This little handout is not a how-to guide in the sense that I want you to follow their organization (although you should notice that it's rather close to what I ask you to do), but I do want you to notice that these scholars are making the same moves I'm trying to teach you, and these paragraphs also provide new ways/language to make those moves. Feel free to poach.

How to Read a Noose By TROY DUSTER

Notice how the author introduces and contextualizes his topic.

The Washington Post reported on October 20 that there have been several "copycat" noose hangings since those in Jena, La., in 2006. The most widely publicized, in a front-page story in The New York Times, was a noose left on the doorknob of a black professor's office at Columbia University. But many other incidents have been reported. As the Post put it: "Nooses have been looped over a tree at the University of Maryland, knotted to the end of stage-rigging ropes at a suburban Memphis theater ... hung in a locker room at a Long Island police station, stuffed in the duffel bag of a black Coast Guard cadet aboard a historic ship, and draped around the necks of black dolls in the Pittsburgh suburbs. The hangman's rope has become so prolific, some say, it could replace the Nazi swastika and the Ku Klux Klan's fiery cross as the nation's reigning symbol of hate." **What are we to make of the noose as symbol in 21st-century America? The question is** whether the reappearance of the symbolic noose is a significant development or a radar blip. **To answer, we need to place the issue in a much broader socio-historical context.**

Note that the author asks a question, and then offers a solution.

Note that the writer provides the context.

During slavery, when white racial domination and political and economic supremacy were uncontested, there was no need for a Ku Klux Klan. Only during Reconstruction, when that supremacy was challenged, did the KKK emerge to "put blacks back in their place." In the decade after the Civil War, black people made dramatic gains in education and political power, and some were competing successfully with white people in the newly developing economy. Then the northern troops withdrew — and the noose appeared. In the 1930s, with the economic disarray of the Great Depression, there was a sharp resurgence of the Ku Klux Klan in several northern cities in response to new, limited, black migration. Using assaults, lynchings, and parades symbolizing their potential power, the Klan sought to protect the position and privilege of white people. The noose appeared again.

Note here that the writer focuses on the function of the noose, and note,too, how the writer invokes a theory to make sense of it... just as you learned to do.

The purpose of terror is straightforward: instilling fear to immobilize the target group, stopping it in its tracks from pursuing a course of action that the terrorists wish to block. Like present-day suicide bombings and overwhelming "shock and awe" bombing raids, lynchings seek to terrorize and immobilize. **Terrorism also employs what the eminent French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu termed "symbolic violence."** Having lynched many African-Americans, the Ku Klux Klan could simply ride in the night, covered by white sheets, plant a large burning cross in front of the house of a black family, and head off into the darkness knowing well that its symbolic violence would terrorize as effectively as an actual lynching.

…...

Note the strategy. This time the writer appeals to *kairos* or timing to justify the need to talk about Carroll. Also note that the writer situates her contribution among other Carroll scholars, and if we had time, I'd ask you to do that, too.

Lewis Carroll's Little Girls By AMY LEAL

This is the year of Lewis Carroll's little girls. They are the subjects of three recent or forthcoming films, a Marilyn Manson CD, a play written for the Yale School of Drama, a photography exhibition, a graphic novel, and a commemorative symposium at Columbia University. Scholars and biographers, of course, have exhaustively studied the life and art of the Rev. Charles Lutwidge Dodgson, aka Lewis Carroll (he was always Dodgson to his "child-friends"), and his Alice books provide perpetual pop-culture fodder ranging from Disney merchandise to Gwen Stefani songs. In recent years, scholars including Morton N. Cohen, Roger Taylor, Edward Wakeling, and Douglas R. Nickel have persuasively argued for the artistic merit of Dodgson's photographs of Victorian notables and little girls as well. Yet the lives of the child-friends whom Dodgson entranced with stories and photographed in various states of exotic undress — Alice Liddell, Alexandra (Xie) Kitchin, Irene MacDonald, and Evelyn Hatch, among many others — have yet to get their due. **Who, exactly, were these little girls, and why was Dodgson so besotted with them?** It is time for the subaltern nymphet to speak. Examining the lives of Dodgson's child-friends and the images he took of them forces us to re-evaluate his vision of childhood, the murky line between art and pornography, and the perennial appeal he has for popular culture.

Again, note the question that justifies the existence of Leal's essay.

Note that Leal is situating Carroll within a literary context.

