

# HIST 407/507: THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAR

Winter Term 2017 – W 2:00-4:50pm – Knight Library 222 – CRN 26786/26787

*Version 1.01, 9 Jan 2017*

Professor: Dr. L. F. Braun  
Office: 311 McKenzie Hall  
Telephone: (541) 346-4838, x64838 on-campus.  
Email: lfbraun@uoregon.edu (*strongly* preferred to phone!)  
Office hours: W 10am-12pm, & by appointment.

## Overview and Objectives

The South African War (1899-1902), known by various other names like “The Anglo-Boer War” and “The 2<sup>nd</sup> War of [Boer] Independence,” was a defining historical moment on a variety of levels. It was at once a foreshadowing of the destructive all-encompassing wars of the early twentieth century and the culmination of the art of mechanized war in the nineteenth. The war was a defining moment in the history of South Africa; its peace settlement, which led eventually to the creation of the Union of South Africa in 1910, can be defensibly characterized as a major step towards the later system of racial segregation known as *apartheid*. However the war was also a defining moment in global history. As the first mass-media war and arguably the first “total” war, its conditions and combatants created a level of global attention and commentary never before seen, not even in the contemporary conflicts of other colonial powers like the US and Japan. So many threads of society, politics, and culture interact with the South African War that its footprint in the popular mind of the era is far larger than general histories might lead us to believe.

Given that the war’s importance is neither limited to the period of hostilities nor to the South African subcontinent, our seminar will focus less on battles and “bullet-counting” and more on the bigger picture both inside and outside South Africa. Historically the narrative has been that this was a “White Man’s War” focused on the British and the Boers, but with the war’s centenary came many challenges to that popular image, so we will consider the myths surrounding the war and its horrors as well as the historical shifts that have culminated in our major course text, Bill Nasson’s *The War for South Africa*, published in 2010. Our discussions, and your research, may surprise you with the relevance of this seemingly distant conflict.

Seminararians successfully completing this course will, at minimum:

- Develop basic chronological and thematic knowledge about the South African War;
- Devise an original and answerable research question about some topic related to that conflict, and present it in a way that demonstrates its value and feasibility;
- Familiarize themselves with the secondary sources regarding their topic of interest;
- Conduct research in primary source materials, and learn how to ask questions of such sources in their historical context;
- Work together with peers in presenting and refining their academic work; and
- Produce a major research paper (4500-6500 words of text for undergraduates) presenting evidence and summarizing findings organized around a core thesis, following the stylistic expectations of the historical profession here in the United States.

## A Note About This Syllabus

***Everything on this syllabus is important; you need to read it carefully and refer to it frequently. You are solely responsible for knowing and understanding its contents.*** The paper copy you receive at the beginning of the course is subject to change, but I will do my best to notify you if any occur and update the copy on Canvas. Students using this course for the major’s Africa “field” or the AFR minor, see me.

## General Requirements and Grading (the big print)

Participation is about 40% of your grade. This includes discussion in class and Canvas questions as well as group work connected to your paper drafts (see the schedule and the assignment list at the end of this syllabus, pp. 7-8). **If you are silent and/or unengaged with the seminar, or disregard these exercises, you will receive a low or failing grade no matter how inspired your other work may be.**

The proposal for the major paper, due in the third week of classes, comprises about 10% of your final grade. This proposal is expected to identify a topic, propose a basic thesis, and identify at least ten separate sources (four primary), in proper style as per Rampolla (see page 6 of this syllabus). Although only a small part of the grade, **late proposals receive a zero grade, and if more than one day late will result in a course F.**

The biggest piece of your grade (~50%) is the major research paper based on primary sources, 4500-6500 words in length (not counting footnotes or bibliography). This paper **must** be a polished piece of writing that is correct in grammar and style to Rampolla's *Pocket Guide* or the *Chicago Manual of Style* (16<sup>th</sup> edition) on which it is based, using footnotes/endnotes and a bibliography. No other styles will be permitted in HIST 407. Style matters, in turn, constitute 1/3 of the final paper grade. **Failure to tender the paper on time (draft in week 9, finished during finals week) will result in a failing grade in the seminar. A final paper that earns a grade lower than "C" (2.0) will also result in a failing grade for the term.**

