiarism are not tolerated. Plagiarism is the act of trying to pass off someone else's ideas or words as your own. You must acknowledge your use of other's work when you quote them word for word (quotation marks for direct quotes), paraphrase, borrow ideas, or incorporate factual information from someone else's work. (Do NOT copy another student's commentary or sample exam answer in your official exam.)

### **CLASS SCHEDULE**

*Extra* readings are not required, but suggested for students interested in further research. "NEWS" and supplemental readings are available via blackboard, unless stated otherwise.

Week 1. (Tues, Jan 13) **Introduction. Why/how study the politics of racial and ethnic diversity?** \* NEWS: "A Teachable Moment." Paul Tough, NY Times, August 17, 2008.  
\* "What It Takes to Make a Student." NY Times. November 26, 2006.  
\* Samuel P. Huntington. *Who are we?: the challenges to America's identity*, 2004. Ch 1 (The Crisis of National Identity). At least four possible future identities exist for America: ideological, bifurcated, exclusivist, and cultural.

#### **Part I. Three Conceptions of America: cultural, liberal, racist**

Anglo-Protestant America

(Thurs, Jan 15) Huntington. Ch. 3 (Components of American ID), Ch 4 (Anglo-Protestant Culture). *Extra*. David Fisher, "Albion's Seed," Wikipedia.org (Chapters also available in blackboard)

Week 2. Liberal-Plural America (Jan 30)

(Tues, Jan 20) **MINI-QUIZ** due every class: summary of reading and one current event. Robert A. Dahl, *Who Governs?* New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 1961, Chs. 1 (Nature of Problem), 4 (Ex-Plebes), 28 (Stability, Change and Democratic Creed). [BLACKBOARD] How can democracy work when people have unequal resources? Classic theory of urban pluralism: multiple, competing groups influence different issues; ethnic groups assimilate to mainstream society; the prevalence of liberal-democratic creed.

\*Two Volunteers for Extra-Credit Commentary (ID, Essay)?

(Thurs) \* NEWS: "BIG MEN ON CAMPUS: The lacrosse furor and Duke's divided culture," New Yorker, September 4, 2006. *Extra*: 2006 Duke University lacrosse case, Responses to the lacrosse case (Wikipedia).

*Extra*: Elshtain, Jean Bethke, *Democracy on Trial* (1996). The erosion of shared democratic creed?

\* How to write Commentary (discuss Extra-Credit ID and Essay).

Week 3. Racial hierarchy

(Tues, Jan 27) \* Rogers M. Smith. "Beyond Tocqueville, Myrdal, and Hartz: The Multiple Traditions in America," *The American Political Science Review*. Vol. 87, No. 3 (Sep 1993), pp. 549-566 (esp. 549-550).

\* Rogers M. Smith & Desmond S. King, "Racial Orders in American Political Development," *American Political Science Review*. Vol. 99, Issue 01 (Feb 2005), pp. 75-92.

Analyze race and American politics in terms of two evolving, competing "racial institutional orders": a "white supremacist" order and an "egalitarian transformative" order. The competing racial order framework explains many past and contemporary political developments, from affirmative action to school vouchers.

*Extra*. Michael Omi & Howard Winant, *Racial Formation in the United States*. Reject the premise of a dominant American liberal-democratic tradition.

\* *Form Leaders/Small Groups (set meeting place)*.

(Thurs) \*\* *Required Team Meeting. Champion, Commentary # 1 due by Friday 2pm* \*\*

Team Champion post commentary to Blackboard Discussion Board ("Commentary & Peer Review") by 2pm. (Team champ also emails commentary and team progress report to Professor/TA.) Everybody posts detailed review on another team's champion by Fri 9pm. I will also post written critique and sample grade: if you do not want sample grade, please state "no sample grade."

EVERYBODY submits *hard copy* of her commentary (with peer review) to Prof office box (College 417) by Friday 2pm, so TA can record credit. If you want sample grade, please state so.