Many of the children Dodgson photographed were also the offspring of famous writers and painters of the day, such as John Everett Millais; Arthur Hughes; Alfred, Lord Tennyson; and George MacDonald. It must have been fascinating to grow up listening in on the conversations of some of the greatest minds of the Victorian era and to be exposed to the new science and art of photography, posing for a stuttering and yarn-spinning "Lewis Carroll." One of Dodgson's models and friends, Effie Gray Millais, had not only a Pre-Raphaelite painter for a father, but also a famous former nymphet as a mother, a woman also called Effie, who had been married to John Ruskin until their scandalous annulment — probably because he was horrified to learn that women, unlike statues and little girls, have hair underneath their clothes. Another of Dodgson's child-friends was Irene MacDonald, a forthright young girl with an unwavering gaze who inspired both her father's beloved The Princess and the Goblin and The Princess and Curdie novels as well as Dodgson's photographic fantasies. She posed for him on several occasions, including a famous one with hair wild and wiry as an untamed Pre-Raphaelite child, one strand corkscrewing through her hand. She reclines on leopard and bear skins with a wolf-tail pillow under her head, her upper body covered only with a paisley shawl, her face half-drugged with sleep, "dreaming through the twilight," as Christina Rossetti put it.

Notice that Leal identifies a problem, question, or puzzle: Was Dodgson a pedophile? Was Wonderland actually Neverland Ranch?

Note how Leal now places the friendships and photos in a specific historical context.

In our time, people are arrested just for getting such photographs in the mail. We live in an age of paranoia, and to our millennial eyes, Dodgson's photographs of his girl acquaintances seem like evidence used against Pete Townshend — although some of Townshend's photographs would probably seem too chaste for the English professor Ellis Hanson's "Sexual Child" class at Cornell. While Dodgson's cartes de visite would not necessarily have titillated or disturbed in the Victorian era, they look like kiddie porn to us. We worry that Wonderland was a Neverland Ranch, that there was something sinister in Dodgson's invitations to girls and young women to visit him at the sea or to go to plays in London. **Yet to understand the nature of his friendships with little girls, one must see his outings and photographic sessions in the context of the Victorian era** — one that also, for example, posed and took pictures of dead children. (Some of Dodgson's photographs of children "sleeping" on a fainting couch resemble those.)

The Movement Press; Israeli Self-Images

For the last two centuries, Americans whose concerns and interests lay outside the accepted political boundaries of the day have organized social movements as the principal vehicle for advancing their cause. Their journals have been their most important tool and have been applied to almost every task these movements undertook. The history of social movements and the history of their press are often nearly inseparable, and historians frequently peg the birth of a social movement to the founding of the movement's first journal.

After the writer describes the problem, he then justifies the existence of his essay by identifying a gap in the scholarship, another typical academic move.

It is therefore surprising that the history of the social-movement press has been studied so little. I suspect this is largely due to the fact that when judged by the standards typically used to assess the importance of mainstream publications — total circulation, advertising revenue, length of book, longevity, "professionalism," "objectivity," and "lack of bias" — social-movement publications appear to have been of negligible importance. Yet even the most cursory review of the social-movement press reveals the mistakes of judging it by these standards.

And here we see the move you need to make: place the text in a context (but note that the writer doesn't quite do that yet.

It is my contention that the history of social-movement journalism can be understood only *in the context of the particular movements of which each journal was a part*: its internal dynamics and strategies, its relation with its immediate adversary, its relation with the state, and its location in the broader culture. ... Each of these four components is highly dynamic; together, they create a context of continuous change.

Note that the writer has just reviewed several troublesome "accounts" about clothing and now she concludes that we need to contextualize the story.

These accounts reveal a haunting ambivalence toward clothing, and suggest that for many workers engaged in clothing production clothing consumption became fraught and, in some instances, politicized. In order to fully understand this ambivalence—in order to fully understand what is at stake in such representations—it is necessary to assess the historical context in which Yezierska was writing. Once we have briefly traced the history of Jewish participation in clothing production, and the development of ready-made clothing as a technology, it becomes possible to determine what ready-made clothing signified in early twentieth-century American society, and to recognize the role ready-made clothing played in the lives of Jewish garment workers. It is only then that it becomes possible to comprehend the complexity of Yezierska's relationship to clothing, and the complexity of her fictional treatment; it is only then, I would argue, that we can fully appreciate Yezierska's material.

And here the writer begins to give us a history lesson, the same move you need to make.

Jewish involvement in clothing production dates back several centuries and was an indirect result of a set of legal restrictions governing Jewish life in the Eastern European Pale of Settlement. Prevented from farming the land, Jews turned to commerce and handicrafts to make their living. Jewish tailors made "kosher" clothes for Orthodox Jews, who were not allowed to wear unmixed wool and linen (Glenn 19-20). But Jews were also tailors and dressmakers for gentiles in the countryside and the cities of Eastern Europe. In Eastern Europe, at