Unless you are prevented from completing coursework for severe medical reasons or a documented emergency backed up by UO, no due date exemptions will be given. The deadlines for work in this course are set out on day one, so you have all term to prepare for them. **Plan ahead.** Note: if you email your work, you alone are responsible for my receipt of it; if the email gets lost or you send the wrong file, **it is a zero.** **Excluding the Sunday questions (see pp.7-8), none of your work will receive credit if it is late.**

## Course Texts

This seminar requires three *very* new texts, all of which should be available at the Duck Store. Make sure to get the editions indicated, especially for Rampolla. **All of these are required purchases.**

- Nasson, Bill. *The War for South Africa: The Anglo-Boer War 1899-1902*. Cape Town: NB Publishers, 2010. ISBN 978-0-624-04809-1. Note: ISBN 978-0-7524-6022-2 should be the same book under a different (2011/12) title (*The Boer War: The Struggle for South Africa*).
- Pretorius, Fransjohan. *The A to Z of the Anglo-Boer War*. Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Press, 2009. ISBN 978-0-8108-7629-3.
- Rampolla, Mary Lynn. *A Pocket Guide to Writing in History* 8<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: Bedford St. Martin's, 2015. ISBN 978-1-457-69088-4.

The "master" style guide from which Rampolla pulls (and Turabian, if you know it), the *Chicago Manual of Style*, is worth acquiring **if** you intend to continue in history or any field that uses Chicago style. It is however an **entirely optional** purchase and is not available at the Duck Store. UO has a subscription online.

All other readings will be available on Canvas, and should be obtainable electronically at the requisite time via links on our course site. **I expect you to bring these readings with you to our class meetings, printed or on-screen; the required course books must always be with you in seminar.** Let me know as soon as possible if you have any problems accessing Canvas, or if a reading is unavailable.

(This course requires a lot of reading. When preparing for seminar, it will helpful to think not only about the subject itself, but also the text as a composition: what is the thesis of the reading, what evidence does the author use, is there an agenda at work, and does the author convince you? Considering these elements of how a historian writes their history will suggest issues and questions you can raise for the broader class.)

### THE PROPOSAL AND THE PAPER: THE HEART OF IT ALL

As you are all well aware, terms at the U of O are extremely short. It is therefore essential that you begin devising workable research subjects as early as possible. With that in mind, I **require** each of you to meet with me personally before our third seminar meeting to discuss your ideas. Following that, you must tender a proposal by 5:00pm on Friday, 27 Jan 2017, that indicates your subject, articulates a research question that will produce an original thesis and argument, and demonstrates the topic's viability as a research subject. I require this early start and approval process in order to prevent the scramble for hard-to-acquire resources or the belated discovery that a topic is unworkable. Your thesis and your focus within the subject may (and likely shall) shift significantly as you conduct research, but I want us to have a good starting point to prevent frustration, stress, and ultimately sub-par work at the end of the term. **Failure to tender this proposal on time will get a zero; if it's more than a day late, you will receive an F in the seminar.**

The proposal for the major paper must include the following elements, as far as you can elaborate them:

- Statement of the subject or problem, and your tentative thesis with a clear thesis statement, which may be in the form of the question or unknown factor you expect your research to answer;
- A discussion of the historical context and the importance of the subject; here you may draw on the secondary literature (history books, etc) and other historical interpretations of your subject; and
- A preliminary bibliography (annotation optional, depending on the strength of your introduction) of at least **ten** potential sources, including at least **four** primary sources (letters, novels, memoirs, speeches, government reports, and the like). **Divide the bibliography into two sections**, one for "primary sources" and one for "secondary sources." Annotation is not required. This bibliography may include material you have not yet received but which looks promising, and you need not have read everything yet. Fortunately, we can get a lot from around the world online, at Knight, or via ILL. You are to avoid internet-originated sources—digitized books and articles are OK, but check with me for anything that's not on Google Books or a journal website. This bibliography **must be stylistically correct** as per Rampolla (or Chicago). See me if you have any questions; David Woken (our reference librarian) will also be available to aid your search.
- **Your proposal must be at least three pages or so in length (750+ words), not counting the bibliography.** Much of that text may contribute to the final paper, so the effort is not in any way wasted. Text, as in all of your writing for seminar, must be double-spaced and stylistically sound.