Week 4. Poverty and Unemployment

(Tues, Feb 3) William J. Wilson, *When Work Disappears: The New World of the Urban Poor* (Knopf, 1996), Chs. Intro, 1, 2, 4. The old black-white divide is complicated with class and geographic mobility. In the post civil rights movement, many blacks have left for middle-class suburbia; left behind are concentrations of urban poverty, and related social ills (e.g. illegitimacy, crime, welfare dependency). Tensions between urban poor and immigrant entrepreneurs.

(Thurs) \* William J. Wilson, Ch. 5.

\* Lawrence M. Mead. "The Great Passivity." *Perspectives on Politics* 2:4 (Dec 2004), pp. 671-675. Diminishing returns to government action with regards to the new urban poor; problem lies in declining family structure, etc, which cannot be mainly solved with government action. The best we can do for welfare recipients is to instill a culture of work and obligations.

\* **NEWS**: "Men Not Working, and Not Wanting Just Any Job," NYT, July 31, 2006. [blackboard]

## **Part II. Emerging Multicultural America: immigration, diversity and reaction.**

Week 5. Old and New Immigration

(Tues, Feb 10) Samuel P. Huntington. Chs. 8 (Assimilation), 9 (Mexican Immigration), 7 (Deconstructing America).

(Thurs) \*\* *Team Meeting, Commentary (week 4 or 5), Champion # 2 (Blackboard Discussion)*

Week 6. (Tues, Feb 17) \* Philip Kasinitz, John H. Mollenkopf, Mary C. Waters and Jennifer Holdaway, *Inheriting the City: The Children of Immigrants Come of Age* (2008), Chapters 1, 5, 11 [BLACKBOARD]. \*\* *Extra.* [www.nytimes.com/2008/05/18/nyregion/18immigrants.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2008/05/18/nyregion/18immigrants.html)

\* *Extra.* Min Zhou, 1997. Segmented Assimilation: Issues, Controversies, and Recent Research on the New Second Generation. *International Migration Review*, 1997. [blackboard]

Week 7. (Tues, Feb 24) Nativist (White) Reaction  
Swain, Carol M. 2002. *The New White Nationalism in America: its challenge to integration*. Chs. 1 (Intro), 2 (New white nationalism), 4 (Demographic Change/Immigration).  
NEWS: "Immigration Upended Entrepreneur's Dreams," *Wall Street Journal*, December 14, 2006.

Swain, Chs. 5 (Crime/fear), 10 (college admissions). *Skim:* Conclusion. Swain discusses white grievances on issues from crime and illegitimacy to affirmative action and immigration. She stresses the need for honest dialogue on sometimes-painful subjects (e.g. black-on-white crime).  
NEWS: "Montana State is coping with a crime wave," *Sports Illustrated*, August 7, 2007

(Thurs) \*\*\* *Team Meeting, Commentary, Champion # 3, Prepare Sample Exam* \*\*\*

Week 8. (Tues, March 3). Class: Review sample questions and answers. Each team posts (blackboard) sample exam by Monday 12pm: 10 IDs and 2 essay questions. The sample questions may or may not appear in actual exam. (For class discussion, please prepare one detailed answer for ID or essay. Let me know which member wrote the answer.) I will email official exam later in the day, and post copy in office door.

