

# SCIENCE AND SOCIAL POLICY

Syllabus version 2017 January 11 – subject to change

MC 351  
Spring 2017  
M,W 3:00-4:20  
340 Case Hall

## PROFESSOR JOY RANKIN

profjoy@msu.edu

Offices: 315 South Case Hall and 191 East Holmes Hall

Office Hours: Tuesday 10:15-11:15 in Holmes and Tuesday 1:30-2:30 in Case

### COURSE DESCRIPTION

This class explores the reciprocal relationships among science, technology, medicine, and American society. We will study cases from the Progressive Era through the present, including the germ theory of disease, genetics and eugenics, contraception and birth control, allergies and environment, and contemporary digital technologies and labor. Our aim will be to analyze how scientific (and medical and technological) practices have shaped American social policies (broadly understood), and how those policies have shaped the practice of science. We will identify continuities and changes over time in these reciprocal relationships.

### REQUIRED READING

Many of the assigned readings for this course are available with full text online through the MSU library (where noted), and some are posted on the course's D2L site (where noted). The readings for the last unit are available via the URLs provided in the syllabus below.

### ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

I value academic integrity and honesty. Any form of cheating or plagiarism in this course will be reported to the Dean and become part of your academic record. Complete your own work. Value your ideas, and honor and respect the ideas of others. Use appropriate citation of all sources in your written work (see the last pages of the syllabus for citation information). I expect each of you to adhere to the Spartan Code of Honor: "As a Spartan, I will strive to uphold values of the highest ethical standard. I will practice honesty in my work, foster honesty in my peers, and take pride in knowing that honor is worth more than grades. I will carry these values beyond my time as a student at Michigan State University, continuing the endeavor to build personal integrity in all that I do."

### SUCCESS IN THIS COURSE / OVERVIEW OF GRADING

Participation and collegiality	15%
Discussion questions	10%
Student-led in-class learning activity	25%
Essay on Unit One	25%
Essay on Combined Units (One/Two, Two/Three, or One/Three)	25%

**Note well: I do not accept late work. Any late work earns a 0.0.**

## **SUCCESS IN THIS COURSE / PARTICIPATION AND COLLEGIALITY**

In order to succeed in this course, your attendance, and active participation and engagement, are required at every class. I expect you to read all of every day's assigned readings, to identify each reading's argument(s) and assess its evidence, and bring to class analyses and reflections for discussion. Early in the semester we will, as a group, determine our own course guidelines for productive, respectful, and inclusive classroom discussion. We will also determine course guidelines for in-class use of technology (laptops, tablets, phones, etc.).

- **4.0:** Students who earn a 4.0 are consistently excellent colleagues. They are always present and prepared for class, and they bring interesting and relevant questions and comments to bear on the subject material. They are equally good listeners and show a genuine interest in their fellow students' thoughts. These students have completely bought into the class and made it better through their contributions, energy, and hard work. *Unexcused missed classes: 0 to 1.*
- **3.0:** A student who earns a 3.0 may have missed a couple of classes throughout the semester but generally has been an active and enthusiastic participant in the course. Other students who earn a 3.0 may have been in class and prepared for class every day, but will have occasionally articulated ideas without reference to the direction of the conversation; that is, they actively participated in discussions without listening to their colleagues' previous statements. *Unexcused missed classes: 2 to 3.*
- **2.0:** A student who earns a 2.0 is very much an average student. He or she will miss two or more classes throughout the semester or will come to class several times during the semester without having fully read and understood the assigned materials. Other such students will be prepared for class and will come to every class meeting, but will not fully participate in class activities and discussion; instead, they hold back, waiting for others to ask the tough questions or take the chance at making a mistake. Still other students who earn a 2.0 will occasionally dominate a class discussion and use rhetorical tactics that limit other students' participation. *Unexcused missed classes: 3 to 4.*
- **Lower than 2.0:** Students who earn a 1.0 or a 0 in the participation and collegiality portion of their grade will have missed more than three classes or will have come to class several times without being fully prepared for the class meeting. In the class discussions and activities, lower than average colleagues will avoid participating or will occasionally attempt to dominate the discussions. *Unexcused missed classes: greater than 4.*