It is important that you make clear what you understand about the subject you are proposing, based on your preliminary research investigations, and what your proposed subject might mean. At the very least, you are to make the case that your thesis is arguable and that materials adequate to investigate it are available in the time allotted. Beyond the requirements, you may want to write about anything else you've considered relative to the paper. Displaying deep, careful thought will not only improve your grade, but also allow me to make more useful and thoughtful comments that will put you ahead of the proverbial game.

The final paper itself must be 4500-6000 words, not counting footnotes, bibliography, cover sheet, and so forth; it must make use of no less than ten relevant and significant sources (including primary sources), but successful papers generally employ many more. The paper is to be a piece of formal writing, in clear and concise college-level English; style counts for 1/3 of the overall paper grade. For the final proposal and the paper, *Chicago Manual* chapter 14 styles (footnotes plus bibliography, as also laid out in Rampolla's *Pocket Guide*) must be used for citations—not APA, MLA, or any other style guide. **Using the wrong style, or using no discernable style at all, will earn you a style grade of F.** Following a style guide's prescriptions are more than just a matter of cosmetics; being assiduous about documenting your research can save you from inadvertent failure to cite sources (plagiarism) and the pain that attends it. General writing help is available from the Writing Labs at the Teaching and Learning Center; see <http://tlc.uoregon.edu/> for more information. **Regardless of anything else, the final draft is due to me no later than exactly 5:00pm PST on Thursday, 23 Mar 2017; I will accept them early, but I will not accept them late. Plan ahead!**

**Graduate Students in History 507 (CRN 26787)**

Graduate students enrolled in History 507 will have modified requirements, most notably a longer paper (6000-8000 words) that deals more heavily with a particular subject's historiography or that engages in comparative or broader contextual analysis. The finished paper should be of publishable quality, but may employ the prevalent citation format and writing style in your field. There will also be additional readings and meetings that we will arrange at the relevant time, and tailor somewhat to your own research strengths and interests. Graduate students are however still beholden to all HIST 407 assigned work.

**Other Policy Statements (the fine print)**

**100% Attendance:** Because this is a participatory seminar that depends on your input, attendance is required at all class meetings and events; the standard penalty for absence works out to about one full letter grade for each instance. We meet only once per week, so even one absence affects the whole seminar; naturally if you are missing for reasons beyond your control (health, weather, family) UO policy covers that. Please inform me immediately if you anticipate an absence, documented or not, so that I can keep you abreast of developments in the seminar and to assure that I receive any work that is due on time. Late arrival and early departure have a similarly detrimental effect on the seminar, and thus upon your grade.

**Special Needs and Gizmos:** Although I'm otherwise a technophile, gadgets in class can be annoying and distracting, whether through peripheral screen movement or typing noise. Laptop screens can also create a physical barrier that stifles open conversation. At the same time we use a lot of PDFs and it's very useful to have these at hand during discussion, along with your own typed notes, just a tab-switch away. Therefore I am allowing their use, but I also ask that you be judicious and mindful of the potential perils. I will reserve the right to rescind this policy if it becomes necessary. In any case, please silence your phones when you come in. Participation does reflect disruptions, whether directly or indirectly.

If you have physical or learning differences that require other kinds of special accommodations, official notice from the Accessible Education Center (see <http://aec.uoregon.edu>) is required. I will do everything in my power to address all documented needs, but I cannot fairly make exceptions without it.

**Academic Honesty:** The information in this subsection should be unnecessary for 99.9% of history majors, but unfortunate experience and surprisingly uneven familiarity with issues of academic honesty among students has prompted me to include it in all of my syllabi. I refer you, for your information, to Student Conduct and Community Standards at the Office of Student Life:

<https://dos.uoregon.edu/academic-misconduct>

You will find there a number of relevant headings to policies on academic honesty and conduct. In our case, inadvertent plagiarism will be the greatest source of peril. If you are unsure of what plagiarism is, you can consult Rampolla's relevant selections (103-110), or the UO's own particular guide to the subject:

<http://researchguides.uoregon.edu/citing-plagiarism>

It is a gross understatement to say that academic dishonesty will adversely affect your grade. At the very least, you will receive an automatic failing mark for the course. However, my personal view of the matter is that plagiarists have no place in an institution of higher learning, and certainly not in a capstone seminar. Therefore I will press for the *maximum* penalty for offenses of this nature, which means suspension or expulsion from the University. If you have any concerns or you're not sure if something is plagiarism, ask me as soon as possible, *before* you turn it in for a grade. At the 407 level, there is no wiggle room.