**Midterm Project:** Exam (2 ID, 1 essay), Two Revised Commentaries (plus original peer-reviewed commentaries), Midterm Evaluation. Email to Prof/TA and hard copy to my office box (COLLEGE 427) by Thursday 2pm. Midterm Evaluation includes self-evaluation (missed any class, team meeting, commentary, peer review), peer evaluation, and optional feedback about class (how to make it better). **NO CLASS THURSDAY.**

\*\*\*\*\* SPRING BREAK \*\*\*\*\*

### **Part III. Diversity and Community**

Week 9. (Tues, March 17) Robert D. Putnam (2007). "*E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century. The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture.*" *Scandinavian Political Studies* 30 (2), 137–174. [<http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1467-9477.2007.00176.x> or Blackboard]

*Extra.* Michael Jonas. "The downside of diversity." *Boston Globe*. August 5, 2007. [Blackboard]

(Thurs) \* *The Big Sort*, "Introduction" – Bill Bishop [Blackboard]

*Extra.* *The Economist*. Jul 14, 2005. "America's sorting out," p. 17. Special Section: A survey of American pluralism and inequality. <http://www.economist.com/surveys>

Week 10. (Tues, March 24) \* Swain, Carol M. 2002. *The new White nationalism in America: its challenge to integration*. Ch. 14. Can Religion Promote Greater Racial and Social Harmony Among America's Diverse Peoples? Religion is potentially the most important, available institution for bringing different races together.

\* Emerson and Smith, *Divided by Faith*, Intro, Ch 7 [blackboard] American Protestantism reinforces racial divisions and white resistance to needed structural changes.

*Extra.* Samuel P. Huntington. Who are we? Ch5 (Religion and Christianity).

(Thurs) \* Michael Emerson with Rodney Woo, *People of the Dream* (2006), Chs 1-3. The challenges and benefits of racial integration in Protestant congregations.

Week 11. (Tues, March 31) Michael Emerson, *People of the Dream*, Chs. 6-7.

\* Kevin D. Dougherty and Kimberly R. Huyser, "Racially Diverse Congregations: Organizational Identity and the Accommodation of Differences," *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 47, no. 1, 23-44, review the literature on racially mixed congregations.

(Thurs) \*\*\*\* Team Meeting, Commentary, Champion # 4, *Research Project* \*\*\*\*

Week 12. (Tues, April 7) \*\* Moskos, Charles C. and John Sibley Butler. 1996. *All that we can be: Black leadership and racial integration the Army way*. Ch 1, Conclusion; Skim rest. Army synthesis of collective identity and pride with interracial cooperation.  
*Extra*. NEWS: Multiethnic Pop Culture ("American Idol") [blackboard]

(Thurs) Joseph Yi, *God and Karate on the Southside*, chs. 1-3 (Introduction, South Park, Theory) [blackboard]

Week 13. (Tues, April 14) Yi, chs. 4-5 (God). (Thurs) Chs. 6-7(Karate).

Week 14. (Tues, April 21) Yi – Skim Ch 8 (GSS), Conclusion.

(Thurs) *Team Meeting, Commentary, Champion # 5, Optional Research Project*

Week 15. (Tues, April 28) Extra-credit research presentations on topic relevant to our course. Review commentaries, sample exams. Each team posts sample exam by Monday 12pm, which includes at least 8 IDs and 2 essay questions.

(Thurs) Class: Preview final project. I will email official exam later in the day, and post copy in office door.

**Final Project:** Exam (2 ID, 1 essay), 2 Revised Commentaries (with peer-reviewed original), Final Evaluation. Email to Prof/TA and hard copy in my office box by Monday (May 5), 2pm. Email extra-credit (optional) projects by Tues, 2pm.

The professor reserves the right to make revisions to this syllabus, esp. second half of semester. I will announce any such changes in class and the class e-mail list.

## APPENDIX: SAMPLE MIDTERM

This is open-book exam (books, notes, reference materials), so please use quotes and page citations when relevant. You have three hours to complete the exam: PLEASE WRITE THE TIME YOU STARTED AND ENDED.

Identifications: Total Points 50.