## **SUCCESS IN THIS COURSE / DISCUSSION QUESTIONS**

To facilitate your active participation, every week you are required to **submit** (at least) **one** thoughtful **discussion question based on the week's readings to Professor Joy by email by Tuesday at 7PM**. We will share, use, and review these questions throughout the semester (although I will usually anonymize them). During the semester, we will consider the characteristics of good discussion questions.

## **SUCCESS IN THIS COURSE / STUDENT-LED IN-CLASS LEARNING ACTIVITY**

Each student will plan and facilitate a portion of in-class learning, to last approximately 30 minutes. Note: you may choose to do this individually or in pairs. Your planned activity must tie in with the day's readings and must deepen your peer's understanding of those readings. However, you may draw connections between the readings and any relevant topic of interest in science, technology, and society. You have tremendous flexibility in the types of activities you may plan. Written work for the assignment is due to Prof. Joy by email 48 hours before the in-class activity. This will consist of a

detailed lesson plan or agenda, as well as electronic links to any primary or secondary sources used for the activity, and to any current articles, video clips, photographs, websites, etc. to be used for the activity. This lesson plan will:

- Identify learning outcomes (or learning goals) that the student selects from among university, Madison College, and course learning goals. Students may also devise their own learning goals that are relevant to the course.
- Explain and thoughtfully reflect on how the planned activity will achieve those learning outcomes. Provide a discussion of any obstacles or challenges that may be anticipated, and how the discussion facilitator (you, the student(s) leading this activity) will work around those outcomes.
- Describe in detail the steps of the activity that the discussion facilitator will lead her or his classmates through in class.
- Identify any primary or secondary sources, or current articles, video clips, photographs, etc. to be used for the activity.
- Identify any supplies that may be needed for the activity.

Your grade will be based on your lesson agenda, the execution of your activity in class, and an evaluation by your peers. Early in the semester, I will provide more detailed instructions for this assignment, and we establish a schedule of presentations. The instructions and schedule will be posted on the course D2L site.

### **SUCCESS IN THIS COURSE / ESSAYS**

You will write two essays for this course. To pass this course, you must satisfactorily complete both of these essays. They should be submitted by email to Professor Joy according to the deadlines specified in the schedule that follows. Every student will write the first essay on *Unit One – The Progressive Era: Germs, Environment, Contraception, and Eugenics*. Students may choose to write their second essay on any combination of two of the three units (One/Two, Two/Three, or One/Three).

The assignment is to write an essay that synthesizes the assigned readings and in-class activities related to the units about which you're writing in each essay. (For the first essay, everyone will be writing about Unit One. For the second essay, your writing should synthesize the two units about which you're writing.) I want to see you engage the materials in a thoughtful and analytical manner and produce an essay that demonstrates that you have thought through the issues involved in that section of the course. Ultimately, I want to see you write an interesting, informed, and well-written essay on a subject that the entire class has explored. Papers should be approximately 1500-2000 words long. A detailed list of the writing guidelines for an outstanding paper appear in the last pages of the syllabus. You must cite quotes and paraphrasing correctly. See the last pages of the syllabus for citation format information. These papers will be evaluated as follows:

- **3.4 to 4.0** – The student has written an ideal essay – ideal because it supported its thesis with accurate evidence and it presented the thesis in a well- organized, stylistically- and grammatically- correct format that followed the writing guidelines. A paper of this caliber shines with original thought and strong, relevant evidence presented in a clear, understandable format. It is obvious that the student has absorbed and thought through the material in a very sophisticated manner.
- **2.8 to 3.4** – The student has obviously read and understood the material and has offered a direct analysis of the subject at hand. The essay is weaker than it could have been because it leaves a

few questions unanswered or overlooks a critical element of the problem. A paper in this grade range may contain an occasional spelling, grammatical, or stylistic error, but generally is quite sound.