**Everything Else:** In all other matters, I default to the Duck Guide or the relevant Departmental policy. If you're not sure of something, please ask!

# HIST 407/507: THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAR

## Meeting and Reading Schedule (subject to modification)

Complete *all* session readings before the meeting assigned, and be ready to discuss them; expect to spend 10 hours a week on this course. Bring your readings to class with you. Note the deadlines; remember that **each Sunday night before weeks 2 through 6**, you must submit questions and ruminations to Canvas!

- W 11 Jan (Week 1) Introduction to the Seminar and Its Requirements; Why the SA War?**  
 Reading: C. F. J. Muller, ed., *500 Years: A History of South Africa* (Pretoria and Cape Town: Academica, 1975), 318-67.  
 (Supplement) Andrew Porter, "The South African War and the Historians," *African Affairs* 99, no. 397 (1999): 633-48.  
 Activities: Introduction of seminar members, backgrounds, and interests.  
 Explanation of seminar scope, goals, ambitions, and expectations.  
 What is the SA War, and what do we know about it? (Muller / Porter)  
 Library visit with David Woken (reference librarian), 144 Knight, 3:45pm.  
 Discussion: historical research, types of sources, and refining topics.
- W 18 Jan (Week 2) History, Historiography, and Sources: Orientation**  
 Rampolla: Rampolla, *Pocket Guide*, 1-23 (ch. 1-2).  
 Reading: Pretorius, *A to Z*, 511-17; also look through the bibliography and the "rough narrative" of the course of the war, xv-lvii. (How does Muller compare?)  
 Nasson, *War for South Africa*, 13-32.  
 Activities: Discussion: the war and its portrayal; avenues for research inquiries.  
**Assignment Due:** Five possible paper topics, each with a brief description of broader aims or questions the paper might answer. See assignment list, pp. 7-8.
- W 25 Jan (Week 3) Causes of the South African War**  
 Rampolla: Rampolla, *Pocket Guide*, 51-61, 82-102, 118-50 *passim* (for citation models).  
 Reading: Nasson, *War for South Africa*, 33-97 (chs. 2 & 3); review ch. 1 (20-32) as well.  
 Iain R. Smith, *The Origins of the South African War* (London: Longman, 1996), 1-13; 389-428.  
 Activities: Discussion: Style and citation standards (Rampolla and the *Chicago Manual*).  
 Discussion: Devising a clear thesis and a roadmap for research.  
**Every seminar member must consult with me individually by this date.**
- F 27 Jan (Week 3.5) Paper Proposal due by 5:00pm. See the proposal/paper description, p.3. Post your topic thread in the "Seminar Papers" forum over the weekend.**
- W 1 Feb (Week 4) The Combatants and the Course of the War**  
 Rampolla: Rampolla, *Pocket Guide*, 61-81, 103-10.  
 Reading: Nasson, *War for South Africa*, 98-198 (chs. 4, 5, & 6).  
 Helen Bradford, "Gentlemen and Boers," in *Writing a Wider War*, eds. Greg Cuthbertson, Albert Grundlingh, and Mary-Lynn Suttie (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2002), 37-66.  
 William N. Tilchin, "The United States and the Boer War," **and** Martin Bossenbroek, "The Netherlands and the Boer War," in *The International Impact of the Boer War*, ed. Keith M. Wilson (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), 107-39.  
 Activities: Discussion: Planning your research and your paper arrangement; evaluating sources for value, content, bias. Primary source reading/viewing exercise.

