

Course texts

Lakoff, G. 2006. *Thinking points: communicating our American values and vision*.
 New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.

Sayles, J. 2004. *Silver City and other screenplays*. New York: Nation Books.

Shakespeare, W. and J. Crewe. 1999. *Coriolanus*. New York: Penguin Books Pelican Shakespeare.

Welcome to English 101, a requirement for virtually all college students. This course develops students' proficiency in college level reading and writing through practice of critical thinking and well-developed expository writing. Find below details on the assignments, readings, and other course information. Dates and schedule subject to slight revision due to class needs or unforeseen events. Essay assignments below show basic requirements. Much more detail and practice will be provided in class. All essays should be typed, double-spaced, in 12-point Verdana font, 1" margins, with in-text citations and references arranged in APA-style format. For essay length requirements, one page ≥ 250 words.

Attendance is required, and as per college policy, students may be dropped after missing a week of class time, or about 3 hours of a 3-unit course. Arriving late and leaving early adds up to unexcused absence as well as does skipping class completely. An attendance record will be posted each day, and students should sign in upon entering class. Online courses are available for students looking for a more independent schedule.

Warning: late essays are not accepted for credit. Late essays will not be scored but will be marked zero. Don't be late: a zero on any of the essays would severely decrease course grades. Students are encouraged to submit drafts early, both for revision tips and to avoid being late due to emergencies.

Essay #1: Analysis and refutation (6 pages total, due in three 2-page parts—part 1.1 due 7/18, part 1.2 due 7/23, and part 1.3 due 7/26, with an optional bonus 1.b also due 7/26)

Write three 2-page analyses of assigned text arguments, newspaper editorials, opinion columns, or persuasive essays. The three separate parts of essay #1 are due on different days but averaged into one score. For each part, students should choose one of two approaches: either refute ideas from *Thinking points* using the assigned essays and other supporting points, or use *Thinking points'* ideas to argue against the contrasting essays, columns, or ideas. Use the chart below to help organize your work.

Due date	Op/ed column, persuasive essay, or thesis/argument (find links online at www.snorko.org/lacc)	Contrast to <i>Thinking points'</i> hypotheses, implications
E1.1 7/18	"we need to be clear about the difference between what conservatives and liberals mean by the term 'values.' I am talking about right and wrong that we know because we learn them from our Bible and tradition that have been handed down through the ages. ...If conservatives learn values from the Bible, where do liberals learn theirs? I guess you can call it this: Make it up as you go along, do what you feel like, and get grants to fund university research to justify what you want to be true. Materialism. Relativism. Hedonism. Life as grass-roots activism. Anything you can muster enough votes for must be true." (from Star Parker's Conservative values versus liberal values)	"Voters who didn't agree with Reagan on the issues still wanted to vote for him...For these four reasons—values, connection, authenticity, and trust—voters <i>identified</i> with Reagan ..Whatever we may think of Reagan, this has been a winning formula for conservatives for the past quarter century ...The purpose of this handbook is to lay out the anatomy of progressive values, ideas, and arguments to free us from the traps we have fallen into...[plus the following] Twelve traps to avoid." (from Lakoff's <i>Thinking points</i>, pp 7—13)
E1.2 7/23	"The liberal motto is 'In Government we trust.' ...the agenda recommends denial of personal responsibility, encourages self-pity and other-pity, fosters government dependency, promotes sexual indulgence, rationalizes violence, excuses financial obligation, justifies theft, ignores rudeness, prescribes complaining and blaming, denigrates marriage and the family, legalizes all abortion, defies religious and	"Political reality is far more complicated than any of these myths [of pure conservatives v pure liberals with pure moderates in between] allow. The biconceptual 'center' actually includes partial conservatives,

