

**HIST 7680/8680: Studies in US History after 1877:
The US Post-1945**

Sarah Potter

Mitchell 111

678-1713

spotter1@memphis.edu

Office hours: Thursdays, 1:30-2:30, and by appointment

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

This course will cover US history after 1945, including topics such as suburbanization and consumption, a variety of social movements, the Cold War, the rise of the service economy, and postmodernity. We will read a mix of both newer and older texts, discussing both the major events and trends in the post-World War II US and the debates in the historical literature surrounding those events.

This course will also make you a better reader, which will help you with your comprehensive exams (not to mention the rest of your career as a historian). As we read each assigned text this semester, we will explore the author's argumentation and methodology. We will probe her/his assumptions, explore the larger ramifications of her or his argument, and consider how s/he understands causality, change over time, and the agency of historical actors. We will also discuss how each author crafted his or her argument and developed it in the text, so that the books we read this semester can serve as models when you begin to think about your own dissertation or MA thesis research.

By the end of the semester, students should be able to:

- knowledgeably discuss and explain many of the key historical events, movements, figures, trends, and transitions in the US after 1945
- knowledgeably discuss and explain some of the key historical interpretations of and debates about important historical events, movements, figures, trends, and transitions in the US after 1945
- identify and evaluate the argument, methodology, analytical approach, and assumptions embedded in historical monographs in both your oral and written work.
- discuss and analyze historical texts in relation to one another in both your oral and written work.
- write a clear, insightful, well-argued, and convincing historiographical paper on a topic covered in the course.

BOOKS:

Required books are available at the university bookstore or you may order them online.

Required:

Lizabeth Cohen, *A Consumers Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America* (2003)

Thomas Sugrue. *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit* (1996)

Adam Rome, *The Bulldozer in the Countryside: Suburban Sprawl and the Rise of American Environmentalism* (2001)

Mary Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (2000)

Andrew Huebner, *Warrior Image: Soldiers in American Culture from the Second World War to the Vietnam Era* (2008)

Martin Klimke, *The Other Alliance: Student Protest in West Germany and the United States in the Global Sixties* (2010)

Aram Goudsouzian, *Down to the Crossroads: Civil Rights, Black Power, and the Meredith March Against Fear* (2014)

Dorothy Sue Cobble, *The Other Women's Movement: Workplace Justice and Social Rights in Modern America* (2004)

Daniel Williams, *God's Own Party: The Making of the Christian Right* (2010)

Bethany Moreton, *To Serve God and Wal-Mart: The Making of Christian Free Enterprise* (2009)

Jefferson Cowie, *Stayin' Alive: The 1970s and the Last Days of the Working Class* (2010)

Daniel T. Rodgers, *Age of Fracture* (2011)

Additional required weekly readings are available on eCourseware.

Suggested readings:

You will each read one suggested reading this semester and present the book (and your reading notes and paragraph on it) to the class. See each week's list for the options. This semester you will also write a historiographical essay for which you will need to read an additional 3 books. Start preparing for your presentation and paper early so that you will have acquired and read all of the necessary books in time.

You may need to do additional reading to do well in this course. For a general introduction to this period in US history, I suggest you consult the following works:

- If this is your first time taking a class on the 20th century US, you should read the relevant chapters of a US history survey textbook. Eric Foner's *Give me Liberty!* is excellent, but nearly any book will give you the basics, and you do not need the most recent edition. Let me know if you would like me to give you a copy of a textbook – I have a number of extras. You should also consider investing in William Chafe's *The Unfinished Journey: America since World War II*, which will delve into topics during the postwar era more deeply than will a general survey textbook. You do not need the most recent edition.
- A number of academic historians have also provided insightful analyses of this time period. These works are not so much overviews of what happened (i.e., they are not textbooks), but instead interpretations as to what is significant about this era and how it reflects or relates to broader transformations in American history. A few to consider: James T. Patterson, *Grand Expectations: The United States, 1945-1974* and *Restless Giant: The United States from Watergate to Bush v. Gore*; H.W. Brands, *American Dreams: The United States since 1945*.

If you are looking for additional information on various historiographical topics or themes in American history, I suggest you consult:

- *Journal of American History* and *American Historical Review* (these journals often have historiographical essays by top scholars)
- James M Banner, Jr., ed., *A Century of American Historiography* (Bedford/St. Martin's, 2010)
- Harvard Sitkoff, ed., *Perspectives on Modern America: Making Sense of the Twentieth Century* (Oxford University Press, 2001)

Assignments:

Weekly Paragraph

Every week, you will write a 250-word paragraph (no, you may not write more than 250 words and you may not write more than one paragraph) answering the following question about the week's assigned monograph:

- What is the most important contribution of this book to historical scholarship on the United States after 1945?

Your paragraph, like all paragraphs in scholarly writing, should begin with a statement of your main point, which in this case is *your answer* to the above question. The body of the paragraph should explain the reasoning behind your interpretation, and it must be based on the evidence you have before you (i.e., the assigned readings for the week). Your paragraph should stay focused on your main point, it should be organized so as to clearly and logically develop your ideas, and it should fully cover your main point. Your writing should be clear and grammatically correct. You should use your own words to make your point, but you may use evidence from the text to support and explain that point. (In other words, don't just quote the author's explanation for why this book is important. Instead, step back, analyze the book yourself, and provide your own answer in your own words.) If you use material from the text, cite it using Chicago Style footnotes.

You will hand in your paragraph to the online dropbox every week. It will be due at the start of class. You should bring a hard copy of your paragraph to class each week to use during the discussion. See the attached page of rubrics for information on how your paragraph will be graded.

Reading Notes (Answer questions and provide a chapter outline – Template on ecourseware)

Your most important task in this course is to read and think carefully about the readings. Part of that process is disciplined note-taking. (You'll also be glad you have good notes when it's time to take your comprehensive exam, and this will hopefully help get you into the routine of taking good reading notes.)

