

English 101: College reading and composition I
 9:35—12:45 Saturdays, JH303
 Classroom section #0459

LACC Fall 2007
 Instructor Ed O'Connell
 www.snorko.org/lacc

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.

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.

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.

Essay #1: Analysis and refutation (6 pages total, due in three 2-page parts—part 1.1 due 9/15, part 1.2 due 9/22, and part 1.3 due 9/29, with an optional bonus 1.b due 10/6)

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 9/15	“For some decades now supposedly ‘liberal’ and ‘progressive’ forces within our society have waged an insidious campaign to corrupt and destroy the moral foundations of our liberty. Under the compassionate guise of government welfare and social programs they have eroded our fortitude and self-discipline, taxed away our independent resources, and in particular undermined the centrality of family as the locus of individual self-reliance. Under the guise of sexual freedom and self-determination they have corrupted our sense of responsibility for our own offspring in the womb and for our biological relationships in general. ...Under the guise of scientific knowledge, and a fallacious separation of religion from public life, they have thrown off the yoke of reason, and denied our sovereign right to acknowledge, as a people, the existence and authority of the Creator. ...Thus, though they masquerade as the champions of community and compassion, these self-styled “liberals” and “progressives” have discarded the principle of unity, the sense of a common good, indispensable to both..” (from <i>ValuesVoters' Contract with Congress</i>.)	“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 9/22	Only the United States, and more specifically, only the conservative, evangelical Christians of America are who stand between radical Islam and their quest for global domination. If	“Political reality is far more complicated than any of these myths [of pure conservatives v

<p>E1.2 9/22 con't</p>	<p>the world is to be saved from Muslim conquest, it will be America who does it. And if America is to be saved, only conservatism can do it. And if conservatism is to be saved, it will be those Bible-believing patriots who do it—those conservative, evangelical Christians who are the bedrock of the American way of life. Why? Because only Christianity has the intellectual and spiritual horsepower to defeat radical Islam and prevent the world from returning to the darkness of the 7th century. ... That's why anything that helps to further separate the West from its Biblical roots ultimately weakens the resolve of the West to fight. Anything that helps the ACLU to further de-Christianize America, to further silence the Christian voice like the current hate-crimes legislation or the fairness doctrine, and to further weaken the Church and devalue the Bible as the religious left has done for decades, are things that empower our enemies and weaken our allies. ... A post-Christian, post-modern, secular-socialist America will be no match for a radical Islam fueled by petro-dollars and threatening the use of nuclear weapons.” (from Frank Pastore's Why al Qaeda supports the emergent church)</p>	<p>pure liberals with pure moderates in between] allow. The biconceptual 'center' actually includes partial conservatives, 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, Thinking points, p 22)</p>
<p>E1.3 9/29</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>“...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>“One can meet priorities if they set priorities. The problem in Congress is they have trouble actually focusing on priorities. Appropriators take their title seriously and they all feel like they got to appropriate, which means there's a myriad of priorities. ...the role of the President, it seems to me, is to help Congress focus on that which is important. We have a debate over that which is important, of course, but one thing that we shouldn't have a debate over is whether or not it's important to fund our troops in this war against radicals, extremists, the war on terror. ...Congress needs to come together, solve their differences—solve their differences first... I have proven in the past... that one is able to set priorities—keep taxes low, grow the economy and reduce the deficit. In other words, we have cut taxes, causing economic growth... And we've proven that you can set priorities and meet obligations. ...so the Congress needs to learn to do that itself.” Question: “But you're confident that you can continue to sustain the kind of level of spending that you've invested in, in Iraq?” President Bush: “I would certainly hope so, because when you say, sustain the level of spending, you're mainly talking about making sure our troops have what it takes to do the job we've asked them to do. I know there's a lot of members who don't agree with the decisions I've made; I would certainly hope they would agree, however, that once someone is in combat or in harm's way, that they get the full support of the federal government. That's exactly what their families expect and that's what the Commander-in-Chief expects, as well.” (from Pres. George W. Bush's August 9, 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, Thinking points, 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 10/20; complete final draft due 11/3)

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 11/17; complete final draft due 12/1)

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: 12/7 & 8

Department final exam given Friday 12/7 (2 sessions: 8:00—11:00 AM and 6:00—9:00 PM) and also Saturday 12/8 (10:00 AM—noon) with classroom students: see previous terms and forthcoming information.

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. One copy of *Silver City* is on reserve for our class at LACC’s MLK Library. *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. *E*1, *E*2, etc. refer to the essays and their due dates.

Calendar of readings and assignment due dates

Week 1, 9/8: *TP* intro

Week 2, 9/15: *E*1.1 due; *TP* 1; *SS* 1—20

Week 3, 9/22: *E*1.2 due; *TP* 2; *SS* 21—40

Week 4, 9/29: *E*1.3 due; *TP* 3; *SS* 41—60; *Cor* I

Week 5, 10/6: optional *E*1.b due; *TP* 4;
SS 61—80; *Cor* I

Week 6, 10/13: *TP* 5; *SS* 81—100; *Cor* II

Week 7, 10/20: *E*2 half-done draft due; *TP* 6;
SS 101—120; *Cor* II

Week 8, 10/27: *TP* 7; *SS* 121—140; *Cor* III

Week 9, 11/3: *E*2 complete due; *TP* 8;
SS 81—160; *Cor* III

Week 10, 11/10: *Cor* IV

Week 11, 11/17: *E*3 half-done draft due; *Cor* IV

Week 12, 11/24: Thanksgiving; *Cor* V

Week 13, 12/1: *E*3 complete due; *Cor* V

Week 14, 12/7 & 8: Final exam