	<p>social tradition, declares inequality unjust, and rebels against the duties of citizenship. ...liberalism's distortions of the normal ability to reason can only be understood as the product of psychopathology. ...The modern liberal mind, its distorted perceptions and its destructive agenda are the product of disturbed personalities" (from Lyle Rossiter's <i>The liberal mind: the psychological causes of political madness</i>)</p> <p>"Alas, psychological reductionism is an analytical malady that is not confined to the left wards of the political looney bin, as demonstrated today on <i>TownHall.com</i> by columnist and shrink Lyle Rossiter's <i>The Psychodynamics of the Radical Liberal Mind</i>. Rossiter, in fact, is Lakoff in reverse, his <i>doppelgänger</i> ...an 'evil twin' or 'the ghostly double of a living person.'" (from John Rosenberg's <i>Reductionism ad absurdum</i>)</p>	<p>partial progressives, and undecideds (biconceptuals in nonpolitical areas of life but with no fixed moral views governing their politics). Conservatives have understood the 'center' in this way, and they understand that biconceptuals have both worldviews. By using conservative language, and repeating it over and over, they activate the deeper conservative value system, not only in their base but in partial conservatives as well. They also use antiliberal language...to inhibit progressive values." (Lakoff, <i>Thinking points</i>, p 22)</p>
<p>E1.3 7/26</p>	<p>"My friends, I hope the editorial writers for the <i>New York Times</i> [7/8/07] would pay attention to Ayman al-Zawahiri, al-Qaida's deputy chief, who said that the United States is merely delaying our 'inevitable' defeat in Iraq, and that 'the Mujahideen of Islam in Iraq of the caliphate and jihad are advancing with steady steps towards victory.' Their target is not Iraq. Pay attention to their words. Their target is the United States of America." (from Sen. John McCain's July 11, 2007 remarks in the US Senate)</p> <p>"we are dealing al Qaeda in Iraq serious blows. Everyone in the American political debate professes to want to fight al Qaeda in Iraq, but now that we are finally doing it effectively Democrats and some Republicans are all but ignoring it. Defeating al Qaeda should be our minimum goal in Iraq no matter what broader policy we choose, whether it is simply a U.S. bugout, a so-called soft partition, or the eventual establishment of a stable, self-sufficient government. If we draw down now, we would give back our hard-won progress against al Qaeda." (from <i>National Review's</i> editorial <i>Don't panic</i>)</p> <p>"...sometimes the debate over Iraq is cast as a disagreement between those who want to keep our troops in Iraq and those who want to bring our troops home. And this is not the real debate. ...The real debate over Iraq is between those who think the fight is lost or not worth the cost, and those that believe the fight can be won and that, as difficult as the fight is, the cost of defeat would be far higher." (from Pres. George W. Bush's July 11, 2007 press conference)</p>	<p>"...look at Iraq. Conservatives have taken the framing initiative and continue to call it 'war.' This frame has very real implications, especially considering the commonplace theory that America only fights the good fight. If what is happening in Iraq is seen as a 'war,' it has to be a just war, despite how and why we got into it. It has to be a war against evil, or we wouldn't be in it. And we have to fight to the finish, however difficult it may be. ...The war frame is dishonest and has led to a loss of life. We need to reframe what's going on in Iraq and tell the truth: this is an occupation, not a war. ...The question is not <i>whether</i> to withdraw but <i>when</i>. In an occupation, the problem is not an evil enemy. The problem is when to leave." (Lakoff, <i>Thinking points</i>, pp 32—33)</p>

For each of the four parts of essay #1, study both the week's reading from *Thinking points* and the contrasting readings. Determine what each author believes (topic + opinion = thesis) and why (reasons, examples, and evidence = argument). Organize your 2-page analyses into three long paragraphs in the following fashion:

The first sentences of the first paragraph should list the author, title, date and thesis of the work and identify that it is to be refuted. Here are a couple models: **On page 5 of his 2007 book *Thinking points*, Lakoff mistakenly claims the war in Iraq has made the US weaker, poorer, and less ethical—or—In his June 28, 2007 speech to the Naval War College, President Bush wrongly claimed that if Iraq can "function as a democracy even amid violence," "like Israel," that will constitute success for both Iraq and the US.** Next, briefly list the reasons given in the original as support. The last sentences of the first paragraph should state a contrasting opinion on the topic to be argued as the alternate thesis.

The second paragraph should explain and refute the original argument in detail, point by point, reason by reason. Explain why the original has misunderstood the situation, gone too far in its approach, forgotten important information, presented an impractically idealistic goal, or otherwise created a flawed analysis.

Try to use ethical, associative, and predictive reasoning to critique the argument refuted:

Ethical reasoning: judge right and wrong standards of morality as applied to topic

Associative reasoning: compare to other situations or events as they inform topic

Predictive reasoning: predict hypothetical future results as models for action

The third paragraph should explain reasons, examples, or other evidence to support the alternate thesis. Do not simply repeat the refutation of the second paragraph, but argue a case in support of the alternate thesis. Try to use ethical, associative, and predictive reasoning to support your alternative thesis. Use as an example at least one source of information on the topic not presented in class but personally found through research and give an author, title, date reference (also document these researched sources in the annotated bibliography for the journal assignment below).

Grading rubric for each part to essay #1; four categories, up to one point each = top score 4

_____ The original source info, thesis, and argument of an assigned work are identified in the first paragraph and designated unsatisfactory;

_____ An alternate thesis on the topic is presented at the end of the first paragraph;

_____ The argument supporting the original is refuted point by point in the second paragraph;

_____ An argument supporting the alternate thesis is developed and sufficiently explained in the third paragraph, perhaps using ethical, associative, and predictive reasoning; one referenced outside source explained as support.