Choose THREE of the following items. For each item, provide:

- 1) AUTHOR: the author(s) associated with the term. [1 pt]
- 2) DEFINITION: a definition of the term, plus (if appropriate) an example. [1-2 sentences: 3 pts]
- 3) CRITICAL LINK: the relevance of the item to key concepts and/or examples from *different* authors and current events (please cite), and a brief statement of explanation. [3-4 sentence, 6 pts]

1. Ampersands
2. WASP
3. Democratic Creed
4. Border Fence/Wall
5. Ethnic Enclave
6. Benjamin Smith
7. KIPP
8. Transformative Egalitarian Order
9. Karate

ONE Essay: Total Points 50

Answer each part of the question. It is to your benefit to use a wide range of readings and current events to answer the essay question. Your essay should make claims, and support them with arguments, evidence and examples, while taking account of potentially contrary arguments and examples. (Do not simply repeat same sentences from ID section.)

- 1) Please discuss the notion of a dominant liberal-democratic tradition in the USA, and its implications for politics and ethnic relations. What are some alternative theories of politics and ethnic relations?
- 2) Huntington argues that four possible future identities exist for America. What are these possible identities, and their implications for politics and ethnic relations? Which, if any, seem most likely? Which is most desirable, from your viewpoint?
- 3) Please discuss one policy issue relevant to racial and ethnic politics (e.g. counter-terrorism, immigration, affirmative action, proposition 8). How does the issue support, challenge or revise key theories in race and ethnicity?

JOHN SMITH POLS 326 MIDTERM Start Time: 5: 46. End Time: 8: 15

## **SAMPLE: CRITICAL ID**

### **ID: IRCA**

**AUTHORS:** Huntington, Omi and Winant, Jones-Correa; Andreas Kallas (student research)

**DEFINITION:** The Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 is widely known as an “Amnesty bill” but its effects are not so clear-cut. Although it did grant citizenship to many illegal immigrants already in the United States, it did so through a complicated and difficult process that was far from an instant amnesty. The bill also sought to impose stronger border controls that would restrict future immigration after making the current wave illegal, but this part of bill had only limited success: illegal immigration actually increased after the passage of IRCA, perhaps because more potential aliens could hope for future amnesty (e.g. 2006 Senate bill?).

**CRITICAL LINKS:** The IRCA was partly motivated by Huntington’s description of societal security. Its authors (e.g. Senator Simpson) thought that the largely unassimilated Hispanic population was undermining our country’s unity, and hoped that giving them citizenship would encourage their participation in the broader society, and avoid dual-citizenships or “ampersands” who owe loyalty to other governments (Huntington 204). The pre-IRCA situation was an “institutional mis-match” because the existing government agencies didn’t have the capacity to deal with the illegal population (Jones-Correa 197), so it was thought better to legalize at least some of them.

The bill was very controversial at the time, because many Americans were against the idea of granting amnesty to illegal aliens. As raised in the Kallas research paper, many Americans felt that illegals were free-loading off larger society’s resources. Omi and Winant argue that the American state creates a racial hierarchy that assumes whites are automatically more deserving than non-whites (83). Most of the discourse surrounding immigration concentrated on the threat Hispanics posed to white cultural norms, which echoes past racist fears of cultural contamination and decay.

### **Ethnic Enclave**

**Authors:** Kwong, Grenier and Castro, Huntington, Dahl.

**Definition:** an ethnic enclave is a location dominated by recent immigrants who form their own institutions instead of assimilating into mainstream society. Examples would be Cubans in Miami, or various “Chinatowns” in large urban centers. In these places, recent immigrants can build ethnic solidarity and find jobs but at the cost of not learning English or building broader social capital (Kwong in Correa 80). Because there are immigrant-owned banks, grocery stores, and so on ethnic solidarity is maximized at the expense of outside interaction.