- **2.2 to 2.8** – The student appears to have engaged with most of the relevant materials and has attempted to explore the subject at hand, but has not written an answer that clearly, fully, or accurately answers key questions that arise from the material. Any one of several elements may have gotten in the way of a good paper, including a lack of relevant evidence, a poorly organized paper, occasional oversimplifications, spelling, grammatical, or stylistic mistakes, or factual errors.
- **1.5 to 2.2** – The student appears to have an incomplete grasp of the subject. Often, a paper of this quality will contain a number of oversimplifications of the material, grammatical and stylistic mistakes, and factual errors.
- **Below 1.5** – The student has submitted an essay that strays from the subject at hand and provides little accurate and relevant evidence. Generally, a paper that earns below a 1.5 will have poor organization, several spelling, grammatical, and stylistic mistakes, and it will fail to demonstrate an understanding of the issue.

## **COURSE SCHEDULE**

### **Monday January 9**

Introductions to the course and each other. Review syllabus. Create job descriptions for students and professor, course guidelines for an inclusive and respectful learning environment, course guidelines for technology use.

## **PRELUDE – SCIENCE AND SOCIAL POLICY: A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE**

### **Wednesday January 11**

Read in class:

Deborah E. Harkness, *The Jewel House: Elizabeth London and the Scientific Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), “A Note about ‘Science’” on pages xv through xviii. Full text online through the MSU Library.

### **Monday January 16**

MLK Day – No class.

### **Wednesday January 18**

Deborah E. Harkness, *The Jewel House: Elizabeth London and the Scientific Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), Chapter Two. Full text online through the MSU Library.

#### **AND**

Chandra Mukerji, “Dominion, Demonstration, and Domination: Religious Doctrine, Territorial Politics, and French Plant Collection” in *Colonial Botany: Science, Commerce, and Politics in the Early Modern World* edited by Londa Schiebinger and Claudia Swan (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2005), 19-33. On D2L.

## **UNIT ONE – THE PROGRESSIVE ERA: GERMS, ENVIRONMENT, CONTRACEPTION, AND EUGENICS**

### **Monday January 23**

Nancy Tomes, *The Gospel of Germs: Men, Women, and the Microbe in American Life* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), Introduction and Chapter Seven. Full text online through the MSU Library.

### **Wednesday January 25**

Nancy Tomes, *The Gospel of Germs: Men, Women, and the Microbe in American Life* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), Chapters Eight and Nine. Full text online through the MSU Library.

### **Monday January 30**

Linda Nash, *Inescapable Ecologies: A History of Environment, Disease, and Knowledge* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), Chapter Three. Full text online through the MSU Library.

### **Wednesday February 1**

Gregg Mitman, *Breathing Space: How Allergies Shape Our Lives and Landscapes* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), Chapter Two. Full text online through the MSU Library.

### **AND**

Maureen Flanagan, “Gender and Urban Political Reform: The City Club and the Woman’s City Club of Chicago in the Progressive Era,” in *Who Were the Progressives*, edited by Glenda Elizabeth Gilmore (Boston: Bedford / St. Martin’s, 2002), 193-219. On D2L.

### **Monday February 6**

Andrea Tone, *Devices and Desires: A History of Contraceptives in America* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2001), Introduction and Chapter Three. On D2L.

### **Wednesday February 8**

Alexandra Minna Stern, *Eugenic Nation: Faults and Frontiers of Better Breeding in Modern America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), Introduction and Chapter One. Full text online through the MSU Library.

### **Monday February 13**

Alexandra Minna Stern, *Eugenic Nation: Faults and Frontiers of Better Breeding in Modern America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), Chapter Two. Full text online through the MSU Library.

