

UNIVERZITA PARDUBICE
Fakulta filozofická
Katedra anglistiky a amerikanistiky

**Posudek vedoucího bakalářské práce
(Literárně-kulturní)**

Autor práce: Michal Krampera
Studijní obor: AJOP
Název práce: Racial superiority in Grant's *Passing of a Great Race* and Higham's *Strangers in the Land*
Akademický rok: 2015/2016
Vedoucí práce: Daniel Sampey, MFA
Oponent práce: Mgr. Michal Kleprlik, Ph.D.

Kritéria hodnocení		Hodnocení 1 - 2 - 3 - 4
Všeobecná charakteristika	Splnění zásad zpracování práce a naplnění stanoveného cíle	1/2
	Logická struktura práce	
	Vyváženost teoretické a praktické části	
Teoretická část	Kvalita uvedení do širšího kontextu	1
	Tematická relevance teoretického úvodu k cíli práce	
Praktická část	Vhodnost využití primárních zdrojů pro podporu/ilustraci argumentace	1/2
	Rozsah a hloubka vlastní analýzy	
	Relevantní a srozumitelná argumentace a interpretace	
Práce s odbornou literaturou	Kvalita, množství a relevance zpracované literatury	1/2
	Kritický přístup ke zdrojům	
Formální stránka	Dodržení doporučených pravidel a norem formální úpravy (směrnice FF UPa)	1/2
	Kvalita vědeckého aparátu, příloh, tabulek a obrázků	
	Dodržení požadovaných citačních a bibliografických norem	
Jazyková úroveň	Gramatická přesnost a komplexnost	3
	Slovní zásoba	
	Koheze a koherence	
	Interpunkce a stylistické aspekty	

Slovní vyjádření k hodnocení bakalářské práce:

This BP is generally well-researched, with about two-thirds of the text devoted to background description, followed by 14 pages of analysis of themes in the two works considered. Emphasis is placed on Grant's *Passing* (1916), with Higham's *Strangers* (1955) used to respond to the types of arguments raised in the earlier book. Two-thirds to one-third is not exactly the optimal average proportion of theoretical to analytical material, but perhaps the nature of the subject matter requires an in-depth explanation of, first, a "History of social discrimination in the United States" (chapter 1, p.10-22), then an exploration of general period theoretical issues of "Race and ethnicity" (chapter 2, p. 23-31). In chapter 1 key concepts are introduced, e.g. "scientific racism," "Anti-" movements,

Anglo-Saxon racialism and especially Nativism, which is traced thoroughly in eight pages (14-22) through four periods of development from the 1870s to the first decades of the 20th century. This section clearly shows the evolution of the main issues and arguments in a historical/cultural context (generally toward a liberal consensus), but perhaps goes on a bit too long, and could have been edited a bit to isolate the main points which are discussed in the analysis of *Passing*.

In the analytical chapter 2 the BP author does a good job of presenting Grant's arguments in an unbiased way, which is difficult to do in the current social and academic climate in which arguments like "nature" privileged over "nurture," eugenics (research into which began in American institutions, e.g. private and university laboratories in the late 19th century) as a viable method of social engineering, and "the idea that democracy perpetuates mediocrity" (45) have long vanished from mainstream acceptance, although it may be argued that similar ideas still persist elsewhere, e.g. in NGOs and other institutions and research foundations both inside and outside of government. This balanced perspective of the BP also shows in the characterizations of Higham's liberal ideas as "an early form of the idea of political correctness." (45) Grant's partiality towards the "reversion" of specific physical characteristics over the assimilation of e.g. Fiske at Columbia is emphasized, as are the complementary theories of "race suicide" (38-40) in the extermination of somatological and "psychical" heredity (40-42). Especially pertinent here is the use of Zolberg's contextualization of these "cultural associations" (42) within their time period, e.g. one in which technological changes related to urbanization and industrialization as well as immigration policies began to affect the familial and social structures of more and more people.

Next, the analysis of arguments supporting the patrician Grant's (along with "some other Nativists") "disdain for democracy" and especially universal suffrage is perhaps the strongest and arguably the most thought-provoking section of the BP (43-46). Here sources are cited ranging from Plato's classic arguments for aristocracy in *Republic* to Grant's contemporary H. L. Mencken's "anti-democratic attitudes." To round out the evolution of political correctness in the contemporary popular discourse, a brief mention of the accusation of sexism regarding the current US president's complimenting of the "skills and physical appearance" of the female US Attorney General is provided, although it is not quite clear how this episode fits with the main arguments presented in the BP.

The next set of Grant's theories to be analyzed through the prism of Higham's *Strangers* is "Racial difference of intelligence" (sic, 46-49). First Grant's tracing of biometric examples such as "Cro-Magnon" man's cranial capacity and the received cultural "indisputable contribution" of the ancient Greeks is summarized (46-47) is favorably compared to Anglo-Saxon "intellectual supremacy" over other races and ethnicities. The BP author then points out how by the 1950s these ideas seemed much less defensible, e.g. through Higham's problematization of the contemporaneous methodologies used to measure intellect, especially the "notorious army intelligence test," which had been both "culturally biased" and not "statistically representative."

In the conclusion the BP author goes beyond the 1950s to summarize important developments in the US since then, e.g. the revival in certain circles of ideas on fundamental biological and / or cultural differences between races and ethnicities. Support for the need for immigration restrictions, e.g. Brimelow's *Alien Nation* (1996) is mentioned along with opposing arguments, e.g. by Linda Chavez, that "assimilation, not race, should be the center of attention." (51-53) Laws and other measures such as California's Proposition 209 (1996) "prohibiting the use of race preferences in all public education, employment, and contracting" as well as affirmative action programs in the 1980s and 90s are briefly described. Finally, events beginning during the administration of George W. Bush having direct effects on immigration policy are pointed out.

One negative aspect of the BP is the level of language, which sometimes falls below the C1 range, e.g. by using Czech sentence structures as well as grammar such as misused (or occasionally completely missing) determiners. This reviewer might have considered marking the entire BP a 1 if

the language had been a bit better. Also, the content could have been organized a bit more coherently, e.g. as is mentioned earlier in this evaluation regarding the two background chapters.

All in all, however, the plethora of information presented here shows both careful research as well as insightful analysis by the BP writer, who has clearly become quite familiar with the relevant issues and has produced a useful and provocative work that is especially relevant in lieu of immigration issues that have arisen in the US and more recently in Europe. Fine job.

V ý s l e d n á k l a s i f i k a c e * (možnosti klasifikace - výborně, <u>velmi dobře</u> , dobře, nevyhověl)	velmi dobře
---	-------------

Doporučuji / Nedoporučuji diplomovou práci k obhajobě.

Dne: 13.1.2016

Daniel P. Sampey
Podpis vedoucího práce