**Links to reading:** ethnic enclaves are controversial in part because they are an extreme example of multiculturalism that authors like Huntington claim threatens our national identity. Because immigrants aren’t encouraged to integrate into larger cultural systems, they become potential weak points full of individuals with more foreign loyalties than care for the United States. They also contradict Dahl’s theory that immigrant groups have to go beyond ethnicity to build broader coalitions, because the strong concentration of foreign-born individuals can make ethnic ties more salient than other political issues. Progressive critics such as Peter Kwong have also explored how these enclaves perpetuate class oppression, because ethnic ties are emphasized at the expense of working conditions. Employers can say “We are all Chinese” to reinforce fears of a racist outside society and justify working conditions that would be unacceptable in the larger society (Kwong 79). Labor unions have so far been ineffective at bringing ethnic enclaves into their membership, leaving them in exploitive situations with no recourse through mainstream social institutions (Kwong 87). Ethnic enclaves can also damage inter-ethnic relations, for example Miami’s Cuban enclave has caused friction with blacks who feel marginalized by the new immigrant culture (Grenier and Castro 143).



### **Evaluation criteria: EXAM or RESEARCH ESSAY**

9: Outstanding/Critical Essay ("A") -- makes clear, critical claims that address the exam questions; supports each claim (point) with logical argument, example and/or evidence; and addresses the strongest contrary arguments and examples. The essay shows superior work mechanics, style and logical content, with well-crafted introduction, body and conclusion. It moves beyond simple summary, clichés and superficial "common sense." It shows the ability to move beyond what we have covered in class, and shows your capacity to draw connections between non-obvious points. It attains an element of imagination as well as logic and critical thinking. It reveals a creative and critical mind that uses the course materials and discussion as springboards to go further and reach one's own conclusions. The essay is written in correct grammatical form and an active prose style.

8: Adequate Essay ("B") – contains the major elements (claims, arguments, examples, contrary), but basically repeats what was covered in class and re-summarizes the readings. It has no significant errors in logic, fact or grammar, but also lacks the creative and critical prose of outstanding essays.

7: Partly Inadequate ("C"). The essay does not contain one of the major required elements (claims, arguments, examples, contrary), or it has significant errors in logic, fact or grammar. The essay might rely on old clichés and "common sense" rather than an argument supported by logic, evidence or examples. C-papers contain good thoughts but the ideas are not clarified much. It is difficult to always see the logic of the arguments, and there are a significant number of grammatical mistakes. (These are common faults among college essays.)

6 or less: Not Adequate ("D"). The essay did not answer the exam question; or it has major errors in logic, fact and grammar.

### **Evaluation criteria: Critical Commentary/short essay**

A critical commentary need not summarize all the points in the reading. It is sufficient to 1) summarize two or three key points from the reading, and the examples that the author uses to support his point; 2) critique the author with arguments and examples, from readings and current events; and if possible, 3) address the strongest contrary arguments and examples.

**ORGANIZATION.** Paper is well organized and flows logically. It critiques the reading with empirical claim, argument, and example(s). (Later in semester, it also considers *contrary* arguments and examples.)

**SUBSTANCE.** Paper includes substantively correct empirical examples/evidence from other readings and events.

**GRAMMAR.** Paper is grammatically correct and all words are spelled correctly.

**OVERALL = Organization (40%) + Substance (40%) + Grammar (20%).**

### SAMPLE: Critical Commentary/essay

In Moskos and Butler's *All That We Can Be*, the army is used as an institutionally unique forum for understanding race relations. They claim that the army stands out alone in America as an "organization unmatched in its level of racial integration" (p 2). It seems that racial harmony within the army, though not model of perfection is startlingly good. They offer both anecdotal and statistical proof for this claim, and thus move quickly onto questions of how, why, and the army's lesson's applicability for mainstream American life. A recurrent theme is that racial relations are a means, not an ends, within the armed services. Race based animosity is seen as a threat to safety and combat effectiveness, the clear goals of the army. To this end, the army has developed a number of interesting practices.

