

Tolerance, Prejudice, and Constructing the “Real American”

IHHGS 399-01 / IHAMST 399-01

Dr. Robert Daniel Rubin

rrubin@keene.edu

Keene State College, Fall 2010

Monday/Wednesday 12:00–1:45 pm

COURSE SYLLABUS

American nationhood historically has rested on precarious footing. White Christian Europeans “settled” the North American terrain and sought to ensure that their own standards of civility shaped the society that emerged there. Gradually, those settlers, citizens of the United States of America, would understand themselves as destined to expand their influence and control over neighboring nations. Leaders of the United States denounced restrictions on private enterprise as “un-American”; most citizens understood the nuclear, heterosexual, father-led family as proper—as a healthy reproduction of the nation’s polity in miniature. When immigrants arrived from places other than the Western European countries from which the first settlers came, they often faced economic and political marginalization. Political radicals and opponents of American military excursions faced especially acute scorn. American culture, society, government, and law lauded particular types of people and behavior as fully and truly American and other types of people and behavior as suspect, lacking in Americanness.

Yet, in forging a distinctly white, Christian nationalism, those settlers and their descendants created foundational documents that embodied liberal premises and opened up space for a diverse citizenry. The Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution called for limited government; independent judiciaries; freedom of speech, press, and assembly; religious tolerance; and, for all citizens, full protection under the law. All of these premises testify to the nation’s roots in the European Enlightenment, which gave the nation a universalistic dimension. All citizens—at least in principle—were guaranteed standing as full Americans, even if they dissented from the government, from business leaders, or from the majority of citizens. In this sense, the “real American” was any and every citizen who embraced the nation and abided by its laws.

The American attempt, in relatively short order, to construct a cohesive nationalism has thus been fraught with a tension between particularist and universalist strands integral to the nation’s political culture. We might understand this tension as the product of our society’s antithetical yet inextricable tendencies toward prejudice and tolerance. Society creates “Americanness” through its prejudice: it excludes or rejects certain categories of personal identity and behavior as un-American. This course looks at Gordon Allport’s 1954 definition of prejudice as an “aversive or hostile attitude toward a person who belongs to a group, simply because he belongs to that group” and then considers how such an attitude has functioned historically to normalize and fortify the body social and political. By designating particular groups as “impure,” American political culture has justified marginalizing and even excising those groups from the normative, “healthy” nation.

At the same time, society and government create a nationalism based on tolerance—a nationalism that permits and incorporates a wide variety identities and behaviors and thereby enacts a more universalistic “American way of life.” This course traces the prescription of tolerance, within particular historical contexts, as a humane response to social and political marginalization. It also considers challenges to the practice of tolerance. Ultimately, this course reckons with how champions of Americanness have enacted either prejudice or tolerance and, in so doing, added to our multiple and contradictory conceptions of the “real American.”

From numerous theoretical and historical perspectives, this course explores the interplay of prejudice and tolerance in the construction of American nationalism. It begins with the 2008 presidential campaign, in which public commentators routinely told their intended audiences that they—in contrast to other audiences—constituted “real Americans.” The course looks at several historical episodes when one group or another attempted to define Americanness by establishing the social characteristics that did or did not fit within the bounds of Americanness. We will also examine an interdisciplinary array of theoretical arguments about prejudice and tolerance, as we try to determine for ourselves the most feasible premises on which the United States ought, in the future, to base its civic nationalism. Through extensive reading, writing, and conversation, each member of the class will arrive at her or his own position regarding Americanness—and, indeed, regarding this entire project called the United States.

Each member of the course will confront as well the potential damage and benefit wrought by American nationalism. This course will explore how persons are hurt or helped by prejudice; we will likewise consider the ways in which robust tolerance affects individuals, groups, and society as a whole. A nationalism based on prejudice and/or tolerance has consequences for persons inside and outside the United States, and this course will attempt to reckon with those consequences. It will try to fathom the impact of American nationalism on persons at the center of the political culture as well as those at the periphery.

Books to Be Purchased

Course Reader

Diana Hacker, *A Writers Reference* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2009).