- W 8 Feb (Week 5) Total War on the Highveld and Beyond**  
 Reading: Nasson, *War for South Africa*, 199-257 (chs. 7 & 8).  
 Elizabeth van Heyningen, *The Concentration Camps of the Anglo-Boer War: A Social History* (Sunnyside, GP: Jacana, 2013), 100-122, 150-78.  
 Fred Morton, *When Rustling Became an Art: Pilane's Kgatla and the Transvaal Frontier, 1820-1902* (Claremont, WC: David Philip, 2009), 237-73.  
 Eva Hunter, "Interview with Elizabeth van Heyningen: On Writing *The Concentration Camps of the Anglo-Boer War: A Social History* Cape Town 20 May 2013," *South African Historical Journal* 65, no. 4 (2013): 638-49.  
 Activities: Writing social/cultural history and its controversies (Hunter/Van Heyningen). Citations and pitfalls (as time permits)  
**Assignment Due:** Short review (2-3 pp.) of the major book/work on your topic. See assignment list.
- W 15 Feb (Week 6) Fallout & Context of the War: The Local and the Global**  
 Rampolla: Rampolla, *Pocket Guide*, 111-150 (relevant from here on out, for quotes/cites).  
 Reading: Nasson, *War for South Africa*, 258-317 (chs. 9 & 10).  
 Christopher Saunders, "African Attitudes to the British Empire Before and After the South African War," in *The South African War Reappraised*, ed. Donal Lowry (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 140-49.  
 Jonathan Hyslop, "The Invention of the Concentration Camp: Cuba, Southern Africa, and the Philippines, 1896-1907," *South African Historical Journal* 63, no. 2 (2011): 251-76.  
 (Optional) Donal Lowry, "'The Boers Were the Beginning of the End'? The Wider Impact of the South African War," in *The South African War Reappraised*, ed. Donal Lowry (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 203-246.  
 Activities: Discussion: Composing your research paper; more on citations and pitfalls.  
**Assignment Due:** Paper outline and revised thesis statement. See assignment list.
- W 22 Feb (Week 7) No regular seminar meeting. Individual meetings required.**  
 Activities: **Every seminar member must meet with me at least once between 20 February and 3 March to consult on paper progress.** You may arrange more than one visit, but at least one (expect an hour or so) is required.
- W 1 Mar (Week 8) No regular seminar meeting. Individual meetings required. See week 7.**
- W 8 Mar (Week 9) Rough Draft Exchange (Short meeting)**  
 Activities: Discussion of the current state of your work, problems and issues, and any other relevant matters that have arisen.  
**Assignment due:** Draft papers due for exchange at class time. Bring multiple copies (probably four); see assignment list on pp. 7-8 for information.
- W 15 Mar (Week 10) Small Group Critiques**  
**Assignment due:** Peer Critiques. Bring two extra copies of each critique. See assignment list.
- R 23 Mar (Finals) Final Papers due by 5:00pm, via email, Canvas, or hardcopy. See page 3.**

Recapitulation of due dates/times (all local Eugene time):

Sundays, start of weeks 2-6, midnight:	"2-3 Questions" due on discussion board
Friday, 27 Jan 2017, 5:00PM	Paper Proposals Due
Wednesday, 8 Mar 2017, 2:00PM	Rough Drafts Due (4 copies)
Thursday, 23 Mar 2017, 5:00PM	Final Research Paper Due

## SEMINAR WEEKLY ASSIGNMENTS: DETAILED LIST & DESCRIPTIONS

**Weeks 2-6 (Each Sunday prior):** On 15 Jan, 22 Jan, 29 Jan, 5 Feb, and 12 Feb, before midnight, I expect you to **post two or three questions relevant to the readings, in our Canvas forum for that week.** These questions *may not* be simple requests for information, but rather must have some intellectual and analytical substance regarding the readings or the issues they raise in connection with the war or the historian’s craft. Yes, you can get meta and ruminate! It may be just a few sentences to couch each question, or a paragraph (or more) if you have two or more interrelated questions to ask about one big idea that’s piqued you.

Besides forcing you to get the reading done early enough to digest it, devising questions also permits you to raise issues or ideas that we can touch upon in seminar. So these questions serve an important role in your participation grade, and because we’re doing this on a discussion board, I also expect you to read over your fellow students’ questions before seminar. No, you can’t ask the same questions someone else did, although you can build on them and even comment on their insights—that is very welcome! Even if you will be absent, I expect you to tender these questions, as with all the weekly assignments.

**Week 2 (18 Jan):** Bring five potential research topics to class, with a one-sentence statement for each with possible questions or research directions for this topic. Of the topics, you must include the following: 1) An individual; 2) an event; 3) a social, cultural, or economic theme; 4) a historiographical topic. The goal of requiring this “spread” is to get you thinking in a variety of ways about devising topics and questions. Use Pretorius, Nasson, and any other relevant readings to help push you along. This is a brainstorming exercise, but do your best to choose topics you think may be new, or might offer new insights.

Those seminarians in African Studies should assure that most, if not all, of these are fully “African,” that is, not rooted outside the continent. One of these ideas may form the seed for your proposal (**due 27 Jan**).