### **Wednesday February 15**

Wendy Kline, *Building a Better Race: Gender, Sexuality, and Eugenics from the Turn of the Century to the Baby Boom* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), Introduction, Chapters One and Two. Full text online through the MSU Library.

**DUE: Monday February 20 at 1:00PM, Essay One (on Unit One) to Professor Joy by email.**

## **INTERLUDE – FROM PROGRESSIVES TO POSTWAR (WORLD WAR II)**

**Monday February 20**

Gregg Mitman, *Breathing Space: How Allergies Shape Our Lives and Landscapes* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), Chapter Five. Full text online through the MSU Library.

**Wednesday February 23**

Johanna Schoen, *Choice and Coercion: Birth Control, Sterilization, and Abortion in Public Health and Welfare* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), Introduction and Chapter One. Full text online through the MSU Library.

**UNIT TWO – POSTWAR: ENVIRONMENT, CONTRACEPTION, EUGENICS, AND IDENTITY****Monday February 27**

Linda Nash, *Inescapable Ecologies: A History of Environment, Disease, and Knowledge* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006), Chapter Four. Full text online through the MSU Library.

**Wednesday March 1**

Gregg Mitman, *Breathing Space: How Allergies Shape Our Lives and Landscapes* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), Chapter Four. Full text online through the MSU Library.

**Monday March 6 and Wednesday March 8**

Spring break – no class

**Monday March 13**

Andrea Tone, *Devices and Desires: A History of Contraceptives in America* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2001), Chapter(s) **TBA**. On D2L.

**Wednesday March 15**

Wendy Kline, *Bodies of Knowledge: Sexuality, Reproduction, and Women's Health in the Second Wave* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010), Chapter Four. Full text online through the MSU Library.

**Monday March 20**

Professor Joy at Computer History Museum Conference – No Class

**Wednesday March 22**

Johanna Schoen, *Choice and Coercion: Birth Control, Sterilization, and Abortion in Public Health and Welfare* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), Chapter Two. Full text online through the MSU Library.

**Monday March 27**

Alexandra Minna Stern, *Eugenic Nation: Faults and Frontiers of Better Breeding in Modern America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), Chapter Five. Full text online through the MSU Library.

**Wednesday March 29**

Alexandra Minna Stern, *Eugenic Nation: Faults and Frontiers of Better Breeding in Modern America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), Chapter Six. Full text online through the MSU Library.

### **Monday April 3**

Joanne Meyerowitz, *How Sex Changed: A History of Transsexuality in the United States* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), Introduction and Chapter Three. Full text online through the MSU Library.

### **Wednesday April 5**

Joanne Meyerowitz, *How Sex Changed: A History of Transsexuality in the United States* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), Chapter Six. Full text online through the MSU Library.

**DUE: Monday April 10 at 1:00PM, Essay on Units One & Two (if you choose to write about these two units), to Professor Joy by email.**

### **UNIT THREE – NOW: TECHNOLOGY, PRIVACY, SECURITY, IDENTITY**

#### **Monday April 10 – Algorithmic Inequities**

W. Patrick McCray, “It’s not all lightbulbs,” Aeon 2016 October 12, <https://aeon.co/essays/most-of-the-time-innovators-don-t-move-fast-and-break-things>.

“Algorithms and Bias: Q. and A. with Cynthia Dwork,” NYT, August 2015  
<http://www.nytimes.com/2015/08/11/upshot/algorithms-and-bias-q-and-a-with-cynthia-dwork.html?abt=0002&abg=1&r=0>

Matthew Kay, Cynthia Matuszek, and Sean A. Munson, “Unequal Representation and Gender Stereotypes in Image Search Results for Occupations,” *CHI 2015 Proceedings*:  
<http://dub.washington.edu/djangosite/media/papers/unequalrepresentation.pdf>

Amit Datta, Michael Carl Tschantz, and Anupam Datta “Automated Experiments on Ad Privacy Settings, A Tale of Opacity, Choice, and Discrimination” in *Proceedings on Privacy Enhancing Technologies*, Volume 2015, Issue 1, Pages 92–112:  
<https://www.degruyter.com/downloadpdf/j/popets.2015.1.issue-1/popets-2015-0007/popets-2015-0007.xml>