Martha C. Nussbaum, *For Love of Country?*, ed. Joshua Cohen (Beacon: Boston, 2002). ISBN: 978-0-8070-4329-5.

Ronald Takaki, *A Different Mirror: A History of Multicultural America* (New York: Back Bay, 2008). ISBN: 987-0-316-02236-1.

James Waller, *Face to Face: The Changing State of Racism across America* (Cambridge, Mass.: Perseus, 1998). ISBN: 0-7382-0613-X.

Course Readings

- Spiro T. Agnew, “Impudence in the Streets” (1969). Reprinted in (and copied from) *Takin’ It to the Streets: A Sixties Reader*, ed. Alexander Bloom and Wini Breines (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 355–58. ISBN: 0–19–506624–3.
- Gordon W. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice* (1954; Cambridge, Mass.: Perseus, 1979), xv–xix, 3–9, 425–43. ISBN: 0-2010-0179-9.
- Neela Banerjee, “Ousted Pastor ‘Completely Heterosexual,’” *New York Times*, Feb. 7, 2007, p. A11. NYT Website refers to author as “Neela Banerjee of The New York Times.” [<http://o-www.lexisnexis.com.ksclib.keene.edu/hottopics/lnacademic/>]
- Carol Barner-Barry, *Contemporary Paganism: Minority Religions in a Majoritarian America* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 205–17. ISBN: 1-4039-6441-6.
- Barbara Barnette, “Minnesota Rep. Michelle Bachman Questions Obama’s Patriotism on ‘Hardball,’” *blogcritics.org*, Oct. 17, 2008.
- Max Blumenthal, “The Palin Effect: How Sarah Palin Made Herself Indispensable While Destroying the Republican Party,” *TomDispatch.com*, posted on Nov. 15, 2009. [www.tomdispatch.com/blog/175153/]
- Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
- Stokely Carmichael, “What We Want,” *New York Review of Books*, Sept. 22, 1966.
- Theodore Dalrymple, *In Praise of Prejudice: The Necessity of Preconceived Ideas* (New York: Encounter, 2007), 1–5, 17–20, 25–29. ISBN-13: 978-1-59403-202-8.
- “The Declaration of Independence,” in *The Constitution of the United States, with Case Summaries*, ed. Edward Conrad Smith and Harold J. Spaeth (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1987), 31–40. ISBN: 0-06-460209-5.
- Donald Douglas, “Is Barack Obama Anti-American?” *americanpowerblog*, Oct. 17, 2008. [<http://americanpowerblog.blogspot.com/2008/10/is-barack-obama-anti-american.html>]
- Stephen J. Ducat, *The Wimp Factor: Gender Gaps, Holy Wars, and the Politics of Anxious Masculinity* (Boston: Beacon, 2004), 168–91, 197–210. ISBN: 0-8070-4344-3.
- Timothy Egan, “The Party of Yesterday,” *New York Times*, Oct. 26, 2008, p. 14. Timothy Egan writes “Outposts,” a column at *nytimes.com*. [<http://o-www.lexisnexis.com.ksclib.keene.edu/hottopics/lnacademic/>]
- David Eisenbach, *Gay Power: An American Revolution* (New York: Carroll & Graf, 2006), 279–81. ISBN 13: 978-0-78671-633-0.
- Hiram Evans, “The Klan’s Fight for Americanism,” *North American Review*, 123 (March–May 1926), 33–63. Reprinted in (and copied from) John Mack Faragher et al., *Out of Many: A History of the American People*, Vol. 2, Documents Set, third edition. (Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 2000), 334–35. ISBN: 0–13–999582–X.
- Eugene Genovese, *The Southern Tradition: The Achievement and Limitations of an American Conservatism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1994), 1–5, 25–27. ISBN: 0-674-82527-6.
- Nick Gillespie, “Get Government out of the Bathroom,” *Reason*, 39 (Nov 2009), p. 17.
- Gregory M. Herek, “The Psychology of Sexual Preference,” in *Psychological Perspectives on Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Experiences*, ed. Linda D. Garnets and Douglas C. Kimmel (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), 157–64. ISBN: 0-231-12413-9.