Perhaps most salient among these is the development and implementation of a training program, or school, meant to actively mold people into racially aware and harmonious individuals. Multiculturalism is taught and understood, but in the service of combat readiness, and it seems that it is in this moment: the shifting of race issues from ends to means that the army stands out. In a related way, the army has a disproportionate number of Afro-Americans in its ranks, when compared to the overall population. One reason is the large pool itself: with more Afro-Americans entering the army, there are more Afro-American to promote. In addition, army policy does not sacrifice quality for diversity. By providing extra training to those in need, the army does not lower standards, while increasing qualified minority candidates. In the army perspective, white racism *does not* stymie black achievement and the possibility of positive race relations; Afro-American under-representation *does*. In other words, white racism in the face of sizable black populations yields better results than minuscule black populations along side well meaning and politically correct white students (read: elite universities/colleges, e.g. Northwestern).

Can the lessons learned from the army, an institution vastly different from civilian life in many ways, be applied appropriately and effectively? Moskos and Butler reply with a resounding "yes", and offer 12 applicable lessons: the need for supply-side affirmative action, promoting black achievement (not suppressing white racism), the recognition of black/white race relations as (the) core of American culture [LINK to HUNTINGTON?], and the fostering of environments in which quality of service, not quality of server, is valued and emphasized. I believe that it is in this moment that Moskos and Butler stand apart from other authors we have read. They suggest, demand, and point out moments in which the kinds of robust moral discourse that SWAIN and others long for are put to use.

Arenas in which racial groups are put together, and explicitly and implicitly expected to get along, work together, and pursue conjoined goals seem to also be the locations of racial harmony, or at least communication. Yi's example of Jehovah's Witnesses as the most diverse church follows this trend, as does their implicit focus on racial cooperation in the face of non-racialized ends. Similarly, Emerson and Smith's exploration of the Evangelical efforts to address race issues in America, and the resulting fiasco suggest that talking about race is less effective than acting. A resounding idea seems to be that trying to move the racial discourse is not quite as effective as jumping into the fray and getting messy interaction while providing a forum for collaborative conversation (collective safety, faith...). It seems that in the conversation about race in America, Race itself acts as our sun: defining forms, issues and ideas, but only from above, for race itself, like the sun, is just a bit too bright/big/blinding to look at alone.

EVALUATION: 8.5 (A-/B+). Good critique of Moskos/Butler, links to different authors. Any links to current events; contrary arguments? What is the stronger counter-argument to the army as model for race relations? (hint: authoritarian hierarchy, tremendous resource expenditure)

### Optional Research Paper (extra credit)

One research-based paper on a topic related to our course (e.g. immigration, faith-based organizations, Proposition 8). Please link to (3) theoretical concepts from course. Two Options are available. Please prepare a summary proposal to get class comments before doing the bulk of the work on the paper.

1) *Individual Paper* (8-12 pages). Everybody in team writes a separate paper. Your paper links key concepts from class (at least 3 theory readings) with 3-5 outside sources: books, articles, interviews with key officials, or analysis of data sets. I recommend (but do not require) **one primary source**, such as interviews, original documents or analysis of data set. Paper includes full bibliography of sources. You pose a specific question, make critical claim(s), support your claim with supporting arguments and evidence, and address the strongest contrary arguments and examples. Please receive written feedback (peer review) from at least one team member.

2) *Group Paper* (12-16 pages). The team as a whole writes one paper. The grading on the project is based on individual and group effort. Please distribute research tasks on an equitable basis. Each student reviews and analyzes 4-8 key sources: books, articles, interviews with officials, or analysis of data sets. The project leader (who coordinates the other members) can review fewer sources. The team paper needs at least **one primary source**, such as interviews, original documents or analysis of data set. Please include a brief paragraph that states how each student contributed to the project and authored which section. Otherwise, same requirements as individual paper (e.g. critical arguments, bibliography). I encourage you to invite the professor to a team meeting. Presentations on Week 15.