#### **Wednesday April 12 – Algorithmic Inequities II**

Latanya Sweeney L, “Discrimination in online ad delivery,” *Communications of the ACM* 2013, 56(5): 44-54. [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=2208240](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2208240)

John Blake, “The New Threat: ‘Racism without racists,’” CNN 2014 November 27:  
<http://www.cnn.com/2014/11/26/us/ferguson-racism-or-racial-bias/>

Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States* (Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield Publishers, 2006), pick a chapter and be prepared to discuss it: [https://anth1001.files.wordpress.com/2014/04/eduardo\\_bonilla-silva\\_racism\\_without\\_racists\\_color-blind\\_racism\\_and\\_the\\_persistence\\_of\\_racial\\_inequality\\_in\\_the\\_united\\_states\\_2nd\\_edition\\_2006.pdf](https://anth1001.files.wordpress.com/2014/04/eduardo_bonilla-silva_racism_without_racists_color-blind_racism_and_the_persistence_of_racial_inequality_in_the_united_states_2nd_edition_2006.pdf)

## **Monday April 17 – Human Labor for Technology**

Adrian Chen, “The Internet’s Invisible Sin-Eaters,” *The Awl* October 2014 Interview:

<http://www.theawl.com/2014/10/the-internets-invisible-sin-eaters>

Moshe Z. Marvit, “How Crowdworkers Became the Ghosts in the Digital Machine,” *The Nation* 2014 February 5: [www.thenation.com/article/how-crowdworkers-became-ghosts-digital-machine](http://www.thenation.com/article/how-crowdworkers-became-ghosts-digital-machine)

Jodie Kantor and David Streitfeld, “Inside Amazon: Wrestling Big Ideas in a Bruising Workplace,” *New York Times* 2015 August 15, [http://mobile.nytimes.com/2015/08/16/technology/inside-amazon-wrestling-big-ideas-in-a-bruising-workplace.html?\\_r=0&referrer](http://mobile.nytimes.com/2015/08/16/technology/inside-amazon-wrestling-big-ideas-in-a-bruising-workplace.html?_r=0&referrer)

Mac McClelland, “I Was a Warehouse Wage Slave,” *Mother Jones* March/April 2012:

<http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2012/02/mac-mcclelland-free-online-shipping-warehouses-labor>

Jamie Lauren Keiles, “How Jukin Media Built a Viral-Video Empire,” *New York Times Magazine* 2016 December 27: <http://www.nytimes.com/2016/12/27/magazine/how-jukin-media-built-a-viral-video-empire.html>.

## **Wednesday April 19 – Technological Labor for People(?)**

Sherry Turkle, *Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other* (New York: Basic Books, 2011), Chapter Six. Note: Available as an e-book from MSU Library.

“Will the Internet of Things Result in Predictable People (Reverse Turing Test),” *The Guardian*, 2015 August 10:

<https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2015/aug/10/internet-of-things-predictable-people>

See Turing’s original 1950 paper, in which he lays out the Turing Test, here:

<http://phil415.pbworks.com/f/TuringComputing.pdf>

ACLU Stop and Frisk App:

<https://www.aclu.org/blog/stop-and-frisk-watch-keep-tabs-nypd-your-smart-phone>

<https://www.aclu.org/issues/racial-justice/race-and-criminal-justice/racial-profiling>

<http://www.nyclu.org/content/nyclu-campaign>

Andy Greenberg, “Hackers Remotely Kill a Jeep on the Highway—With Me in It,” *Wired*, 2015 July 21: <http://www.wired.com/2015/07/hackers-remotely-kill-jeep-highway/>

