

17.20 Long Paper Prompt

In the long paper for this course, you will take and defend a normative position related to one of the substantive debates covered in Part V of the syllabus. You will support your argument with theory and empirical evidence drawn from the readings assigned for the relevant lecture as well as from readings from lectures earlier in the course.

Requirements:

- A rough draft of the paper is due on April 30, and the final version is due on the last day of class (May 16). As always, the paper must be uploaded by noon on the day it is due. Late papers will be docked one-third of a grade each eight hours. Given the disruptions of the past week, I will be happy to grant extension requests for both the draft and the final, as long as I receive the request at least three days before the due date. The only thing to keep in mind is that the earlier you submit the draft, the earlier you will receive comments back from your TA.
- Your paper must be at least 3,000 (and preferably no more than 3,500) words in length. This goes for the draft as well as the final.
- Your argument must be *normative*, meaning that it must take sides on questions of wrong/right, credit/blame, or what should/shouldn't be done.
- You must support your normative argument with theoretical and empirical evidence drawn from the readings. That is, you must justify your position on how things *should be* with evidence regarding how things *actually are* in reality.
- Although some of the works assigned for your chosen Part V lecture may be more central to your argument than others, you must engage with all of them by (at a minimum) characterizing their position on the normative debate. This includes the works marked with an asterisk (*) on the syllabus. Better papers will engage with the readings on a deeper level, synthesizing, arguing against, and drawing connections between different works. Some authors may express an explicit position on your chosen normative debate, but other works may do so more subtly through the assumptions they make or the implications of their (non-normative) argument.
- Your argument must draw on and explicitly cite at least four works assigned in Parts I–IV of the course. These works must be distributed

across at least two different lectures. Other works by one of the authors in the Part V lecture will not count towards this requirement.

- As with the other papers, make sure to properly cite the sources you use. When citing a specific quotation or part of a work, provide the page number. Include a reference list at the end of the paper. For a good resource, consult *The Chicago Manual of Style*.

Writing Tips:

- The works from Parts I–IV may be drawn from any two lectures, but some lectures may be more relevant than others. Below are listed some suggested pairings between substantive debates and earlier lectures (you are free to disregard these suggestions if you want):
 - *Polarization and Extremism*: Lectures 7, 14, 20, and 21
 - *Money and Organized Interests*: Lectures 2, 6, and 16
 - *The Politics of Economic Inequality*: Lectures 12, 18, and 19
 - *Race and Racism*: Lectures 3, 10, and 11
 - *Immigration and Multiculturalism*: Lectures 3, 15, and 18

MIT OpenCourseWare
<http://ocw.mit.edu>

17.20 Introduction to American Politics
Spring 2013

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <http://ocw.mit.edu/terms>.