

Paper 2

Abstract (150 words) due on lmlm20.blogs.rutgers.edu by 10 a.m. on Monday, May 11.

Paper (2000–2500 words) due on Sakai Assignments by May 26. Extensions are possible, but it's better to just turn something in. I prefer to receive papers in PDF.

Write a short position paper on any question related to the course, drawing your evidence primarily from texts we have read together, including at least one text from the second half of the course. Given the circumstances, a research paper is discouraged: please focus your attention on the primary and secondary readings from the course, and strictly limit any time given over to further reading beyond the syllabus. One or two further secondary sources may be useful but are not required.

I strongly encourage you to re-use your own blog posts and to cite others' posts in your writing, and to think of this paper in the spirit of continuing seminar discussion rather than as an independent statement.

Here are some (only some) of our recurring themes, in almost no particular order:

1. Modes of representing, authenticating, and communicating experience
2. Movement, migration, circulation (especially: transnational)
3. The uses of racial and ethnic categories or types
4. The significance of mixed linguistic registers (including formal language, vernaculars, and dialects)
5. Relations between mass culture (especially: journalism, advertising) and its others
6. The effects of varied audiences and reception circumstances (including print contexts)
7. Stylistic or technical innovation and its significance; difficulty and access
8. The “translation” into the literary field of extra-literary struggles (political, economic...)
9. The applicability of the categories or criteria of classic modernism (e.g. anticonventionalism, innovation, abstraction, autonomy) beyond the core of classic modernism¹

1. If you find yourself considering this one, please do not allow yourself to be consumed by the

You might choose any of these, or formulate another, and approach it *either* through an interpretation of one text from the second half of the semester *or* through a wider-ranging comparative discussion of multiple texts. Take advantage of the constraints of the assignment and give yourself permission to operate in a generalizing mode on the basis of our shared inquiry.

As in the first paper, what is most important in this assignment is to articulate a meaningful scholarly *motive*, to formulate a specific *argument*, and to support that argument with some *evidence*, analyzed in a way that points metonymically to a wider potential body of supporting evidence.

My evaluation of your work will take into account the difficult circumstances we all find ourselves in.

STYLE

You may use any bibliographic system you prefer, so long as you are consistent and sufficiently complete. The *Chicago Manual* is good; the new *MLA Handbook* is even worse than the old. Electronically generated citations always need hand-correction.

Clarity and precision are important in academic prose. Pay attention to the way your sentences communicate your meaning to your reader.

question of whether something deserves membership in “the canon” or indeed whether something “is modernist” or not. These issues are a terrible tangle, and I will solve them for you next semester if you take my graduate seminar in the fall (joke). I think you will find it more fruitful to focus on a more specific concept or category that modernism brings to mind, and generate more specific comparative claims about how that category does or does not travel.