Students should **hand in the answers to following questions on every assigned book:**

- 1) What is the *key question* the author asks? (i.e.: what does the author seek to understand, and how does s/he frame his or her interrogation into the topic?)
- 2) What is the author's *key argument*? (i.e.: how does the author answer that question? What is the main claim of this book?)
- 3) What is the *evidence* on which the author bases that argument?
- 4) What *concepts, theories, or ideas* inform the author's approach, including any *assumptions* or *unexamined beliefs*? (i.e.: what is the author's theoretical framework, and is there anything that the author takes for granted?)
- 5) What is the author's *intervention* in the existing literature? (i.e.: What does this book's argument add to the field? How does it change our thinking? Why is it significant?)

Your answers to these questions should be itemized (i.e., *specifically address each question, DO NOT* just write a general paragraph that you believe addresses these questions). While I do not expect completely polished prose, your answers should be written as fully explicated thoughts

that I can understand. Your answers will vary in length by question, but generally your answers overall should fill roughly three-quarters of a page, single-spaced.

Following your answers to these questions, you should also **provide a brief chapter outline of the assigned book**. Write down each chapter number (including the introduction and conclusion, epilogue, etc.) and explain the key argument or idea that is advanced in that chapter. *Do not* just state the topic of the chapter; instead state the argument of the chapter and explain how it fits into the larger claim of the book. You should write at least a few sentences per chapter.

You should also write a **brief summary of the assigned article(s) for the week**. Your summary should provide the main argument of each article and explain how the author develops that argument. This summary can be a formal paragraph, or it can be in the form of notes – as long as they are clearly-written and fully explicated enough that I can understand them (this will ensure these notes remain useful to you years from now, when you no longer recall the article itself). Each article summary should take up around 1/3 or so of a page, single-spaced.

You will hand in these notes to the online dropbox every week. They will be due at the start of class. You should bring a hard copy of your notes to class each week to use during the discussion. See the attached page of rubrics to see how your reading notes will be graded.

Presentation/Paragraph/Notes on Supplemental Reading

I have listed supplemental readings for each week of this course. You will each read one of these texts (or another related text, which must be approved by me) and do a five- to ten-minute presentation in which you explain to the class the book's main argument and contribution. You will also prepare a paragraph and notes on this text, just like the paragraph and notes you prepare for all of the other books we read. Your paragraph and notes will be distributed to your colleagues via ecourseware the day of your presentation. You will sign up for a supplemental reading/presentation date during the first day of class. Presentations will be distributed as evenly as possible across the semester, and you will present in the week in which your book is listed. So come to the first class with several possible weeks/books in mind, as you might not get your first choice. Please submit your supplemental book notes to both the online dropbox and to the appropriate discussion page on ecourseware. See the attached page of rubrics to see how your presentation will be graded.

Historiographical Essay

You will write a 15-20 page historiographical essay as your final paper in this course. Your paper will analyze the historiographical contributions of 5 books (or an equivalent mix of books and articles) on a single topic or time period. Only two of the books may be something you have read for the course thus far. Your paper should not simply be five book reviews pasted together. Instead, put the arguments of these books in conversation with each other in order to illustrate a larger point about the nature of historians' understanding of and/or disagreements about the topic or time period at hand. You will hand in a brief description of your paper topic and the five books you intend to use in class and to the online dropbox in week 10. You will hand in an outline for your paper during the last week of the semester and we will meet individually to discuss your plans. Final papers are due Monday, May 5, to the online dropbox by 9:00 AM. See the attached page of rubrics to see how your final paper will be graded.

Class Participation

Being a professional historian means being able to speak critically and coherently about history and historiography, to listen carefully to the thoughts and ideas of others, and to pose thoughtful questions and new lines of thinking. Like it or not, your future in this field will require that you spend a great deal of time discussing ideas with students and colleagues. There's no time like the present to work on this skill, so you must participate in this class. Good class participation reflects not only an energetic commitment to dialogue, but also an informed reading of the assigned material, an intellectual curiosity about historical and pedagogical implications, and a proper appreciation for class dynamics. See the attached page of rubrics to see how your class participation will be graded.

Evaluation

Final grades will be broken down as follows:

- Weekly Paragraphs: 20%
- Reading Notes: 20%
- Presentation on Supplemental Reading: 5%
- Notes on Supplemental Reading: 2.5%
- Paragraph on Supplemental Reading: 2.5%
- Final Paper (grade will also reflect your performance on your submitted paper topic and outline): 35%
- Class Participation: 15%

My grading scale follows the departmental standards for graduate students:

- A: Outstanding, excellent work. Approaches professional quality work.
- A-: Very good work. High quality performance, but falls short of excellence.
- B+: Good Work. Solid effort, shows potential for higher achievement.
- B: Needs improvement: Reflects serious effort, but raises doubts about the potential for achieving professional quality, so students should consult with professors about how to improve their work, especially if they are in the Ph.D. program or would like to be.
- B-: Marginal. A few positive qualities, but plagued by serious problems that must be immediately addressed.
- C+ and below: unacceptable.

Feel free to ask me if you have any questions about my evaluations of your work during the semester.

Expectations:

- I expect you to always be *respectful to your colleagues and to me in class*. We are on this intellectual journey together, and we will treat each other fairly and kindly to make this a rewarding experience for everyone.
- I expect you to *attend all class sessions*. Contact me if you have an illness or emergency.
- I expect you to *arrive for class and our individual meetings on time and prepared*.
- I expect you to *turn in all assignments on time*. I will not accept late assignments unless you have specific permission from me prior to the due date.

- *Cell phones must be turned off and remain out of sight* during class. If you have children or other family members who might need to reach you due to an emergency during class, please put your phone on vibrate in your pocket and only consult it when necessary.
- I expect you to *adhere to the University of Memphis Code of Student Conduct regarding academic misconduct*, which “defines academic misconduct as all acts of cheating, plagiarism, forgery and falsification.” For the details of this policy, please see the “University of Memphis Code of Student Conduct – Academic Dishonesty” online at <http://saweb.memphis.edu/judicialaffairs/dishonesty/definitions.htm>. For more information and for guidelines on how to appropriately cite materials written by other authors in your work, please see the History Department’s policy on academic misconduct (http://history.memphis.edu/misconduct_policy.html) and the Department’s “Advice about plagiarism and using sources” (http://history.memphis.edu/misconduct_plagiarism.html). You should also feel free to talk to me if you have questions about my policies and expectations for the papers. If you commit academic dishonesty I will report the infraction.

Course Schedule

1. January 21, 2014: The Long Shadow of the New Deal and WW2

James T. Sparrow, “‘Buying Our Boys Back’: The Mass Foundations of Fiscal Citizenship in World War II,” *Journal of Policy History* 20.2 (April 2008): 263-86.

Jefferson Cowie and Nick Salvatore, “The Long Exception: Rethinking the Place of the New Deal in American History,” *International Labor and Working Class History* 74 (Fall 2008): 3-32.

Professional Development: Graduate School Strategies for Success

2. January, 28, 2014: Consumption and the Globalizing Economy

Lizabeth Cohen, *A Consumers Republic: The Politics of Mass Consumption in Postwar America* (2003)

David Steigerwald, "All Hail the Republic of Choice: Consumer History as Contemporary Thought," *Journal of American History* 93 (Sept. 2006): 385-403.

Professional Development: Time Management

Suggested Reading:

Meg Jacobs, *Pocketbook Politics: Economic Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America* (2005)

Jennifer Klein, *For All These Rights: Business, Labor, and the Shaping of America’s Public-Private Welfare State* (2006)

Adam Green, *Selling the Race: Culture, Community, and Black Chicago, 1940-1955* (2006).

Marc Levinson, *The Box: How the Shipping Container Made the World Smaller and the World Economy Bigger* (2006)

Sarah Igo, *The Averaged American: Surveys Citizens, and the Making of a Mass Public* (2007)

Matthew Hilton, *Prosperity for All: Consumer Activism in an Era of Globalization* (2008)

Shane Hamilton, *Trucking Country: The Road to America’s Wal-Mart Economy* (2008)

Nelson Lichtenstein, *The Retail Revolution: How Wal-Mart Created a Brave New World of Business* (2009).

Louis Hyman, *Debtor Nation: The History of America in Red Ink* (2011)

Greta Krippner, *Capitalizing on Crisis: The Political Origins of the Rise of Finance* (2012)

3. February 4, 2014: Urban Crisis and Suburbanization

Thomas Sugrue. *The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit* (1996)

Robert O. Self and Thomas Sugrue, "The Power of Place: Race, Political Economy, and Identity in the Post-War Metropolis," in Jean-Christophe Agnew and Roy Rosenzweig, eds., *A Companion to Post-1945 America* (Blackwell, 2002), 20-44.

Professional Development: Ph.D. Programs

Suggested Reading:

Kenneth Jackson, *Crabgrass Frontier: The Suburbanization of America* (1985).

Becky M. Nicolaides, *My Blue Heaven: Life and Politics in the Working-class Suburbs of Los Angeles, 1920-1965* (2002)

Robert Self, *American Babylon: Race and the Struggle for Postwar Oakland* (2003).

Eric Avila, *Popular Culture in the Age of White Flight: Fear and Fantasy in Suburban Los Angeles* (2004).

Andrew Weise, *Places of their Own: African American Suburbanization in the 20th Century* (2004).

Amanda Seligman, *Block by Block: Neighborhoods and Public Policy on Chicago's West Side* (2005)

Kevin Kruse, *White Flight: Atlanta and the Making of Modern Conservatism* (2006)

Matthew Lassiter, *The Silent Majority: Suburban Politics in the Sunbelt South* (2007)

Beryl Satter, *Family Properties: How the Struggle over Race and Real Estate Transformed Chicago and Urban America* (2009)

Samuel Zipp, *Manhattan Projects: The Rise and Fall of Urban Renewal in Cold War New York* (2010)

4. February 11, 2014: Environmentalism (and more Suburbanization)

Adam Rome, *The Bulldozer in the Countryside: Suburban Sprawl and the Rise of American Environmentalism* (2001)

Ian Tyrrell, "Modern Environmentalism" in Jean-Christophe Agnew and Roy Rosenzweig, eds., *A Companion to Post-1945 America* (Blackwell, 2002), 328-342.

Professional Development: Comprehensive Examinations

Pick from suggested readings for week 4 or choose one of the following:

Robert Gottlieb, *Forcing the Spring: the Transformation of the American Environmental Movement* (1993).

Andrew Hurley, *Environmental Inequalities: Class, Race, and Industrial Pollution in Gary, Indiana: 1945-1980* (1995)

Michelle Murphy, *Sick Building Syndrome and the Problem of Uncertainty: Environmental Politics, Technoscience, and Women Workers* (2006).

Julie Sze, *Noxious New York: The Racial Politics of Urban Health and Environmental Justice* (2007)

5. February 18, 2014: Cold War Politics

Mary Dudziak, *Cold War Civil Rights: Race and the Image of American Democracy* (2000)

Ellen Schrecker, "McCarthyism and the Red Scare," in Jean-Christophe Agnew and Roy Rosenzweig, eds., *A Companion to Post-1945 America* (Blackwell, 2002), 371-384.

Professional Development: Constructing a Vita

Suggested Reading:

- Ellen Schrecker, *Many are the Crimes: McCarthyism in America* (1998)
- Daniel Horowitz, *Betty Friedan and the Making of the Feminine Mystique: The American Left, the Cold War and Modern Feminism* (2000).
- Robert Dean, *Imperial Brotherhood: Gender and the Making of Cold War Foreign Policy* (2001)
- K. A. Cuordileone, *Manhood and American Political Culture in the Cold War* (2004)
- Salim Yaqub, *Containing Arab Nationalism.: The Eisenhower Doctrine and the Middle East* (2004)
- Penny Von Eschen *Satchmo Blows Up the World: Jazz Ambassadors Play the Cold War* (2004).
- David K. Johnson, *The Lavender Scare: The Cold War Persecution of Gays and Lesbians in the Federal Government* (2006)
- John Lewis Gaddis, *The Cold War: A New History* (2006)
- Elizabeth Borgwardt, *A New Deal for the World: America's Vision for Human Rights* (2007)
- Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times* (2007)
- Carl Bon Tempo, *Americans at the Gate: The United States and Refugees during the Cold War* (2008)

6. February 25, 2014: Vietnam and Military History

- Andrew Huebner, *Warrior Image: Soldiers in American Culture from the Second World War to the Vietnam Era* (2008)
- David Hunt, "Washington Quagmire: US Presidents and the Vietnam Wars – A Pattern of Intervention" in Jean-Christophe Agnew and Roy Rosenzweig, eds., *A Companion to Post-1945 America* (Blackwell, 2002), 464-478.

Professional Development: Writing Encyclopedia Entries and Book Reviews

Suggested Reading:

- Christian Appy, *Working-Class War: American Combat Soldiers and Vietnam* (1993)
- Lloyd Gardner, *Pay Any Price: Lyndon Johnson and the Wars for Vietnam* (1995)
- Tom Wells, *The War Within: America's Battle over Vietnam* (1995)
- Fredrik Logevall, *Choosing War: The Lost Chance for Peace and the Escalation of the War in Vietnam* (1999).
- George Herring, *America's Longest War: The United States and Vietnam, 1950–1975* (2001)
- Jeffrey Kimball, *Nixon's Vietnam War* (2002)
- James M. Carter, *Inventing Vietnam: the United States and State Building, 1954-1968* (2008).
- Beth Bailey, *America's Army: Making the All-Volunteer Force* (2009)
- Julian Zelizer, *Arsenal of Democracy: The Politics of National Security – From World War II to the War on Terrorism* (2009)
- James Sparrow, *Warfare State: World War II Americans and the Age of Big Government* (2011)
- Meredith Lair, *Armed with Abundance: Consumerism and Soldiering in the Vietnam War* (2011)
- Michael Allen, *Until the Last Man Comes Home: POWs, MIAs, and the Unending Vietnam War* (2012)
- Mary Dudziak, *War Time: An Idea, Its History, Its Consequences* (2012)

Kimberly Phillips, *War! What is It Good For?: Black Freedom Struggles and The US Military from World War II to Iraq* (2012)

7. March 4, 2014: New Left and 1960s Protest (with Dr. Andrew Daily)

Martin Klimke, *The Other Alliance: Student Protest in West Germany and the United States in the Global Sixties* (2010)

Article TBA

Professional Development: Conference Papers

Suggested Reading:

Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage* (1987)

Amy Swerdlow, *Women Strike for Peace: Traditional Motherhood and Radical Politics in the 1960s* (1993)

David Farber, *The Age of Great Dreams: America in the 1960s* (1994)

Terry H. Anderson, *The Movement and the Sixties: Protest in America from Greensboro to Wounded Knee* (1995)

Douglas Rossinow, *The Politics of Authenticity: Liberalism, Christianity, and the New Left in America* (1998)

Beth Bailey, *Sex in the Heartland* (1999)

Aniko Bodrogkozy, *Groove Tube: Sixties Television and the Youth Rebellion* (2001)

Jeremy Suri, *Power and Protest: Global Revolution and the Rise of Détente* (2005)

Alan Petigny, *The Permissive Society: America, 1941-1965* (2009)

James T. Patterson, *The Eve of Destruction; How 1965 Transformed America* (2012)

Marc Stein, *Rethinking the Gay and Lesbian Movement* (2012)

8. March 11, 2014: Spring break

9. March 18, 2014: Civil Rights (with Dr. Aram Goudsouzian)

Aram Goudsouzian, *Down to the Crossroads: Civil Rights, Black Power, and the Meredith March Against Fear* (2014)

Jacquelyn Dowd Hall, "The Long Civil Rights Movement and the Political Uses of the Past," *Journal of American History* 19.4 (March, 2005): 1233-63.

Professional Development: Book Publishing

Suggested Reading:

John Dittmer, *Local People: The Struggle for Civil Rights in Mississippi* (1995)

Suzanne Smith, *Dancing in the Street: Motown and the Cultural Politics of Detroit* (1999)

James Meriwether, *Proudly We Can Be Africans: Black Americans and Africa, 1935-1961* (2002)

John D'Emilio, *Lost Prophet: The Life and Times of Bayard Rustin* (2003)

Martha Biondi, *To Stand and Fight: The Struggle for Civil Rights in Postwar New York City* (2003)

Emilye Crosby, *A Little Taste of Freedom: The Black Freedom Struggle in Claiborne County, Mississippi* (2005)

Matthew Frye Jacobsen, *Roots Too: White Ethnic Revival in Post-Civil Rights America* (2006)

Peniel Joseph, *Waiting 'til the Midnight Hour: A Narrative History of the Black Power in America* (2006)

Annelise Orleck, *Storming Caesar's Palace: How Black Mothers Fought their Own War on Poverty* (2006)

James Gregory, *The Southern Diaspora: How the Great Migrations of Black and White Southerners Transformed America* (2007)

Nancy MacLean, *Freedom is Not Enough: The Opening of the American Workplace* (2008)

Glenda Gilmore, *Defying Dixie: The Radical Roots of Civil Rights, 1919-1950* (2008)

Thomas Sugrue, *Sweet Land of Liberty: The Forgotten Struggle for Civil Rights in the North* (2008)

Peggy Pascoe, *What Comes Naturally: Miscegenation Law and the Making of Race in America* (2010)

Lisa Levenstein, *A Movement Without Marches: African American Women and the Politics of Poverty in Postwar Philadelphia* (2010)

Hasan Kwame Jeffries, *Bloody Lowndes: Civil Rights and Black Power in Alabama's Black Belt* (2010)

Danielle McGuire, *At the Dark End of the Street: Black Women, Rape, and Resistance – A New History of the Civil Rights Movement from Rosa Parks to the Rise of Black Power* (2011)

10. March 25, 2014: Feminism

Dorothy Sue Cobble, *The Other Women's Movement: Workplace Justice and Social Rights in Modern America* (2004)

Nancy MacLean, "Postwar Women's History: The 'Second Wave' or the End of the Family Wage?" in Jean-Christophe Agnew and Roy Rosenzweig, eds., *A Companion to Post-1945 America* (Blackwell, 2002), 235-259.

Professional Development: Archival Research

You must turn in today to the online dropbox and bring to class a hard copy of a brief description of your final paper topic and a list of the 5 books you intend to use. Keep in mind that only two of the books can be something you have read (or will read) for this course.

Suggested Reading:

Sara Evans, *Personal Politics: The Roots of Women's Liberation in the Civil Rights Movement and the New Left* (1980)

Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era* (2010; 1988)

Sara Evans, *Tidal Wave: How Women Changed America at Century's End* (2003)

Premilla Nadasen, *Welfare Warriors: The Welfare Rights Movement in the United States* (2004)

Joanne Meyerowitz, *How Sex Changed: A History of Transsexuality in the United States* (2004)

Anne Enke, *Finding the Movement: Sexuality, Contested Space, and Feminist Activism* (2007)

Winifred Breines, *The Trouble Between Us: An Uneasy History of White and Black Women in the Feminist Movement* (2007)

Anne Valk, *Radical Sisters: Second-Wave Feminism and Black Liberation in Washington, DC* (2008)

Wendy Kline, *Bodies of Knowledge: Sexuality, Reproduction, and the Women's Health in the Second Wave* (2010)

Rebecca Jo Plant, *Mom: The Transformation of Motherhood in Modern America* (2010)
Elaine Tyler May, *America and the Pill: A History of Promise, Peril, and Liberation* (2011)
Stephanie Gilmore, *Groundswell: Grassroots Feminist Activism in Postwar America* (2013)
Victoria Hesford, *Feeling Women's Liberation* (2013)

11. April 1, 2014: Religion, Politics, and the New Right

Daniel Williams, *God's Own Party: The Making of the Christian Right* (2010)
David L. Chappell, "The Triumph of Conservatives in a Liberal Age," in Jean-Christophe Agnew and Roy Rosenzweig, eds., *A Companion to Post-1945 America* (Blackwell, 2002), 303-327.
James T. Fisher, "American Religion Since 1945" in Jean-Christophe Agnew and Roy Rosenzweig, eds., *A Companion to Post-1945 America* (Blackwell, 2002), 44-63.

Suggested Reading:

Edward Larson, *Summer for the Gods: The Scopes Trial and America's Continuing Debate over Science and Religion* (1997)
Lisa McGirr, *Suburban Warriors: The Origins of the New American Right* (2001)
Bruce Schulman, *The Seventies: The Great Shift in American Culture, Society, and Politics* (2001)
Janice Irvine, *Talk about Sex: The Battles over Sex Education in the United States* (2004)
Catherine Rymph, *Republican Women: Feminism and Conservatism from Suffrage through the Rise of the New Right* (2006)
Natasha Zaretsky, *No Direction Home: The American Family and the Fear of National Decline, 1968-1980* (2007)
Kim Phillips-Fein, *Invisible Hands: The Businessmen's Crusade Against the New Deal* (2009)
Darren Dochuck, *From Bible Belt to Sunbelt: Plain-Folk Religion, Grassroots Politics, and the Rise of Evangelical Conservatism* (2010)
Whitney Strub, *Perversion for Profit: The Politics of Pornography and the Rise of the New Right* (2010)
Michelle Nickerson, *Mothers of Conservatism: Women and the Postwar Right* (2012)
Robert Self, *All in the Family: The Realignment of American Democracy Since the 1960s* (2012)

12. April 8, 2014: Sunbelt Conservatism and the Service Economy

Bethany Moreton, *To Serve God and Wal-Mart: The Making of Christian Free Enterprise* (2009)
Darren Dochuk, "Moving Mountains: The Business of Evangelicalism and Extraction in a Liberal Age," in Kim Phillips-Fein and Julian E. Zelizer, eds., *What's Good for Business: Business and American Politics since World War II* (Oxford, 2012): 72-90.
Professional Development: MA Thesis and Dissertation Writing

For the suggested reading, you may select a relevant book from a previous week or choose one of the following:

Jefferson Cowie, *Capital Moves: RCA's 70-Year Quest for Cheap Labor* (2001)
Nelson Lichtenstein, *State of the Union: A Century of American Labor* (2002)
Leon Fink, *The Maya of Morgantown: Work and Community in the Nuevo New South* (2003)
Ruth Milkman, *LA Story: Immigrant Workers and the Future of the US Labor Movement* (2006)

Judith Stein, *Pivotal Decade: How the United States Traded Factories for Finance in the Seventies* (2010)

Thomas Borstelmann, *The 1970s: A New Global History from Civil Rights to Economic Inequality* (2012)

13. April 15, 2014: Labor and the Economy in the 1970s (with Dr. Scott Marler)

Jefferson Cowie, *Stayin' Alive: The 1970s and the Last Days of the Working Class* (2010)

Joshua B. Freeman, "Labor During the American Century: Work, Workers, and Unions Since 1945" in Jean-Christophe Agnew and Roy Rosenzweig, eds., *A Companion to Post-1945 America* (Blackwell, 2002), 192-210.

Professional Development: Journal Articles

For the suggested reading, you may select a relevant book from a previous week.

14. April 22, 2014: Postmodernity

Daniel T. Rodgers, *Age of Fracture* (2011)

Professional Development: The Job Market

15. April 29, 2014: Outline of Historiography Paper Due, Individual Meetings to Discuss Outlines

We will meet individually today to discuss your historiography papers. The night before our meeting, you will turn into the online dropbox an outline of your paper, which must include your paper's argument and how you intend to support that argument.

Outline of historiography paper due by 11:59 PM, April 28, to the online dropbox.

Final Papers due Monday, May 5, to the online dropbox by 9:00 AM.

Weekly Paragraph

	<i>Excellent (A)</i>	<i>Good (A-/B+)</i>	<i>Fair (B)</i>	<i>Poor (B- and below)</i>
<i>Interpretation</i>	Answer to question is original, insightful, and convincing.	Answer to question is reasonable and convincing.	Answer to question is reasonable, but a bit vague or superficial.	Answer to the question is unclear, incoherent, and/or unconvincing.
<i>Reasoning and use of evidence</i>	Reasoning behind interpretation is thoroughly, convincingly, and clearly explained using ample evidence. Reasoning reveals a sophisticated understanding of the assigned text, the discipline, and field of US history.	Reasoning behind interpretation is fairly clearly and convincingly explained using evidence. Reasoning draws on the assigned text and reflects a solid understanding of the discipline and the field of US history.	Reasoning behind interpretation has some merit, but it is also occasionally unclear, shallow, and/or unconvincing. Uses little evidence. Reasoning suggests minimal engagement and/or understanding of the assigned text, the discipline, and/or the field of US history.	Paragraph does not provide coherent reasoning behind its interpretation.
<i>Focus and organization</i>	Topic sentence states the main idea of the paragraph. Body of the paragraph explains that point clearly and concisely. Each sentence advances the argument of the paragraph. Each sentence leads to the next in order to fully develop and explain the main idea.	Topic sentence states the main idea of the paragraph. Body of the paragraph explains that point. Most sentences advance the argument of the paragraph, but a few may stray slightly off-topic. Most sentences are organized so as to logically lead the reader from one idea to the next.	Topic sentence states the main idea of the paragraph. Body of paragraph meanders off that main point quite a bit, and/or does not systematically advance that main point.	Topic sentence does not state the main idea of the paragraph, or does not state it fully. Body of the paragraph does not adequately explain that point. Sentences are frequently off-topic and/or disorganized.
<i>Mechanics and clarity of writing</i>	Writing is clear and accessible. Author uses clean and correct grammar and uses words correctly. Provides accurate and thorough citations for its evidence and ideas in Chicago Style.	Writing is reasonably clear and accessible. Author uses mostly correct grammar and uses most words correctly. All evidence is cited, but there are some minor problems with completeness or format of some citations.	Writing is a bit difficult to follow. Author makes a number of mistakes in terms of grammar and word usage. Some pieces of evidence are unreferenced or inaccurately referenced, and there are problems with completeness and format of citations.	Writing is unclear, with frequent poor grammar and word usage. Evidence is unreferenced.

Book/Article Notes

	<i>Excellent (A)</i>	<i>Good (A-/B+)</i>	<i>Fair (B)</i>	<i>Poor (B- and below)</i>
<i>Answers to questions about book</i>	All answers are thorough, clear, and convincing. They reflect a solid grasp of the critical reading skills in which these questions are grounded, as well as the text itself.	Most answers are thorough, clear, and convincing, but one or two may be a bit vague or shallow. They reflect a reasonable grasp of the critical reading skills in which these questions are grounded, as well as the text itself.	One or two answers are thorough, clear, and convincing, but most are a bit vague or shallow. They reflect an uneven grasp of the critical reading skills in which these questions are grounded, as well as the text itself.	All answers are vague or shallow. They reflect a minimal to non-existent grasp of the critical reading skills in which these questions are grounded and/or the text itself.
<i>Chapter outline of book</i>	Outline thoroughly and clearly explains the key argument of each chapter, as well as how the chapter advances or relates to the main claim of the book.	Outline explains the key argument of each chapter and how the chapter advances or relates to the main claim of the book, but the coverage of one or two chapters is a little shaky.	Outline tends to focus on the topic rather than the argument of each chapter. Little explication as to how each chapter advances or relates to the main claim of the book.	Outline is shallow and superficial, providing little information about each chapter.
<i>Summary of article</i>	Summary is clear and very thorough. Fully encapsulates the article's claim and argumentation. Demonstrates sophisticated and nuanced comprehension of the article.	Summary is clear and reasonably thorough. Largely encapsulates the article's claim and argumentation. Demonstrates solid comprehension of the article.	Summary is a bit vague. Provides a gloss of the article's main claim and argumentation, but does not demonstrate in-depth reading and comprehension.	Summary is very vague, superficial, or incorrect.

Presentation

	<i>Excellent (A)</i>	<i>Good (A-/B+)</i>	<i>Fair (B)</i>	<i>Poor (B- and below)</i>
<i>Explication of argument, methodology, and analysis of book</i>	Presenter's explication the book's argument, methodology, and analysis is clear, thorough, and precise	Presenter's explication the book's argument, methodology, and analysis is generally correct, but occasionally vague or unclear	Presenter's explication the book's argument, methodology, and/or analysis gets the gist of the book, but it is somewhat unclear, imprecise, and occasionally incorrect	Presenter's explication the book's argument, methodology, and/or analysis is incorrect or very vague and superficial
<i>Explication of significance of book</i>	Presenter's explication the book's significance to the field is clear, thorough, and precise	Presenter's explication the book's significance to the field is generally correct, but occasionally vague or unclear	Presenter's explication the book's significance to the field gets the gist of the book, but it is somewhat unclear, imprecise, and occasionally incorrect	Presenter's explication the book's significance to the field is incorrect or very vague and superficial
<i>Clarity and organization of presentation</i>	Presentation is extremely clear, easy to follow, well-organized, and focused.	Presentation is reasonably clear, easy to follow, well-organized, and focused, but it may meander or be a bit confusing at points.	Presentation is fairly unclear, difficult to follow, poorly-organized, and/or unfocused.	Presentation is entirely unclear, impossible to follow, disorganized, and unfocused.

Historiographical Essay

	<i>Excellent (A)</i>	<i>Good (A-/B+)</i>	<i>Fair (B)</i>	<i>Poor (B- and below)</i>
<i>Knowledge and comprehension of works under review</i>	Paper provides a highly accurate and precise description, summarization, and/or paraphrasing of the key claims of the texts and their methodologies, as well as all pertinent information about each author, the time period in which each work was written, and/or the historiographical trends of the time.	Paper provides a fairly accurate and precise description, summarization, and/or paraphrasing of the key claims of the texts and their methodologies, as well as most pertinent information about each author, the time period in which each work was written, and/or the historiographical trends of the time.	Paper provides a fairly accurate, but not precise, description, summarization, and/or paraphrasing of the key claims of the texts and their methodologies. Provides minimal pertinent information about each author, the time period in which each work was written, and/or the historiographical trends of the time.	Paper provides a cursory, vague, and occasionally inaccurate description, summarization, and/or paraphrasing of the key claims of the texts and their methodologies. Provides almost no pertinent information about each author, the time period in which each work was written, and/or the historiographical trends of the time.
<i>Ability to place texts within the broader context of the literature</i>	Paper provides a highly accurate and precise summarization, description, and/or paraphrasing of the important historical questions, interpretations, arguments, and debates that relate to the books/topic. Paper thoroughly and accurately explains how each text under review relates to that broader context.	Paper provides a fairly accurate and precise summarization, description, and/or paraphrasing of the important historical questions, interpretations, arguments, and debates that relate to the books/topic. Paper fairly accurately explains how each text under review relates to that broader context.	Paper provides a fairly accurate, but not precise, summarization, description, and/or paraphrasing of the important historical questions, interpretations, arguments, and debates that relate to the books/topic. Paper explains how each text under review relates to that broader context, but that explication is cursory or vague.	Paper provides a cursory, vague, and occasionally inaccurate summarization, description, and/or paraphrasing of the important historical questions, interpretations, arguments, and debates that relate to the books/topic. Paper does not explain how each text under review relates to that broader context.
<i>Knowledge of history of US since 1945</i>	When, in the course of its analysis, the paper discusses particular historical events, people, movements, transitions, etc., it provides a highly accurate and precise summarization and/or description of those subjects.	When, in the course of its analysis, the paper discusses particular historical events, people, movements, transitions, etc., it provides a fairly accurate and precise summarization and/or description of those subjects.	When, in the course of its analysis, the paper discusses particular historical events, people, movements, transitions, etc., it provides a fairly accurate, but not precise, summarization and/or description of those subjects.	When, in the course of its analysis, the paper discusses particular historical events, people, movements, transitions, etc., it provides a cursory, vague, and occasionally inaccurate summarization and/or description of those subjects.
<i>Ability craft thesis and advance argument about historiography</i>	Paper provides an insightful, original, and persuasive thesis about the authors'	Paper provides a persuasive thesis about the authors' approaches, orientations,	Paper provides a vague, confusing, or somewhat unpersuasive thesis about the	Paper does not provide a thesis about the authors' approaches, orientations,

	approaches, orientations, assumptions, analyses, methodologies, etc., in relation to one another. The paper offers coherent, incisive, and original analysis of the books under review to advance a clear argument about the <i>writing</i> of history, not the history that the books discuss.	assumptions, analyses, methodologies, etc., in relation to one another. The paper offers a coherent analysis of the books under review to advance an argument about the <i>writing</i> of history, not the history that the books discuss.	authors' approaches, orientations, assumptions, analyses, methodologies, etc., in relation to one another. The paper analyzes the books under review to advance a somewhat muddled argument about the <i>writing</i> of history, not the history that the books discuss.	assumptions, analyses, methodologies, etc., in relation to one another, or that thesis is indecipherable or largely unpersuasive. The paper does not advance an argument about the writing of history by analyzing the books under review, or that argument is largely unpersuasive.
<i>Thoroughness of analysis</i>	The author persuasively explains and justifies any decisions s/he has made to delimit the scope of his/her analysis. Within those bounds, his/her analysis is thorough, leaving no unanswered questions or unaccounted for discrepancies in the analysis.	The paper's analysis is reasonably thorough, but it leave some questions unanswered and/or some aspects of the texts unaccounted for. The author has not persuasively explained or justified those lapses in analysis.	The paper's analysis is not very thorough, leaving many questions unanswered and/or many aspects of the texts unaccounted for. The author has not explained or justified those lapses in analysis.	The paper's analysis leaves most questions about the texts unanswered and unaccounted for.
<i>Ability to anticipate and respond to counterarguments</i>	Paper introduces, carefully considers, and responds to both obvious and not-so-obvious alternative analyses and potential counter-arguments that could be made about these texts.	Paper introduces and responds to obvious alternative analyses and potential counter-arguments that could be made about these texts.	Paper introduces only the most obvious alternative analyses and potential counter-arguments that could be made about these texts. Responses are minimal, non-existent, or mere claims of refutation.	Paper does not introduce or consider alternative analyses and potential counter-arguments that could be made about these texts.
<i>Structure</i>	Paper has a clear structure. It begins with a clear and concise introduction that provides the reader with the paper's main claims and a brief overview of how it will argue those claims. It follows with body paragraphs that thoroughly explicate and explain all the necessary background information and analysis needed to support	Paper has a clear structure. It begins with a reasonably clear introduction that provides the reader with the paper's main claims, but it does not provide much insight into how those claims will be advanced or developed in the paper. It follows with body paragraphs that explicate most of the necessary	Paper has an introduction, body, and conclusion, but these parts of the paper do not fully accomplish their purposes in the paper. The introduction introduces the topic of the paper, but does not provide the reader with a clear understanding of the paper's main claims or argumentation. The body paragraphs contain	Paper might make an attempt at having an introduction, body paragraphs, and conclusion, but these parts of the paper are not well defined.

	the author's argument. It finishes with a conclusion that reiterates the main points of the paper, ties up any loose ends, and points to larger issues for future scholarship to consider based on the claims of this paper.	background information and analysis needed to support the author's argument. It finishes with a conclusion that simply reiterates the main points of the paper.	information about the topic, books, etc., but they do not fully or clearly explicate the author's argument. The conclusion does not successfully reiterate those claims.	
<i>Organization</i>	Paper is superbly organized. It leads its reader seamlessly from one idea to the next in a logical order.	Paper is reasonably well organized. It leads its reader from one idea to the next in roughly logical order, but at points the organization is uneven.	Paper is not very well organized. It covers most of the necessary material and attempts to lay out its claims completely and thoroughly, but often in a way that makes it difficult for a reader to follow the author's argument and ideas.	Paper is poorly organized and difficult to follow. Does not seem to have much of an organizational pattern.
<i>Focused paragraphs</i>	Each paragraph of the paper presents a single idea that is developed and explained in the body of that paragraph. Each paragraph contributes to the larger claim of the paper.	In general, most (but not all) paragraphs of the paper present a single idea that is developed and explained in the body of that paragraph. Most paragraphs contribute to the larger claim of the paper.	A number of paragraphs in the paper present multiple ideas, or are muddy in terms of their contribution to the overall point of the paper.	Paragraphs are poorly written, with multiple points in some paragraphs, incomplete points in others. Many paragraphs do not contribute to the larger claim of the paper.
<i>Writing style</i>	The writing style is clear and accessible. It has clean and correct grammar, uses words correctly, and explains any complicated ideas, terms, or concepts thoroughly.	The writing style is reasonably clear and accessible. It has mostly correct grammar, uses most words correctly, and generally explains any complicated ideas, terms, or concepts.	The writing style is a bit difficult to follow. It makes a number of mistakes in terms of grammar, word usage, and the explication of complicated ideas, terms, or concepts.	The writing style is unclear, with frequent poor grammar and word usage.
<i>Use of evidence</i>	Paper explains and illustrates each point with ample analysis and evidence. Examples are well-suited to making the author's point, and are explained thoroughly in relation to the author's analysis.	Paper explains and illustrates each point with analysis and evidence. But some examples could have been better selected, some points could use more evidence or explication, and/or some examples could have been	Paper explains and illustrates most but not all points with analysis and evidence. Some examples are ill-chosen and some points lack evidence or explication. Not all evidence seems to relate back to the author's analysis.	Paper has minimal evidence and analysis.

		better explained in in relation to the author's analysis.		
<i>Synthesis</i>	Paper reads as a complete and unified piece of work. It synthesizes its various parts into a coherent whole, and the connections between its parts are clear and insightful.	Paper reads as a mostly coherent whole. The connections between its parts are generally clear.	The paper reads as a somewhat coherent whole, but the connections between its parts are somewhat unclear.	The paper does not read as a complete and unified piece of work. Instead it seems scattered, not always coherent, and incomplete.
<i>Citations</i>	Paper provides accurate and thorough citations for its evidence and ideas in Chicago Style.	All evidence is cited, but there are some minor problems with completeness or format of some citations.	Some pieces of evidence are unreferenced or inaccurately referenced, and there are problems with completeness and format of citations.	Evidence is frequently unreferenced and citations are improperly formatted.

Class Participation

	<i>Excellent (A)</i>	<i>Good (A-/B+)</i>	<i>Fair (B)</i>	<i>Poor (B- and below)</i>
<i>Reasoning</i>	Arguments or positions are reasonable and supported with evidence from the readings. Often deepens the conversation by going beyond the text, recognizing implications and extensions of the text. Provides analysis of complex ideas that help deepen the inquiry and further the conversation.	Arguments or positions are reasonable and mostly supported by evidence from the readings. In general, the comments and ideas contribute to the group's understanding of the material and concepts.	Contributions to the discussion are rare and are more often based on opinion or unclear views than on reasoned arguments or positions based on the readings. Comments or questions suggest a difficulty in following complex lines of argument or student's arguments are convoluted and difficult to follow.	Comments are frequently so illogical or without substantiation that others are unable to critique or even follow them.
<i>Listening</i>	Always actively attends to what others say as evidenced by regularly building on, clarifying, or responding to their comments. Often reminds group of comments made by someone earlier that are pertinent.	Usually listens well and takes steps to check comprehension by asking clarifying and probing questions, and making connections to earlier comments. Responds to ideas and questions offered by other participants.	Does not regularly listen well as indicated by the repetition of comments or questions presented earlier, or frequent non sequiturs.	Behavior frequently reflects a failure to listen or attend to the discussion as indicated by repetition of comments and questions, non sequiturs, off-task activities.
<i>Reading</i>	Student has carefully read and understood the readings as evidenced by oral contributions; familiarity with main ideas, supporting evidence and secondary points. Comes to class prepared with questions and critiques of the readings.	Student has read and understood the readings as evidenced by oral contributions. The work demonstrates a grasp of the main ideas and evidence, but sometimes interpretations are questionable. Comes prepared with questions.	Student has read the material, but comments often indicate that he/she didn't read or think carefully about it, or misunderstood or forgot many points. Class conduct suggests inconsistent commitment to preparation.	Student either is unable to adequately understand and interpret the material or has frequently come to class unprepared, as indicated by serious errors or an inability to answer basic questions or contribute to discussion.
<i>Classroom Dynamics</i>	Student shows respect for members of the class, both in speech and manner, and for the method of shared inquiry and peer discussion. Contributes frequently, but does not dominate discussion. Student challenges ideas respectfully, encourages and	Student shows respect for members of the class and for the method of shared inquiry and peer discussion. Participates regularly in the discussion, but occasionally either dominates the discussion or "hides" rather than jumping in with a new	Student shows respect for members of the class and for the method of shared inquiry and peer discussion. But student does not regularly participate. Student rarely takes an active role in maintaining the flow or direction of the discussion.	Student shows a lack of respect for members of the group and the discussion process. Either dominates the discussion or disengages from the process. Student's conduct and comments tend to detract from the discussion. When contributing, can be

	<p>supports others to do the same. Takes responsibility for maintaining the flow and quality of the discussion whenever needed. Helps to redirect or refocus discussion when it becomes sidetracked or unproductive. Makes efforts to engage reluctant participants. Provides constructive feedback and support to others.</p>	<p>idea. Will take on responsibility for maintaining flow and quality of discussion and encouraging others to participate, but either is not always effective or is effective but does not regularly take on the responsibility.</p>	<p>Student is largely passive in class, adding little to the conversation.</p>	<p>argumentative or dismissive of others' ideas. Does not play an active role in maintaining the flow of discussion or undermines the efforts of others who are trying to facilitate discussion.</p>
--	--	--	--	--