Essay #2: Political candidate analysis, contrasting colloquial fiction and academic non-fiction styles (3-page academic analysis + 3-page short story = 6 pages total, with half-done draft due 7/30; complete final draft due 8/2)

Research a current candidate for political office and analyze the candidate's projected character and positions to test the value of Lakoff's model from chapter 4 of the Nurturant parent/progressive vision versus the Strict father/conservative vision in contemporary politics. Research a wide variety of editorials and news stories, and include analysis of at least 4 newspaper articles, editorials, or opinion columns published in the last six months (these may include two previously used for essay #1, if desired). Outline, draft, and revise a 3-page formal academic persuasive analysis of the situation with clear introduction (including thesis and outline of argument), fully explained body of argumentation (perhaps structured around ethical, associative, and predictive reasoning), and conclusion (restating thesis and summarizing argument). Prepare in-text references and reference page in APA style. Consider Sayle's screenplay *Silver City* and his portrayal of a gubernatorial candidate. Create an original, fictionalized evaluation of the important aspects of the candidate's campaign in a 3-page short story. Create characters, describe the setting, and explain the plot using at least three other literary devices to convey the story's theme(s). Use rubric presented in class to help organize and revise essay. More details and practice provided in class.

Essay #3: Metaphorical lessons from literature on today's world (6 pages total, half-done draft due on 8/6; complete final draft due 8/13)

Create and argue a thesis comparing the metaphoric lessons two different characters from Shakespeare's *Coriolanus* offer toward the using the model "How argument frames work" discussed in *Thinking Points'* chapter 8 to evaluate debate on an important current issue or event. Develop a metaphor on your thesis in which the two characters are interpreted to represent better and worse arguments for action on the issue or event. Research a wide variety of editorials and news stories, and include analysis of at least 4 newspaper articles, editorials, or opinion columns published in the last six months and **not** previously used for essay #1 or #2. Prepare in-text references and reference page in APA style. Use rubric presented in class to help organize and revise essay.

Journal: scored weekly and averaged

Class notes, students' ideas on discussion, responses to other students' ideas, and drafts of essays should be collected on an ongoing basis and presented as the journal for scoring in class on Wednesdays. To help students organize their research and drafts of essays, the journal should also include two annotated

bibliographic references for each week of class, presented in APA format (see examples at <http://www.library.cornell.edu/olinuris/ref/research/skill28.htm>). Students' journals should comprise at least one page combined of class notes, rough drafts, and annotated bibliography for each day of class.

Final exam: 8/15—16

Final exam will be a presentation of essay #3 to the class. More details and practice will be provided in class.

Grade weights and scales (all assignments scored on 4-point scale then adjusted to fit 100 point total)

Essay #1: 25% (4-point rubric score x 6.25)
Essay #2: 25% (4-point rubric score x 6.25)
Essay #3: 25% (4-point rubric score x 6.25)
Journal: 15% (4-point rubric score x 3.75)
Final exam: 10% (4-point rubric score x 2.5)
Total: 100% (100 adjusted points total)

A = 90—100% (4-point scale scores 3.6—4.0)
B = 80—89% (4-point scale scores 3.2—3.59)
C = 70—79% (4-point scale scores 2.8—3.19)
D = 60—69% (4-point scale scores 2.4—2.79)

Readings

TP 1, 2, 3, etc. refer to the chapters of George Lakoff's *Thinking points*. LAPL has a couple copies. *SS* 1—80 and 81—160 refer to page numbers in John Sayles' *Silver City and other screenplays*. LAPL has the film but not the book. *Cor* I, II, III, IV, and V refer to the acts of the play *Coriolanus*, by William Shakespeare. The Pelican paperback in the bookstore is good, but most libraries will have annotated Shakespeare texts that will serve as well—perhaps included in a volume of the collected works. Free online non-annotated versions in the public domain (for example at MIT's <http://shakespeare.mit.edu>) are also useful for searching with an edit→find computer function. Other reading assignments will be freely available online, particularly in newspaper editorials and opinion columns. E1, E2, etc. refer to the essays and their due dates.

Calendar of readings and assignment due dates

Week 1 (7/16—19): *TP* intro/1/2; *Cor* I;
E1.1 due Wed 7/18

Week 2 (7/23—26): *TP* 3/4/5; *Cor* II
E1.2 due Mon 7/23; E1.3 due Thu 7/26; optional E1.b also 7/26

Week 3 (7/30—8/2): *TP* 6/7/8; *SS* 1—80; *Cor* III
E2.1 due Mon 7/30; E2 complete due Thu 8/2

Week 4 (8/6—9): *SS* 81—160; *Cor* IV/V
E3.1 due Mon 8/6

Week 5 (8/13—16): Final exam presentations 8/15—16
E3 complete due Mon 8/13