## **Monday April 24 – Media, Technology, Politics**

Read all eight essays (six new ones and two older ones) on “the networked public sphere” by various authors from the *Data & Society Research Institute*: <https://points.datasociety.net/media-technology-politics-258f4cfc87c#.cqdqbvpze>

## **Wednesday April 26 – Conclusions**

No assigned reading – reflections and remaining questions

**DUE: Monday May 1 at 1:00PM, Essay on Units One & Three OR Essay on Units Two & Three (if you did not write the essay on Units One & Two), to Professor Joy by email**



## **Science and Social Policy**

MC 351 Spring 2017

Professor Joy Rankin

### **Essay Evaluation Criteria**

**The following are the characteristics of an essay that will earn a 4.0:**

#### **Thesis**

- Clear and concise
- Strong argument
- Narrow and specific
- Interesting and original

#### **Analysis and Evidence**

- Displays mastery of course topics and supporting course materials pertinent to essay
- Claims are supported with evidence from assigned readings, lectures, discussion, and other relevant course materials
- Demonstrates critical and thoughtful reading of works and sources cited
- Effectively incorporates evidence from sources into the body of the paper
- Argues from rather than describes sources
- Authors, dates, and audiences of sources are clearly identified

#### **Style and Language**

- Grammatically correct and without spelling mistakes or typographical errors
- Active verbs
- Appropriate and engaging word choice
- Citations correct and consistent according to Chicago Manual of Style (16<sup>th</sup> ed.) format

#### **Structure**

- Introduction contextualizes the thesis
- Middle paragraphs develop the thesis in logical order
- Conclusion raises broader significance
- Coherent, no distracting tangents
- Concepts are clear
- Paragraphs begin with topic sentences
- Transitions between paragraphs and ideas are clear
- Fulfills assigned word and/or page count

## Citation Style for MC 351 Written Assignments

Source: Chicago Manual of Style Online, *Chicago-Style Citation Quick Guide*.

Note that the complete Chicago Manual of Style is available online through the MSU Library. Go to <https://www.lib.msu.edu/research/cite-resources/>, click on “Chicago Manual of Style,” and log in with your NetID. *Chapter 14: Documentation I: Notes and Bibliography* provides detailed information that is summarized in the Quick Guide below. You will find the Quick Guide linked through the online Chicago Manual of Style homepage.

### **Chicago-Style Citation Quick Guide**

*The Chicago Manual of Style* presents two basic documentation systems: (1) notes and bibliography and (2) author-date. Choosing between the two often depends on subject matter and the nature of sources cited, as each system is favored by different groups of scholars.

The notes and bibliography style is preferred by many in the humanities, including those in literature, history, and the arts. This style presents bibliographic information in notes and, often, a bibliography. It accommodates a variety of sources, including esoteric ones less appropriate to the author-date system.

The author-date system has long been used by those in the physical, natural, and social sciences. In this system, sources are briefly cited in the text, usually in parentheses, by author’s last name and date of publication. The short citations are amplified in a list of references, where full bibliographic information is provided.

### **Notes and Bibliography: Sample Citations**

The following examples illustrate citations using the notes and bibliography system. Examples of notes are followed by shortened versions of citations to the same source. The bibliography entry for the source follows the shortened citations. For more details and many more examples, see [chapter 14](#) of *The Chicago Manual of Style*. For examples of the same citations using the author-date system, click on the Author-Date tab above.

#### **Book: One author**

1. Michael Pollan, *The Omnivore’s Dilemma: A Natural History of Four Meals* (New York: Penguin, 2006), 99–100.
2. Pollan, *Omnivore’s Dilemma*, 3.

Pollan, Michael. *The Omnivore’s Dilemma: A Natural History of Four Meals*. New York: Penguin, 2006.

#### **Book: Two or more authors**

1. Geoffrey C. Ward and Ken Burns, *The War: An Intimate History, 1941–1945* (New York: Knopf, 2007), 52.
2. Ward and Burns, *War*, 59–61.