**Week 5 (25 Jan):** You are to write a review of the most important book (secondary source) on your topic as proposed, about two to three pages (600-900 words) in length. In this review, I want you to describe the book’s scope and subject, state its thesis (that is, what is the book trying to prove or to say?), summarize the main points of its argument, and assess its effectiveness as well as its use of sources. The purpose of this exercise is for you to think critically about historical writing and to get comfortable evaluating others’ work. Bring the review to class; we will talk about the book and its relationship to your subject at length.

**Week 6 (1 Feb):** A thesis statement and paper outline are due at class time. By this week you should have a general idea of where your paper is going. You are to tender a one-sentence thesis statement together with an outline in this classic “nested” format:

- I. Happy things
  - a. Hot coffee and warm donuts on a cold morning
  - b. Getting both Park Place and Boardwalk in Monopoly
  - c. Pigs in mud
    - i. Wet mud
    - ii. Dry mud
- II. Unhappy things
  - a. Sending risqué text message to a parent by mistake
    - i. Worse: a sibling
    - ii. Worst: a grandparent
  - b. Startled rock hyraxes
    - i. They’re already really, really ill-tempered
  - c. [et cetera]

You can annotate your points more fully with text if you’ve started your writing, but the primary goal is to be clear. (No, I don’t know what topic this outline could possibly address.)

**Week 9 (8 Mar): Tender of draft research papers.** Bring four copies of your research paper drafts, whatever state they may be in (depending on class size, this number may vary). I will organize you into complementary groups of 3-4 writers as peer groups for critique and commentary. Ideally you will be well along in your writing; matters of style will not be graded at this point. I do expect you to have most of the paper complete by this point; if it's not, the grading hit will harm you less than the inability to benefit from your colleagues' insights. Regardless, be sure to continue your writing between weeks 9 and 10, and think about how you will introduce your paper and your process to your peers when we meet in week 10.

**Week 10 (15 Mar): Peer critiques.** Meet to exchange written comments and talk about draft papers in small groups. One author will talk about their paper a bit, and then the readers will each present their individual commentaries/critiques, and discussion will follow. Yes, brainstorming is encouraged—it's like a work-in-progress session. Every 30 minutes or so, I will signal the groups to move to the next paper and author. If any given meeting of our seminar is "most important" for your participation it is this one.

### **Format for the Written Commentaries/Critiques (Week 10):**

Your comments for each paper in your 4-person group **must** be typed and at least two pages (or more) in length. Bring three copies: one for you, one for the paper's writer, and one for the professor.

At the outset of your commentary/critique you must briefly, in a sentence or two, **identify the subject of the paper and state its thesis as you, the reader, see it.** This seems elementary but it is hard for writers sometimes to distance themselves and read their work as an outside viewer might. If a thesis is hard for a paper's commentators to divine, that is a valid point for discussion.

After that, segue into talking about the paper itself, its strengths and weaknesses, any issues you might have about its approach, things you think might strengthen the paper or that you feel are superfluous, and the like. Keep these questions (and perhaps others) in mind as you write your evaluation:

- Is the core thesis clear, and does the author support her or his position?
- Is the organizational framework reasonable and logical? Can you follow the narrative or argument?
- Are any big questions left unanswered or unaddressed? Does the approach presume or omit anything notable?
- Is any portion of the paper particularly strong or weak in some way?
- Do you think primary sources used judiciously, and in a way that contributes materially to the strength of the paper?
- Is the paper fair to other potential ways to read sources on its subject, if any?
- Does the paper adequately deal with the seminar subject, that is, the South African war and its various contexts?

**In all of these cases you must assure that your comments are constructive,** meaning that you should offer a solution to the issue at hand (which may be implicit in your comment, for example in corrections). You should also feel free to praise the author at strong points of the paper, and perhaps consider why those parts were so impressive and how to expand that strength. More specific comments, such as names or terms that are not defined, are at your discretion as to whether you wish to include them in the written comments or communicate them orally.

Generally you should avoid making comments on the prose in a draft unless it is exceptionally difficult to read or needs reorganization. Citations, too, may be in a fairly rough state, and should not be the subject of commentary. If you wish, you may also return a marked draft of the paper to the author, but that is entirely up to you as the reader and is not required.

(Thanks to Dr. Alex Dracobly for his input and inspiration in refining the assignments and critiques. –LFB)