- Martin Luther King, “I Have a Dream” speech (1963), in *A Call to Conscience: The Landmark Speeches of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.*, ed. by Clayborne Carson and Kris Shepard (New York: Warner, 2001), 81–87. ISBN: 0-446-52399-2.
- George Lakoff, *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think* (Chicago: University Of Chicago Press, 2002), 3, 29–36. ISBN: 0-226-46771-6.
- David Limbaugh, “Obama: Too Cool by Half?” DavidLimbaugh.com, Aug. 28, 2009. [http://www.davidlimbaugh.com/mt/archives/2008/08/new_column_obam_11.html]
- Dana Milbank, “A Senator’s Wide Stance: I Am Not Gay,” *Washington Post*, Aug. 29, 2007, p. A2. Dana Milbank is a staff writer for the Washington Post.
- Thomas Nagel, “Moral Conflict and Political Legitimacy,” *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 16 (Summer 1987), 215–40. Published in 1987 by Princeton University Press; currently published by Wiley Periodicals.
- John L. O’Sullivan, excerpts from “The Great Nation of Futurity,” *United States Democratic Review*, 6 (Nov. 1839), 426–30. http://www.pbs.org/kera/usmexicanwar/resources/manifest_destiny_sullivan.html.
- Leonard Pitts Jr., “Faking It in Real America,” *Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune*, Oct. 24, 2008. No page number available. Leonard Pitts Jr. is a columnist for the Miami Herald. His e-mail address is lpitts@miamiherald.com. [<http://www.lexisnexis.com.ksclib.keene.edu/hottopics/lnacademic/>]
- Preamble to U.S. Constitution, in *The Constitution of the United States, with Case Summaries*, ed. Edward Conrad Smith and Harold J. Spaeth (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1987), 41. ISBN: 0-06-460209-5.
- Janice Radway, “What’s In a Name?” Presidential Address to the American Studies Association, Nov. 20, 1998, *American Quarterly*, 51 (March 1999), 1–32.
- Sarah Rosenthal, “GOP Suffers from Small-Town Tourette’s,” *Brown Daily Herald* (Brown University), Oct. 29, 2008. [<http://www.lexisnexis.com.ksclib.keene.edu/hottopics/lnacademic/>]
- “Senator, Arrested in Airport Bathroom, Pleads Guilty,” *New York Times*, Aug. 28, 2007, p. 19.
- Woden Teachout, *Capture the Flag: A Political History of American Patriotism* (New York: Basic Books, 2009), 173–223, 249–56. ISBN 13: 978-0-465-00209-2.

Blackboard

At the course Blackboard site you will find documents describing the assignments, including the research paper. This syllabus is also available there. You can access Blackboard through your MyKSC page. After logging in, you should click on the course link. It is your responsibility to download for yourself the descriptions of the assigned paper and the peer critique. Please be sure also to check this site for course announcements, syllabus updates, and weather-related cancellations.

Writing

The precarious standing of the United States in the international order and in world history demands that Americans bring renewed attention to the character of their nation. We must ask ourselves: Who are Americans? How do they stand toward other peoples? Do some Americans belong more fully to their nation than do other Americans?

Such self-examination requires us to scrutinize American nationalism, including its historical dimension. More generally, we must be willing critically to assess the larger project of building or maintaining a nation. Does that project expose greater numbers of human beings to oppression than would be exposed if the world consisted of one single nation? Would human beings be safer and live more meaningful lives if they affiliated primarily, not with a nation, but with a tribe, subculture, or small institution? How is humanity affected by the dominance of a civic nation such as the United States, which purports to guarantee universal political rights, engages in “democracy” building throughout the world, and entices fervent loyalty from the majority of its own citizens?

In this course, we will practice scrutinizing these issues partly through our writing exercises. Students will draw on the skills acquired through their ITW course. The writing assignments should advance clear and concise arguments that enable students to comprehend their topic more fully. By composing those arguments students propel themselves into public discussion and equip themselves to persuade their readers. Students will consider arguments that diverge from or refute their own, in order that their own arguments ultimately grow deeper and persuade an even greater portion of their readers.