Ward, Geoffrey C., and Ken Burns. *The War: An Intimate History, 1941–1945*. New York: Knopf, 2007.

#### **Book: Four or more authors**

For four or more authors, list all of the authors in the bibliography; in the note, list only the first author, followed by *et al.* (“and others”):

1. Dana Barnes et al., *Plastics: Essays on American Corporate Ascendance in the 1960s . . .*
2. Barnes et al., *Plastics . . .*

#### **Book: Editor, translator, or compiler instead of author**

1. Richmond Lattimore, trans., *The Iliad of Homer* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951), 91–92.
2. Lattimore, *Iliad*, 24.

Lattimore, Richmond, trans. *The Iliad of Homer*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

#### **Book: Editor, translator, or compiler in addition to author**

1. Gabriel García Márquez, *Love in the Time of Cholera*, trans. Edith Grossman (London: Cape, 1988), 242–55.
2. García Márquez, *Cholera*, 33.

García Márquez, Gabriel. *Love in the Time of Cholera*. Translated by Edith Grossman. London: Cape, 1988.

### Chapter or other part of a book

1. John D. Kelly, "Seeing Red: Mao Fetishism, Pax Americana, and the Moral Economy of War," in *Anthropology and Global Counterinsurgency*, ed. John D. Kelly et al. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010), 77.
2. Kelly, "Seeing Red," 81–82.

Kelly, John D. "Seeing Red: Mao Fetishism, Pax Americana, and the Moral Economy of War." In *Anthropology and Global Counterinsurgency*, edited by John D. Kelly, Beatrice Jauregui, Sean T. Mitchell, and Jeremy Walton, 67–83. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.

### Preface, foreword, introduction, or similar part of a book

1. James Rieger, introduction to *Frankenstein; or, The Modern Prometheus*, by Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), xx–xxi.
2. Rieger, introduction, xxxiii.

Rieger, James. Introduction to *Frankenstein; or, The Modern Prometheus*, by Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley, xi–xxxvii. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.

### Book published electronically

If a book is available in more than one format, cite the version you consulted. For books consulted online, list a URL; include an access date only if one is required by your publisher or discipline. If no fixed page numbers are available, you can include a section title or a chapter or other number.

1. Jane Austen, *Pride and Prejudice* (New York: Penguin Classics, 2007), Kindle edition.
2. Philip B. Kurland and Ralph Lerner, eds., *The Founders' Constitution* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), accessed February 28, 2010, <http://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/>.
3. Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*.
4. Kurland and Lerner, *Founder's Constitution*, chap. 10, doc. 19.

Austen, Jane. *Pride and Prejudice*. New York: Penguin Classics, 2007. Kindle edition.

Kurland, Philip B., and Ralph Lerner, eds. *The Founders' Constitution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987. Accessed February 28, 2010. <http://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/>.

### Article in a print journal

In a note, list the specific page numbers consulted, if any. In the bibliography, list the page range for the whole article.

1. Joshua I. Weinstein, "The Market in Plato's *Republic*," *Classical Philology* 104 (2009): 440.
2. Weinstein, "Plato's *Republic*," 452–53.

Weinstein, Joshua I. "The Market in Plato's *Republic*." *Classical Philology* 104 (2009): 439–58.

### Article in an online journal

Include a DOI (Digital Object Identifier) if the journal lists one. A DOI is a permanent ID that, when appended to <http://dx.doi.org/> in the address bar of an Internet browser, will lead to the source. If no DOI is available, list a URL. Include an access date only if one is required by your publisher or discipline.

1. Gueorgi Kossinets and Duncan J. Watts, "Origins of Homophily in an Evolving Social Network," *American Journal of Sociology* 115 (2009): 411, accessed February 28, 2010, doi:10.1086/599247.
2. Kossinets and Watts, "Origins of Homophily," 439.

Kossinets, Gueorgi, and Duncan J. Watts. "Origins of Homophily in an Evolving Social Network." *American Journal of Sociology* 115 (2009): 405–50. Accessed February 28, 2010. doi:10.1086/599247.