TOPIC example: Ethnic and class relations in a medium-size city, such as in Spokane. What are the key determinants of engagement or indifference among different groups (e.g. college students, Korean immigrants, low-income residents)? What are some key organizational arenas of interaction: do schools and churches bridge differences? This topic can be studied by reviewing past scholarship on Spokane (e.g. Dr. Herold), reading the local newspaper on the current state of gown-town relations, and interviewing thoughtful informants. You can then compare your local analysis with studies of other localities (e.g. Putnam 2007, Yi 2009).

Another great research topic may be Proposition 8, and the role of different ethnic and religious groups.

#### Research References:

- \* Loftland & Loftland. 1995. *Analyzing Social Settings*. Qualitative (ethnographic) research.
- \* King, Keohane & Verba. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry*.
- \* *The craft of research* by Wayne C. Booth et al. 1995/2003. "Planning, Writing in Groups," p.29-34 (1995 version).
- \* Minnesota Social Capital Research Project:  
<http://www.acad.carleton.edu/curricular/POSC/MNSC/MNSCAP.pdf>

**Champion/Team Progress Report:** Please write a brief (2-3 paragraph) progress report that summarizes member attendance and the substance of discussion. Please include the following criteria:

Champion Name: Homer Smith

Team Name, Location, Date, Time: Team Liberty or Death, Crosby, Thursday, 7-830pm

Members present and time of attendance: 1) Bart (715-830pm); 2) Lisa (7-830pm); 3) Homer (705-830pm); 4) Marge (7-815pm). Marge had to leave early for FHA meeting; she is the president of local chapter.

Summary of discussion and activities: At team meeting #1, we introduced each other, reviewed and discussed commentaries and divided tasks for research paper. We each read two commentaries. I personally read all three: Lisa, Marge and Bart. Bart came late, and I volunteered to read his commentary. He actually had some interesting ideas for our weekly discussion of American founding and liberty. Bart said that some American founders, esp. Thomas Jefferson, had a somewhat anti-governmental, anarchic view of government (see Wilson, page xxx). A little rebellion once every generation, such as Shay's rebellion, reminds the government who is in charge and brings needed change. Lisa countered that the majority of founders, such as John Adams, abhorred violent rebellions that endangered property (see Wood, xxx). One revolution (1776) is enough! In a republican system, political change should be orderly, with regular elections and no damage to life or property.

In her commentary, Marge linked political radicalism and violence to civil rights and anti-war protests in the 1970s, and abortion and environment in the 1990s: she asked whether groups ever had legitimate cause to damage private or public property. I (Homer) linked political violence to recent entertainment (e.g. "V"). Homer also claimed forms of political extremism turn off the vast middle of American voters, who do not like violent rhetoric and conflict; voters may retreat from politics and the public sphere, and instead spend their time watching TV and playing video games.

Team paper: We thought the above topic would be great for research paper, and decide to divide up research tasks based on each member's interest. Bart and Lisa: Founders view on political extremism (e.g. Jefferson vs. Adams). Marge and Homer: 20<sup>th</sup> century protests, pop culture and public reaction. Bart and Marge will interview key experts and participants on radical movements (e.g. abortion, environment). Lisa will check public attitudes on political radicalism through the National Election Studies dataset. Homer will help coordinate member activities and take the lead in writing the intro and conclusion.

**PEER EVALUATION (Midterm, Final Projects):** When writing final evaluations of team members, please include the following criteria.

Team Member: John Smith

CONTRIBUTION / SUBSTANCE

Student always contributed substantively to group discussion and research

Student frequently contributed to substantively to group

Student sometimes contributed to group

Student rarely contributed to group

PREPARATION

Student was always well-prepared

Student frequently well-prepared

Student sometimes well-prepared

Student rarely well-prepared

HELPFUL

Student always attentive/supportive of group peers

Student frequently attentive/supportive of group peers

Student sometimes supportive of group peers

Student rarely supportive of group peers

Overall Evaluation: Excellent (4)...Good (3)...Satisfactory (2)...Mediocre (1)

GENERAL COMMENTS: