



**SA 887-4: Power, Democracy and the State
Summer 2014**

Instructor: Gerardo Otero. E-mail: otero@sfu.ca

Office: A.Q. 5100. **Office Hours:** Tuesdays: after class and 2:00-3:00 p.m. or by appointment

Location: BLU10655, Burnaby Campus, Tuesdays 8:30-12:20.

Course Description:

This graduate seminar focuses on sociological debates about power, democracy and the state, and how these concepts have evolved in the process of neoliberal globalization since the 1980s. Although much attention will be paid to how power is constructed and imposed by dominant classes and the state, the main question guiding this review of the literature is theoretical and political: what are the conditions under which subordinate groups, communities and classes can push social and political development toward a societal democracy to reduce or eliminate inequalities? We will try to decipher the conditions for transformation both from below (civil society) and from above (the state or political society).

We start off with liberal-democratic perspectives on power and democracy, but most of the course will be devoted to disentangling critical perspectives in the Marxist tradition. The latter has two main polar perspectives on the capitalist state. The Leninist perspective sees the state as part of the superstructure which emanates from determined capitalist class relations. Any reforms to institutions within capitalism end up being absorbed or neutralized. The only way to change the character of the state is by smashing it. Paradoxically, taking over state power is considered central to smashing it. Social democratic positions, on the other hand, consider that the state is not merely functional to capital accumulation; it is crossed by contradictions. The “contradictory functionality” of the state allows for the emergence of a variable political space in which egalitarian, democratic and even emancipatory politics may be pursued. The state, therefore, is not seen as a monolithic structure that always functions to reproduce dominant power; it is also penetrated by social contradictions and can be used by organized forces to implement progressive change. The state is considered equally central. Our main task in this seminar is thus to explore the range of theoretical and empirical issues bearing on the possibilities of empowerment for subordinate groups and classes.

Weekly seminars will consist of a combination of lectures by the instructor (minimal), structured discussion of extensive readings, and a presentation of final-paper drafts during the last session of the term. Each student will moderate seminar discussions at least one week, choosing discussion questions from the weekly assignments. A short book review (800-1000 words) and a final review essay (3,000-5,000 words) centered on the same book will be required. The latter consists of a review essay focusing on one of the required or recommended readings for this seminar. Notice that a review essay is more than just a review and always entails citing more readings than the central book in question. Suggested readings for each week may be used to write your review essay. You can consult review essays published in a recent issue of *Contemporary Sociology* to see how this is done. If you would like to review a book that is not contained in this syllabus, this should be discussed and approved by the instructor.

Learning Goals:

This seminar has several learning goals beyond the substantive topic of its title as specified above. Other learning goals include the following:

Critical synthesis. One of the main abilities that any university student must acquire is to gather, classify, analyze and synthesize large amounts of information. Information is usually abundant, so what you need to develop is the ability to process it in a coherent way. For graduate students, this ability will become critical when writing their theses or dissertations. Undergraduate students planning to do graduate work will also greatly benefit from this exercise. Most assignments in this course are geared to enhance the ability for critical synthesis.

Peer review. Scholarly life progresses largely as a dialogue, discussion and debate in the community of peers. Peer review is the process by which a scholarly contribution is subjected to the reading by other scholars in a similar field with the goals of assessing its merits and identifying areas in which it could be improved. There are several essential conditions to engage in fair peer review. One is to read materials generated by others with an open mind, looking for both strengths and weaknesses. Rendering a synthesis of core strengths is a condition to then engage in a discussion of weaknesses. Another condition for doing a fair peer review is to humbly subject one's own work to the review of others, get their feedback, and try to make the best of it in revising the work. This reciprocal back-and-forth process among scholars makes for a cooperative mode of advancing in the production of knowledge. Unfortunately some feedback is negative and ill-intended but, in my view, most scholarly exchange tends to be constructive and well-meaning. This is the type of feedback that I hope to promote in this seminar, both in relation to all of its members and the authors that we will be reading, reviewing, and discussing.

Group interaction. Most settings in the world of work will involve discussion, dialogue, debate and group interaction. Fruitfully interacting with other students is a skill to be learned or developed. Our group discussions will also involve that each student will take different roles in each seminar, which shall be rotated weekly among group members: **moderator**, chooses questions, introduces readings, and coordinates discussion, making sure that no two people speak at one time and that everyone gets a fair share of time to contribute; **time keeper**, makes sure that discussion is flowing at an adequate pace to finish assignment on time; **participation encourager**, makes sure that everyone in the group contributes in some way to the discussion; **concept clarifier**, checks the readings as needed to make sure that the group is properly understanding the key concepts under discussion; and **reporter** to class, records the names of group participants and keeps minutes of the discussion with a view to give a summary of conclusions to the entire class, and hand in an outline of the group's discussion with the names of participants to professor. **Because this will be a small seminar, we will function as a single group with rotating roles each week, and two-three people will act as concept clarifiers.**

Presentation skills. A presentation of about 15 minutes using power point with no more than about 15 slides, assuming that you take a minute per slide, will be done in the last class. Technical guidelines: Each slide should not contain much more than 3-5 lines, with not more than 3-4 words per line, always using a 36-point font in the main text and 40 points for slide titles. If you use pictures or images, then shorten text within those slides or leave them without a text. Content guidelines: (1) Introduce your topic, why you were interested in the book you chose, its relevance, and how it relates to your thesis or dissertation's research question. This should take no more than 3 minutes. (2) Go over the main theoretical positions in which the book is inserted and what is the author's position in the debate. What is your own position in this debate and with respect to the book's author (3-5 minutes). (3) Briefly describe the empirical evidence used by the author as it relates to the debate and/or to your own stance (3-5 min.) (4) Finally, what are your main conclusions and ideas for your future research? (2-3 min.) This exercise will prepare you for your thesis or dissertation defense.

Theory and practice. Most of the books that we will be reading for this class tend to be on the theoretical rather than the historical side of scholarly production. The best way of gaining an understanding of theoretical concepts, however, is by seeing the specific ways in which they can be employed as tools for analysis of concrete historical situations. In order to put some of the main concepts to work, students leading the weekly discussion are encouraged to identify a current-news article in a major newspaper (e.g., *The New York Times*, *The Globe and Mail*, *The Guardian*) in the 600-800 words range. Ideally, such article will be thematically related to one of the core topics for the student's thesis or dissertation. The article should be posted on our Canvas space. Each student may choose to print the article for use in class. The leader can then allow the class to engage either in a structured discussion around concepts that she or he considers most appropriate from the relevant week's readings, or allow the group to inductively derive such concepts from discussion. The group can spend 5-10 minutes reading the news article and then 20 minutes establishing the relationship with major concepts. We can then spend another 20 minutes to better understand both the substantive issues involved in the current-news article and the concepts used for its analysis. (This is an optional exercise and you are welcome to experiment.)

Grading:

Six Discussion Papers	30% (one each of six weeks, 5% each)
Book Review	15% (July 8)
Moderate Discussion	5% (one-week leading)
Draft Presentation	10% (July 29)
Review Essay	30% (due August 1)
Participation:	10%

Extra Credit Option: Write up to five responses in any week that you do not also write a discussion paper. Each response will be valued at 1%.

Academic Dishonesty and Misconduct Policy

The Department of Sociology and Anthropology follows SFU policy in relation to grading practices, grade appeals (Policy T 20.01) and academic dishonesty and misconduct procedures (S10.01- S10.04). Unless otherwise informed by your instructor in writing, in graded written assignments you must cite the sources you rely on and include a bibliography/list of references, following an instructor-approved citation style. It is the responsibility of students to inform themselves of the content of SFU policies available on the SFU website:

<http://www.sfu.ca/policies/gazette/student.html>.

Required Texts: (available at SFU Bookstore, Library Reserves or online)

David Harvey. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. ISBN: 9780199283262.

Steven Lukes. 2005 [1974] *Power: A Radical View*. Second Edition. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. ISBN: 0333420926.

C.B. Macpherson. 2012 [1977]. *The Life and Times of Liberal Democracy*. Don Mills, Ont.: Oxford University Press. ISBN: 9780195447804.

Selections from Pierre Bourdieu's work on democracy and politics (available on Canvas).

Archon Fung and Erik Olin Wright, eds. 2003. *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*. London: Verso. ISBN: 1859844669.

J.K. Gibson-Graham. 2006. *A Postcapitalist Politics*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press. ISBN: 0816648042. (Electronic version available at SFU library.)

Erik Olin Wright. 2010. *Envisioning Real Utopias*. London and New York: Verso. ISBN: 9781844676170.

Gianpaolo Baiocchi, Patrick Heller, and Marcelo K. Silva. 2011. *Bootstrapping Democracy: Transforming Local Governance and Civil Society in Brazil*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. ISBN: 9780804760560.

Discussion Papers (a total of eight for weeks 2-12. You can only miss three weeks so plan accordingly): These typewritten, single-spaced papers (450-600 words), in 12-point font are due **no later** than 12:00 noon on the Monday of the relevant week (i.e., one day before the class). Discussion papers should be posted on the relevant week's container within our Canvas space (the replacement of WebCT). Save an electronic copy for your files. If you need to communicate with the whole class, for class-related matters, you can send a message to our courselist: sa887-d100@sfu.ca and/or sa460-d100@sfu.ca. Make sure to write "SA887" or "SA460" in the **Subject** field of any email correspondence you send to the class or to me. This will insure my immediate attention.

Please follow these guidelines when posting your discussion papers: (1) Include your name and week for which you are writing on the top line, using **only one line** for this information: the fewer pages I have to print the better. (2) There is no need to include the full reference to the works you are writing about in discussion papers, except the author's name. (3) The discussion papers should be written **EXCLUSIVELY** on the basis of required readings.

Organizing the content. Discussion papers should include 4 **explicit** parts, i.e., divide your papers into the following **overt sections** (use the following description as a model):

(1) **Introduction.** Write a paragraph raising a paradox or central question about the topic of the readings. You must then provide an **outline** of the rest of your essay (50 words). Having an agenda, however brief, is a crucial element in social-science writing, so it is important to compose a proper introduction.

(2) **Synthesis.** Provide a brief **synthesis** of what the author(s) is (are) saying. (250-350 words.) Identify the central questions, main points, concepts, and/or core arguments. Rather than analyzing all the ideas that the author presents, you should focus in depth on the most significant aspects of the text, always mentioning the key concepts used by the author. Brief definitions of such concepts would help, including a reference to a specific page number or providing the author's most synthetic rendering of the concept(s) by using a textual quotation. A synthesis is not the same as a summary. The latter is an attempt to provide an inventory of the entire text. A synthesis is not as easy because it presupposes that the text has been understood, and focuses on the core, most central parts. A good synthesis of a text requires an awareness and knowledge of the author's style of thinking, not just the particular facts that are presented to support an argument. Focus on interrogating the texts about their theory and/or methodology, whichever seems most relevant in a given text, as well as the core argument.

(3) **Assessment.** Brief **assessment** of the *strengths* and/or *weaknesses* of the authors' central arguments or concepts. (50-150 words.) Do the authors' evidence or analysis really support what they set out to do and their conclusions? How does their viewpoint color the interpretations they make? How well does the theory and method serve the author(s)? Rather than merely giving

your opinions, say why you agree or disagree with their argument and conclusions. I encourage you to be contentious and take a risk by taking a strong stand that will get debate going in class, and be ready to defend your stance with relevant evidence and/or analysis.

(4) **Questions.** Finally, provide two discussion **questions** related to the readings. (30-40 words.) One should be a lingering question whose answer would further clarify the readings for you, with a focus on theory. The other may be a question on methods or one that will promote class discussion. The main task of discussion papers is to help understand the text, a precondition to assess and discuss their applicability.

I am looking for well-written papers which extract the main theoretical concepts and propositions, critique the readings directly or support their arguments, and which draw in questions and issues that have been raised in other readings, lectures, and/or discussions from earlier in the course (40% for eight papers, or 5% each).

Discussion papers will be marked according to the following criteria:

Name: _____					Discussion Paper Evaluation	Grade: _____
POOR					EXCELLENT	
1	2	3	4	5	Contains four explicit sections, as requested.	
1	2	3	4	5	Introduces main topic and sets up clearly defined agenda .	
1	2	3	4	5	Focuses on core arguments, concepts and perspectives (rather than a superficial summary or inventory of themes).	
1	2	3	4	5	Coherence of explanation. Clear statements. Succinct (i.e. thorough on core points, yet stays within word limit).	
1	2	3	4	5	Key terms and concepts are defined and explained .	
1	2	3	4	5	Assertions and arguments supported with specific cites to required readings.	
1	2	3	4	5	Assertions and arguments supported with specific quotes from required readings.	
1	2	3	4	5	Reasoned assessment of strengths and weaknesses (rather than merely agreeing or disagreeing).	
1	2	3	4	5	Questions help disentangle readings conceptually, referring back to text rather than eliciting opinion or application.	
1	2	3	4	5	Depth of coverage of required readings.	

Note: Late discussion papers will not be marked or counted.

Extra-Credit, Optional Responses. Students not writing a paper for a given week have the option of writing a **response** on the ideas of **at least** one of the other students' discussion papers. You can post up to five sets of responses in as many alternate weeks. You cannot write both a discussion paper and a response on the same week. The ideal responses are those that will promote further disentangling and understanding of the readings, rather than simply rendering an opinion. **All** responses should be based on your peers' rendering of the text, **using citations and quotations** from the text as needed to make your points. Assume that the texts constitute your "empirical evidence," which must be referred to in order to back up or reinforce your statements and main arguments. In a sense, students writing discussion papers are accountable to those writing responses. Respondents will make sure that the right interpretations are being conveyed

in discussion papers. Responses without some cites or quotes will automatically be marked with a zero. Post your responses in Canvas by 9:00 p.m. on the Monday before class. Make sure that you post your response as a single paper in its own weekly container under “Responses” (up to 5%, or 1% each).

Post your responses on Canvas by 9 p.m. on the Monday before our Tuesday seminar.

Book Review. This is a book review (800-1200 words) in which the central task is to present a neutral point of view, or what Wikipedia calls NPOV, of the book: a straight forward synthesis of the author’s perspective and arguments without yourselves being argumentative. This is akin to what could be required in a policy analysis position in the form of a “policy brief.” While a policy brief is expected to cover a wide range of debate and discussion on a given topic, the writer must present a neutral rendering of such debate. In this case you are expected to develop the ability to engage in this type of writing in a book review. Students can endeavour to make an actual contribution to Wikipedia with their review, but the group will have to collectively figure out how to implement it. Notice that actual book reviews published in scholarly journals are expected to do this kind of neutral presentation plus an assessment of strengths and weaknesses which is usually argumentative. Such assessment will be the task of the final paper. You may choose a different book for that. Otherwise, the book review will be a constitutive element of the final review essay. Therefore, this assignment may be cumulative toward the final paper (10%).

Presentation. Students will make a 10 minutes presentation of a draft of their final review essay during the last session of the seminar. The idea is to give you a forum to practice the type of presentation entailed in an M.A. or Ph.D. defence. While you cannot be exhaustive in articulating all the points of the book (or your thesis), you need to highlight the most central points and make it exciting and understandable for the audience beyond your committee.

Final Review Essay. The **review essay** is intended for students to think through the various theoretical approaches and interpretations of your specific theme in a comparative perspective, while focusing the discussion on a single book. Please note that the “essay” part of this assignment should be taken seriously: the essay should **engage** the book under consideration and you are also encouraged to make an original argument while discussing the book’s perspective.

You are welcome to focus on a single central issue of the book and support your arguments with citations or quotations from other readings. Each essay must resort to **at least three** of the required and/or supplementary readings for sustained discussion (3,000-5,000 words, double-spaced, 12-point font, times roman). This is your chance to integrate your views on a central topic (25%). Because the review essay can be based on the same book used for the book review (10%), this may be a cumulative assignment of 35%.

Submit **a printed and an electronic version** of each essay and attach a sociological-evaluation sheet to the printed version for the book review and the final review essay. The electronic version will be for my files.

Grading System

Course Grading System is A+, A, A-, B+, B, B-, C+, C, C-, D, F, N (N standing to indicate the student did not complete the assignments). Intervals for the assignment of final letter grades based on course percentage grades are as follows:

A+ 95 – 100	B+ 80 - 84	C+ 65 - 69	D 50 – 54
A 90 - 94	B 75 - 79	C 60 - 64	F 0 – 49
A- 85 - 89	B- 70 - 74	C- 55 - 59	

Centre for Student with Disabilities

Students with hidden or visible disabilities who believe they may need classroom or term paper accommodations are encouraged to register with the SFU Centre for Students with Disabilities (1250 Maggie Benson Centre) as soon as possible to ensure that they are eligible and that approved accommodations and services are implemented in a timely fashion.

Tentative Class Schedule

Week 1 (May 6): Introduction and Course Overview

Required Readings: Start reading David Harvey. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Suggested Readings:

Jamie Peck. 2010. *Constructions of Neoliberal Reason*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Week 2 (May 13): Neoliberalism

Required Readings:

Finish David Harvey. 2005. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
(Write discussion paper on whole book even if you focus on one or two core ideas or arguments).

Suggested Readings:

Eduardo Silva. 2009. *Challenging Neoliberalism in Latin America*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Howard Kimeldorf. 2013. "Worker Replacement Costs and Unionization: Origins of the U.S. Labor Movement." *American Sociological Review*. 78(6):1033-1062.

Week 3 (May 20): Power in democratic theory (self-managed discussion as I will be away at a conference in Chicago)

Required Readings: Steven Lukes. 2005 [1974] *Power: A Radical View*. Second Edition. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Suggested Readings:

Frances Fox Piven. 2006. *Challenging Authority: How Ordinary People Change America*. Boulder, CO.: Rowman & Littlefield.

Annette Desmarais. 2007. *La Via Campesina: Globalization and the Power of Peasants*. (Forward by Walden Bello.) Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Manuel Castells. 2009. *Communication Power*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Aaron Bobrow-Strain. 2007. *Intimate Enemies: Landowners, Power, and Violence in Chiapas*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Marshal Ganz. 2009. *Why David Sometimes Wins: Leadership, Organization and Strategy in the California Farm Worker Movement*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Week 4 (May 27): Liberal Democracy and its Limits

Required Readings: C.B. Macpherson. 2012 [1977]. *The Life and Times of Liberal Democracy*. Don Mills, Ont.: Oxford University Press.

Suggested Readings:

James Cairns & Alan Sears. 2012. *The Democratic Imagination: Envisioning Popular Power in the Twenty-First Century*. New York: University of Toronto Press.

Elinor Ostrom. 1990. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. New York: Cambridge University Press

Deborah J. Yashar. 2005. *Contesting Citizenship in Latin America: The Rise of Indigenous Movements and the Postliberal Challenge*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Nancy Grey Postero. 1997. *Now We Are Citizens: Indigenous Politics in Postmulticultural Bolivia*. Palo Alto, CA.: Stanford University Press.

Will Kymlicka. 1996. *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press.

Week 5 (June 3): Pierre Bourdieu on Democracy, Delegation, and the State

Required Readings: Read Wacquant 2004 and at least two of Bourdieu's pieces:

Löic Wacquant. 2004. "Pointers on Pierre Bourdieu and Democratic Politics." *Constellations* 11(1):3-15.

Pierre Bourdieu. 2004. "From the King's House to the Reason of State: A Model for the Genesis of the Bureaucratic Field." *Constellations* 11(1):16-36.

Pierre Bourdieu. 2004. "The Mystery of the Ministry: From Particular Wills to the General Will." *Constellations* 11(1):37-43.

Pierre Bourdieu. 1989. "Social Space and Symbolic Power." *Sociological Theory* 7(1):14-25.

Suggested Readings:

Löic Wacquant. 1996. "Reading Bourdieu's 'Capital'." *International Journal of Contemporary Sociology*. 33(2):151-170.

Mathieu Hikaru Desan. 2013. "Bourdieu, Marx, and Capital: A Critique of the Extension Model." *Sociological Theory* 31(4):318-342.

Pierre Bourdieu. 1985. "The Social Space and the Genesis of Groups." *Theory and Society* 14(6):723-744.

Löic Wacquant, ed. 2005. *Pierre Bourdieu and Democratic Politics*. Cambridge, UK and Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Loic J.D. Wacquant. 1989. "Towards a Reflexive Sociology: A Workshop with Pierre Bourdieu." *Sociological Theory* 7(1):23-63.

Week 6 (June 10): Deepening Democracy I

Required Readings: Archon Fung and Erik Olin Wright, eds. 2003. *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*. London: Verso. ISBN: 1859844669. Read Ch. 1 by Fung and Wright plus at least two case studies from Part II.

Suggested Readings:

Week 7 (June 17): Deepening Democracy II

Required Readings: Archon Fung and Erik Olin Wright, eds. 2003. *Deepening Democracy: Institutional Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance*. London: Verso. ISBN: 1859844669. Read at least two commentaries from Part III plus the Epilogue by Fung and

Wright. Then, skim through the following article, reading at least the abstract and its conclusions:

Maria Akchurin and Cheol-Sung Lee. 2013. "Pathways to Empowerment: Repertoires of Women's Activism and Gender Earnings Equality." *American Sociological Review* 78(4):679-701.

Suggested Readings:

David Brandy, Regina S. Baker, and Ryan Finnigan. "When Unionization Disappears: State-Level Unionization and Working Poverty in the United States." *American Sociological Review* 78(5): 872-896.

Week 8 (June 24): Beyond Capitalist Politics I

Required Readings: J.K. Gibson-Graham. 2006. *A Postcapitalist Politics*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press. ISBN: 0816648042. (Electronic version available at SFU library.) Read through Ch. 4, inclusive.

Week 9 (July 1): Beyond Capitalist Politics II

Required Readings: J.K. Gibson-Graham. 2006. *A Postcapitalist Politics*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press. ISBN: 0816648042. (Electronic version available at SFU library.) Finish book.

Suggested Readings:

John Holloway 2010 [2001]. *Changing the World Without Taking Power*. London and New York: Pluto Press. ISBN: 980745329185.

Raúl Zibechi. 2010. *Dispersing Power: Social Movements as Anti-State Forces*. (Forward by Benjamin Dangl and John Holloway.) Oakland, CA: AK Press.

Thomas Olsen. 2005. *International Zapatismo: The Construction of Solidarity in the Age of Globalization*. London & New York: Zed Books.

Shannon Speed, R. Aída Hernández Castillo, and Lynn M. Stephen, eds. 2006. *Dissident Women: Gender and Cultural Politics in Chiapas*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Week 10 (July 8): Real Utopias I

Required Readings: Read through p. 149 of Erik Wright's book

Suggested Readings:

Roy Morrison. 1991. *We build the road as we travel*. Philadelphia, PA.: New Society Publishers.

Book Review Due Today by 8:30 in class.

Week 11 (July 15): Real Utopias II

Required Readings: Finish Wright's book

Suggested Readings:

Week 12 (July 22): The State and Civil Society

Required Readings: *Bootstrapping Democracy* (read at least four chapters including the introduction and ch.1.)

Suggested Readings:

Gianpaolo Baiocchi. 2006. *Militants and Citizens: the Politics of Participatory Democracy in Porto Alegre*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Brian Wampler. 2007. *Participatory Budgeting in Brazil: Contestation, Cooperation, and Accountability*. University Park, PA.: Pennsylvania University Press.

Gianpaolo Baiocchi, ed. 2003. *Radicals in power: the Workers' Party (PT) and Experiments in Urban Democracy in Brazil*. London and New York: Zed Books.

Recommended on MST:

Wolford, Wendy. 2010. *The Land is Ours Now: Social Mobilization and the Meanings of Land in Brazil*. Durham: Duke University Press. (Available online at SFU's library.)

Branford, Sue, and Jan Rocha. 2002. *Cutting the Wire: The Story of the Landless Movement in Brazil*. London: Latin America Bureau.

Gabriel A. Ondetti. 2008. *Land, Protest, and Politics: the Landless Movement and the Struggle for Agrarian Reform in Brazil*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University.

Angus Wright and Wendy Welford. 2003. *To Inherit the Land: the Landless Movement and the Struggle for a New Brazil*. Oakland, CA: Food First Books.

Recommended on Ethnic Politics in Latin America:

Donna Lee Van Cott. 2005. *From Movements to Parties in Latin America: The Evolution of Ethnic Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Madrid, Raúl. 2012. *The Rise of Ethnic Politics in Latin America*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Week 13 (July 29): Presentations

Review Essay Due on Friday, August 1, 2014 by 4:00 p.m. Please slide under my office door.

Sociological Essay Evaluation (for Book Review and Review Essay)

Name: _____.

Essay grade: _____.

Analysis and Criticism:

POOR

EXCELLENT

1	2	3	4	5	Follows the directions of the assignment (e.g., answers questions sufficiently).
1	2	3	4	5	Clearly defined agenda to demonstrate the thesis or hypothesis.
1	2	3	4	5	Coherence of explanation. Clear statements. Succinct.
1	2	3	4	5	Key terms and concepts are defined and explained.
1	2	3	4	5	Assertions and arguments supported with specific <u>cites</u> to the original works.
1	2	3	4	5	Assertions and arguments supported with specific <u>quotes</u> from the original works.
1	2	3	4	5	Creative use of insights from lecture and class discussion.
1	2	3	4	5	Various parts and paragraphs of paper well structured and interconnected.
1	2	3	4	5	Depth of coverage of existing literature and original works.
1	2	3	4	5	Analyzes literature beyond summarizing.

Technical presentation:

X denotes that attention should be paid to this problem.

XX denotes that extra attention is warranted.

- _____ Late paper (one letter grade is deducted for each day the paper is late).
- _____ Paper format: pages numbered in top right hand corner, one-inch margins, double-spaced.
- _____ Appropriate citation format not followed.
- _____ Text is too long.
- _____ Text is too short.
- _____ Redundancy (wordy; can be trimmed without loss of meaning).
- _____ Some statements are unsupported (e.g., undeveloped and/or vague statements).
- _____ Insufficient coverage of existing literature.
- _____ Insufficient depth of coverage.
- _____ Typographic errors, misspelled words, punctuation errors.
- _____ Incomplete sentences, awkward sentence structure.
- _____ Some paragraphs are too long.
- _____ Some paragraphs are too short.

SA 887/460

STUDENT SURVEY

Summer 2014

Name: _____

Phone(s): _____

Major? _____ Year/Class _____

E-mail: _____

Other courses taken this semester (names, not numbers):

Home town and/or country? _____

How long have you studied at Simon Fraser University? _____ If you come from another college or university, please name: _____

Why are you interested in this course? (check one:)

It is required ☐ ☐

Interested in subject ☐ ☐

Fit my timetable ☐ ☐

Looked easy ☐ ☐

Other ☐ ☐ Specify _____.

Please name two to three courses taken at Simon Fraser University or other universities or colleges that have influenced your thinking the most. Write course names, not numbers.

What is your current definition of the state? (2-3 sentences)