### Article in a newspaper or popular magazine

Newspaper and magazine articles may be cited in running text ("As Sheryl Stolberg and Robert Pear noted in a *New York Times* article on February 27, 2010, . . .") instead of in a note, and they are commonly omitted from a bibliography. The following examples show the more formal versions of the citations. If you consulted the article online, include a URL; include an access date only if your publisher or discipline requires one. If no author is identified, begin the citation with the article title.

1. Daniel Mendelsohn, "But Enough about Me," *New Yorker*, January 25, 2010, 68.
2. Sheryl Gay Stolberg and Robert Pear, "Wary Centrists Posing Challenge in Health Care Vote," *New York Times*, February 27, 2010, accessed February 28, 2010, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/28/us/politics/28health.html>.
3. Mendelsohn, "But Enough about Me," 69.
4. Stolberg and Pear, "Wary Centrists."

Mendelsohn, Daniel. "But Enough about Me." *New Yorker*, January 25, 2010.

Stolberg, Sheryl Gay, and Robert Pear. "Wary Centrists Posing Challenge in Health Care Vote." *New York Times*, February 27, 2010. Accessed February 28, 2010. <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/28/us/politics/28health.html>.

### Book review

1. David Kamp, "Deconstructing Dinner," review of *The Omnivore's Dilemma: A Natural History of Four Meals*, by Michael Pollan, *New York Times*, April 23, 2006, Sunday Book Review, <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/04/23/books/review/23kamp.html>.
2. Kamp, "Deconstructing Dinner."

Kamp, David. "Deconstructing Dinner." Review of *The Omnivore's Dilemma: A Natural History of Four Meals*, by Michael Pollan. *New York Times*, April 23, 2006, Sunday Book Review. <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/04/23/books/review/23kamp.html>.

### Website

A citation to website content can often be limited to a mention in the text or in a note ("As of July 19, 2008, the McDonald's Corporation listed on its website . . ."). If a more formal citation is desired, it may be styled as in the examples below. Because such content is subject to change, include an access date or, if available, a date that the site was last modified.

1. "Google Privacy Policy," last modified March 11, 2009, <http://www.google.com/intl/en/privacypolicy.html>.
2. "McDonald's Happy Meal Toy Safety Facts," McDonald's Corporation, accessed July 19, 2008, <http://www.mcdonalds.com/corp/about/factsheets.html>.
3. "Google Privacy Policy."
4. "Toy Safety Facts."

Google. "Google Privacy Policy." Last modified March 11, 2009. <http://www.google.com/intl/en/privacypolicy.html>.  
 McDonald's Corporation. "McDonald's Happy Meal Toy Safety Facts." Accessed July 19, 2008. <http://www.mcdonalds.com/corp/about/factsheets.html>.

### Blog entry or comment

Blog entries or comments may be cited in running text ("In a comment posted to *The Becker-Posner Blog* on February 23, 2010, . . .") instead of in a note, and they are commonly omitted from a bibliography. The following examples show the more formal versions of the citations. There is no need to add *pseud.* after an apparently fictitious or informal name. (If an access date is required, add it before the URL; see examples elsewhere in this guide.)

1. Jack, February 25, 2010 (7:03 p.m.), comment on Richard Posner, "Double Exports in Five Years?," *The Becker-Posner Blog*, February 21, 2010, <http://uchicagolaw.typepad.com/beckerposner/2010/02/double-exports-in-five-years-posner.html>.
2. Jack, comment on Posner, "Double Exports."

*Becker-Posner Blog, The*. <http://uchicagolaw.typepad.com/beckerposner/>.

### E-mail or text message

E-mail and text messages may be cited in running text ("In a text message to the author on March 1, 2010, John Doe revealed . . .") instead of in a note, and they are rarely listed in a bibliography. The following example shows the more formal version of a note.

1. John Doe, e-mail message to author, February 28, 2010.