Writing well is thus central to this course. The assignments are designed to encourage the development of clear, concise, and persuasive academic writing. As important, the assignments will help each student to increase his or her understanding of American nationalism.

You will be given three types of written assignments:

1. Response Essays: Students will be asked to write four short essays that respond to an assigned reading or set of readings. Each essay will need specifically to answer or expand on a given set of questions. Students must be sure to follow all directions: An essay may not be shorter than the minimum length, and it may not exceed the maximum length. It must conform to the font and margin directions as well.
2. Research Paper: One of our main focuses in this course will be developing a sustained, well-reasoned argument in a 7–10 page writing project. We will work through the entire process step by step, from the initial stage of proposal (identifying an issue and questions that intrigue you), through the initial drafting and revising of your paper, to the second (final) draft.

3. Peer Critiques: You and three of your classmates will be placed into a four-member group. Each member of the group will read two other members' drafts and offer critical feedback. During the following class session the group will meet, and each member will listen as her fellow members report back their evaluations of her paper. Peer critiques will be performed for the proposal and the first draft. Each critique should be 1–1½ pages long, double spaced. The left, right, top, and bottom margins should all be 1”.
4. Writing Conferences: You will be required to schedule two conferences with me to discuss your writing. These meetings will help you to rework your drafts—not simply by “correcting” mistakes of grammar and punctuation, but by enabling you to see your drafts differently from how you saw them previously. These meeting will enable you to rethink the organizational concepts and writing methods that you have employed.

Intermittently throughout the semester, during regular class time, I will hold blocks of pre-scheduled meetings. You may schedule your writing conferences during these blocks or during regular office hours, in my office.

Writing conferences are mandatory. Failure to meet with me will hurt your grade. With each failure to meet with me by the above dates, your total for the course will drop by twenty points.

Attendance and Class Participation

Active and informed class participation is an essential part of this course. To receive a good grade, you need to read the assigned materials thoroughly and arrive at class prepared to participate.

You are permitted three absences without penalty. These absences are intended for use in case of illness. Each absence beyond the permitted three will cause your class-participation grade to drop by two points.

If you need to miss more than three class sessions because of religious observances or college-sanctioned events, you must provide me—by the end of the second week—with a written list of the dates and explanations for why the absences are necessary

To get credit for an assignment, you must submit it on the day that it is due. Missing class doesn't excuse you from turning in an assignment on time. If you do miss a class, you are responsible for finding out what you missed and getting copies of any new materials and assignments.

Repeated tardiness will harm your class participation grade. On any given day, if you arrive more than thirty minutes late for class, I will consider you absent for that day.

Late Assignments

In this course everyone relies on everyone else’s performance. Because of that, you are expected to participate in an active and informed manner; also, because of that, you are expected to turn in all assignments at the time that they are due. When you show up without that day’s assignment completed, you deprive other students of a valuable learning opportunity. You need to submit all assignments on time if you wish to get a good grade in this course.

To receive credit for an assignment, you must hand it in on time. If you absolutely need an extension on an assignment, you need to ask for it at least four full days before the assignment is due. Even this does not guarantee that you will get the extension.

Students with an excused absence—for illness, family tragedy, religious observance, or performance in an athletic event—must work out with me a plan for submitting the assignment. Even in this event, you need to inform me before the assignment is due, not afterward.

Quizzes

Six unannounced quizzes will be given at various times throughout the semester. Quizzes will ask short questions or give IDs based on the readings and class discussions. The quizzes will not be announced ahead of time. Although six quizzes will be given, only the four highest grades will be factored into the final grade; that is, the two lowest quiz grades will be dropped. *Quizzes will not be announced beforehand, and they may not be made up.*

Grading

Final grades will be calculated as follows:

Response papers (four)	5 pts. each	20%
Quizzes (four)	4 pts. each	16%
Research paper—proposal		5%
Peer Critiques (two)	5 pts. each	10%
Research paper—first draft		10%
Research paper—second (final) draft		25%
Class participation		14%

Etiquette

Please arrive promptly to all class sessions. If unavoidable circumstances delay your arrival, enter quietly and take your seat without disrupting the class.

Please turn off all cell phones before class begins. All use of cell phones, iPads, and laptops is prohibited during class.

Because in-class discussion is so central to this course, it is especially important that everyone respect and honor everyone else. Sensitive topics will be covered. No one should be made to feel wrong or foolish on account of their personal convictions, nor should classroom distractions cause anyone to feel ignored or slighted.

During discussions please treat your classmates and your instructor respectfully. Keep in mind the manner in which you present your views: thoughtful, well-reasoned opinions are welcome, but personal attacks are not.

Please do not use class time to discuss personal matters, such as grades and absences. Concerns regarding your own personal performance and evaluation should be addressed after class, during office hours, or by email.

While in class, please do not sleep, read magazines, or engage in other activities not related to this course. Please do not begin packing your books before class has ended.

Academic Integrity

You are encouraged to discuss course material with your classmates, and we will engage in collaborative work in class. Students sharing ideas is an important element of this course. However, you must complete all assignments and exercises on your own, unless you are specifically instructed to collaborate with another student on a particular assignment.

You are responsible for reading, understanding, and abiding by Keene State’s Policy on Academic Honesty [<http://www.keene.edu/policy/academichonesty.cfm>]. That policy strictly prohibits plagiarizing and cheating, and it requires that you give proper credit for other people’s ideas and/or words when you incorporate them into your own writing. We will spend time in class discussing appropriate methods for quoting, paraphrasing, summarizing, and citing sources. You should take these discussions very seriously.

Evidence of academic dishonesty will result in disciplinary action. If you are caught cheating, plagiarizing, or otherwise acting dishonestly, you will probably receive an F as a final grade for the entire course. After having read the college’s policy, if you remain confused about what does or does not constitute academic dishonesty, please see me during office hours.

Students with Disabilities

If you have a disability that may affect your performance in this course, please speak with me (after class, during office hours, or by email) as soon as possible so that we can make any necessary arrangements.

Assistance with Writing

For additional assistance with your writing, you may meet with a peer tutor at the KSC Center for Writing, 81 Blake St., 603-358-2412, or [<http://keeneweb.org/write>].

Class Cancellations

Whenever the weather is treacherous, you should check Blackboard to check for cancellations. On any day that class has been canceled due to inclement weather, a notice announcing the cancellation will be posted on Blackboard by 10:30 am that same day.

Ownership of this Syllabus

You are responsible for signing a form indicating that you have carefully read this syllabus in its entirety and have understood everything that it allows and requires from students. If there are parts of this syllabus that you do not fully understand, it is your responsibility to ask me to explain them until you do understand them. By signing this form you confirm your familiarity with all provisions of this syllabus.

Schedule of Readings

Part A: Who Counts as a “Real American”?

Monday, August 30: Course introduction

Wednesday, September 1: Who Counts as a “Real American”?

ASSIGNED READING:

1. Josh Lanier, “Hayes Explains Comments at McCain Rally” (2008), on Blackboard.
2. Max Blumenthal, “Will Palin Make It a Rogue GOP?” (2009).
3. Timothy Egan, “Party of Yesterday” (2008).
4. Barbara Barnette, “Minnesota Rep. Michelle Bachman Questions Obama’s Patriotism on ‘Hardball’” (2008).
5. Leonard Pitts Jr., “Faking It in Real America” (2008).
6. Clarence Page, “Flag Flyers Not Flying” (2008), on Blackboard.
7. Sarah Rosenthal, “GOP Suffers from Small-Town Tourette’s” (2008).

Monday, September 6: No class—Labor Day

Wednesday, September 8: “Joe the Plumber” as Patriotic Ideal

ASSIGNED READING:

1. Donald Douglas, “Is Barack Obama Anti-American?” (2008).
2. David Limbaugh, “Obama: Too Cool by Half” (2008).

Monday, September 13: Worldview and Politics

ASSIGNED READING:

1. George Lakoff, *Moral Politics* (2002), 3, 29–36.
2. Stephen J. Ducat, *The Wimp Factor* (2004), 168–91.

Wednesday, September 15: Worldview and Gender

ASSIGNED READING:

1. Ducat, *Wimp Factor* (2004), 197–210.

RESPONSE PAPER NUMBER 1 DUE: Compose and hand in a very short essay (between three quarters of a page and a full page in length) answering the following question: What do we gain from reading this book and thinking about its underlying argument? Your answer to this question should include a characterization of the author’s assumptions and goals.

**Part B: Constructing an American Nationalism:
Prejudice toward the Un-American”**

Monday, September 20: Foundational Ideals and American Nationalism

ASSIGNED READING:

1. Declaration of Independence (with added attention to first two paragraphs) (1776)
2. Preamble to U.S. Constitution (1789)

Wednesday, September 22: The Nature of Prejudice

ASSIGNED READING:

1. Gordon W. Allport, *Nature of Prejudice* (1954), xv–xix, 3–9.
2. James Waller, *Face to Face*, 1–42.

Monday, September 27: Facing Blackness

ASSIGNED READING:

1. Waller, *Face to Face*, 43–220.

RESPONSE PAPER NUMBER 2 DUE: Write and turn in a short essay (no less than a page and a half, no more than two pages in length) answering the following questions: What does Waller’s book suggest about the character of the United States? How persuaded are you by Waller’s book? After reading the book, what would state as fact about prejudice and its role in American society? Your essay should reflect your beliefs as well as the author’s claims.

Wednesday, September 29: The Will of the Christian Majority

ASSIGNED READING:

1. Margaret Barner-Barry, *Contemporary Paganism* (2005), 205–17.

Monday, October 4: Gays, Lesbians, and “Real Americans”

ASSIGNED READING:

1. Gregory M. Herek, “The Psychology of Sexual Preference” (2003), 157–64.
2. David Eisenbach, *Gay Power*, pp. 279–81.

IN-CLASS VIEWING: *Milk*, dir. Gus van Sant (2009), several-minute section on Anita Bryant talking about “real Americans”

Wednesday, October 6: Passing, Publicity, and the Instability of Anti-Americanism

ASSIGNED READING:

1. Ryan Lee, “Antigay Pastor Admits ‘Sexual Immorality,’” (2006), on Blackboard.
2. Neela Banerjee, “Ousted Pastor ‘Completely Heterosexual” (2007).
3. “Senator, Arrested in Airport Bathroom, Pleads Guilty” (2007).
4. Dana Milbank, “A Senator’s Wide Stance: I Am Not Gay”
5. Nick Gillespie, “Get Government out of the Bathroom” (2009).

Monday, October 11: Prejudice and the Good Society

ASSIGNED READING:

1. Eugene Genovese, *Southern Tradition* (1994).
2. Theodore Dalrymple, *In Praise of Prejudice* (2007).
3. Allport, *Nature of Prejudice* (1954), 425–43.

RESPONSE PAPER NUMBER 3 DUE: Write and turn in a short essay (between 1 and 1.5 pages long) that *cites Genovese and Dalrymple* in addressing the following question: Could an American society built on sturdy prejudices be a fair society?

Part C: Constructing an American Nationalism: Tolerance and Its Problems

Wednesday, October 13: Locke, Mill, and the Tolerant Society

ASSIGNED READING:

1. John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty* (1859), on Blackboard.

Monday, October 18: Tolerance, Neutrality, and Ideology

ASSIGNED READING:

1. Thomas Nagel, “Moral Conflict and Political Legitimacy” (1987).
2. Ronald Takaki, *Different Mirror* (2008), 3–20.

Wednesday, October 20: The Problem of American Civilization

ASSIGNED READING:

1. Takaki, *Different Mirror*, 26–130. (Read the entire section, but skim over details.)

Monday, October 25: Manifest Destiny and American Nationalism

ASSIGNED READING:

1. Takaki, *Different Mirror*, 155–76.
2. John L. O’Sullivan, “Great Nation of Futurity” (1839)

Wednesday, October 27: Varieties of Patriotism

ASSIGNED READING:

1. Frederick Douglass “What Is the Slave to the Fourth of July?” (1852).
2. King, “I Have a Dream” (1963).

RESPONSE PAPER NUMBER 4 DUE: Write and submit a short essay (no less than 1.5 pages, no more than 2 pages in length) that cites Douglass’s speech in addressing the question: Was Fredrick Douglass a patriotic American? Why or why not?

IN-CLASS VIEWING: Tea Party declaration of love toward America but resistance toward its government (2009 or 2010).

Monday, November 1: Loyalty and Americanism

ASSIGNED READING:

1. Hiram Evans, “The Klan’s Fight for Americanism” (1926).
2. Spiro T. Agnew, “Impudence in the Streets,” (1969).

RESEARCH PAPER PROPOSAL DUE

Wednesday, November 3: Americanism and the Flag

ASSIGNED READING:

1. Woden Teachout, *Capture the Flag* (2009).

PEER CRITIQUES OF PROPOSALS DUE

PEER GROUPS DISCUSS CRITIQUES, EXCHANGE PAPERS

Monday, November 8: Imperialism of the Civic Nation

ASSIGNED READING:

1. *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
2. King, “I Have a Dream” (1963).
3. Stokely Carmichael, “What We Want” (1966).
4. Janice Radway, “What’s In a Name?,” presidential address to the American Studies Association (1999).

Wednesday, November 10:

STUDENT-INSTRUCTOR MEETINGS

Monday, November 15: The Virtues of Tolerance I

ASSIGNED READING:

1. Ingrid Creppell, “Toleration, Politics, and the Role of Mutuality” (2008), 315–30, on Blackboard.

Wednesday, November 17: Mutuality and the True Believer

In-class writing exercise

Monday, November 22:

STUDENT-INSTRUCTOR MEETINGS

Wednesday, November 24: No class—Thanksgiving

Monday, November 29: The Virtues of Tolerance II

ASSIGNED READING:

1. Ingrid Creppell, “Toleration, Politics, and the Role of Mutuality” (2008), on Blackboard.

RESEARCH PAPER, FIRST DRAFT, DUE

Wednesday, December 1: Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism

ASSIGNED READING:

1. Martha C. Nussbaum, “Introduction: Cosmopolitan Emotions,” ix–xiv, and “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism,” 3–17, in Nussbaum, *For Love of Country* (2002).
2. Charles Taylor, “Why Democracy Needs Patriotism,” in Nussbaum, *For Love of Country*, 119–21.
3. Immanuel Wallerstein, “Neither Patriotism nor Cosmopolitanism,” in Nussbaum, *For Love of Country*, 122–24.

Monday, December 6: Cosmopolitanism and Naïveté

RETURN FIRST DRAFT TO STUDENTS

ASSIGNED READING:

1. Benjamin R. Barber, “Constitutional Faith,” in Nussbaum, *For Love of Country*, 30–37.

Tolerance, Prejudice, and Constructing the “Real American” 14

2. Gertrude Himmelfarb, “Illusions of Cosmopolitanism,” in Nussbaum, *For Love of Country*, 72–77.

PEER CRITIQUES OF FIRST DRAFTS DUE
PEER GROUPS DISCUSS CRITIQUES, EXCHANGE PAPERS

Wednesday, December 8
STUDENT-INSTRUCTOR MEETINGS

Monday, December 13 (No class: Reading Day)

Wednesday, December 15 (1:00 pm–1:30 pm)
RESEARCH PAPER, SECOND (FINAL) DRAFT, DUE

Schedule of Classes—Section 29 (Monday and Wednesday, 12:00–1:45)

Readings listed for a particular date are to be completed by *that class session*.

DATE	READING (FOR THAT DAY)	ASSIGNMENT DUE
Mon., Aug. 30		Course introduction
Wed., Sept. 1	Lanier, “Hayes Explains Comments” Blumenthal, “Will Palin Make It a Rogue GOP?” Egan, “Party of Yesterday” Barnette, “Bachman Questions Obama’s Patriotism” Pitts, “Faking It in Real America” Page, “Flag Flyers Not Flying” Rosenthal, “GOP Suffers”	
Mon., Sept. 6	NO CLASS— LABOR DAY	
Wed., Sept. 8	Douglas, “Is Barack Obama Anti-American?” Limbaugh, “Obama: Too Cool by Half”	

Tolerance, Prejudice, and Constructing the “Real American” 15

DATE	READINGS (FOR THAT DAY)	ASSIGNMENT DUE
Mon., Sept. 13	Lakoff, <i>Moral Politics</i> Ducat, <i>Wimp Factor</i> , 168–91.	
Wed., Sept. 15	Ducat, <i>Wimp Factor</i> , 197–210.	Response paper no. 1
Mon., Sept. 20	Declaration of Independence, first two paragraphs Preamble to U.S. Constitution	
Wed., Sept. 22	Allport, <i>Nature of Prejudice</i> , xv–xix, 3–9 Waller, <i>Face to Face</i> , 1–42	
Mon., Sept. 27	Waller, <i>Face to Face</i> , 43–220	Response paper no. 2
Wed., Sept. 29	Barner-Barry, <i>Contemporary Paganism</i>	
Mon., Oct. 4	Herek, “Psychology of Sexual Preference” Eisenbach, <i>Gay Power</i>	
Wed., Oct. 6	Lee, “Antigay Pastor Admits ‘Sexual Immorality,’” Banerjee, “Ousted Pastor Heterosexual” “Senator, Arrested in Airport Bathroom, Guilty” Milbank, “Senator’s Wide Stance” Gillespie, “Get Government out of the Bathroom”	
Mon., Oct. 11	Genovese, <i>Southern Tradition</i> Dalrymple, <i>In Praise of Prejudice</i> Allport, <i>Nature of Prejudice</i> , 425–43	Response paper no. 3
Wed., Oct. 13	Mill, <i>On Liberty</i>	
Mon., Oct. 18	Nagel, “Moral Conflict and Political Legitimacy” Takaki, <i>Different Mirror</i> , 3–20	
Wed., Oct. 20	Takaki, <i>Different Mirror</i> , 26–130	
Mon., Oct. 25	Takaki, <i>Different Mirror</i> , 155–76 O’Sullivan, “Great Nation of Futurity”	
Wed., Oct. 27	Douglass “What Is the Slave to the Fourth of July?” King, “I Have a Dream”	Response paper no. 4
Mon., Nov. 1	Evans, “Klan’s Fight for Americanism” Agnew, “Impudence in the Streets”	Research paper proposal
Wed., Nov. 3	Teachout, <i>Capture the Flag</i>	Peer critique of proposal
Mon., Nov. 8	<i>Brown v. Board of Education</i> King, “I Have a Dream” Carmichael, “What We Want” Radway, “What’s In a Name?”	
Wed., Nov. 10	STUDENT-INSTRUCTOR MEETINGS	
Mon., Nov. 15	Creppell, “Toleration, Politics, and the Role of Mutuality,” 315–30	

Tolerance, Prejudice, and Constructing the “Real American” 16

DATE	READINGS (FOR THAT DAY)	ASSIGNMENT DUE
Wed., Nov. 17		Writing exercise: Mutuality and the True Believer
Mon., Nov. 22	STUDENT-INSTRUCTOR MEETINGS	
Wed., Nov. 24	NO CLASS— THANKSGIVING	
Mon., Nov. 29	Creppell, “Toleration, Politics, and the Role of Mutuality,” 330–52	Research paper, first draft
Wed., Dec. 1	Nussbaum, “Introduction: Cosmopolitan Emotions” Nussbaum, “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism” Taylor, “Why Democracy Needs Patriotism” Wallerstein, “Neither Patriotism nor Cosmopolitanism”	Peer critique of first draft
Mon., Dec. 6	Barber, “Constitutional Faith” Himmelfarb, “Illusions of Cosmopolitanism”	
Wed., Dec. 8	STUDENT-INSTRUCTOR MEETINGS	
Wed., Dec. 15		Research paper, final draft, 1:00–1:30