Your task is to read *Standing at Armageddon* by Nell Irvin Painter and write a book review. The assignment is due on **Wednesday September 11, 2019**. Excluding the cover page, your paper must **be 750 – 1000 words**, **Times New Roman, 12 point font, double space, MLA format**. You will submit your paper on turnitin.com and bring a hard copy to class. This assignment counts as a test grade (100 points) for the First Marking Period. No exceptions. **Late work points will be deducted if turned in late (10 points every day it is late plus any other points I deduct for content).**

You are required to read a *Standing at Armageddon* by Nell Irvin Painter. Check to see if the book is available in a library before purchasing it. You are to take a rough outline of notes as you read the book and attach them to your book review.

**Book Review Instructions**: Your book review should be approximately 750-1000 words in length, word processed, and should include the following:

1. A basic bibliographical citation --- author, title, place and date of publication at the bottom of the last page.

2. A brief identification of the AUTHOR(S), which might include answers to the following:
   - When/where born?
   - Where/how educated?
   - Special expertise or qualifications to write about this subject?
   - Present position?

3. A REVIEW of the book's contents and a description of its general scope and nature; also a brief identification of the book's major themes, content and conclusion.
   - Subject matter covered
   - Author's purpose: what is he/she trying to do?
   - Period of time covered?
   - Topics/issues emphasized?
   - Supporting evidence presented
   - Organization?
   - Is the book historical/political/social/economic/biographical?
   - What did the book teach you about how the "game" of politics is played?

4. A CRITICAL EVALUATION / reflection, which might include:
   - Strengths or weaknesses of the book?
   - Were the sources presented by the author primary or secondary?
   - Was the author balanced, objective or biased?
   - Charts/illustrations used?
   - Literary style

**Please include the following features in your heading:**

Your name
Date
Period
AP US History II
Please attach a rubric as the final page of your book review. If you have any questions contact Ms. Guzman at gabguz@bergen.org

**Book Review Rubric**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>20-Highly Competent</th>
<th>15-Competent</th>
<th>10-Minimally Competent</th>
<th>5-Not Competent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>Clearly identifies and critically evaluates the author’s central argument, purpose, and approach to the subject</td>
<td>Identifies but not does not critically evaluate the author’s central argument, purpose, and approach to the subject</td>
<td>Identified a few main ideas but not the thesis</td>
<td>Is unaware of the author’s thesis or the purpose of the book. The review is descriptive but not analytical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Evaluation &amp; Reflection</strong></td>
<td>Evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of the book, addresses the use of primary and secondary sources, literary style, and addresses the author’s biases.</td>
<td>Does some of the following: Evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of the book, addresses the use of primary and secondary sources, literary style, and addresses the author’s biases.</td>
<td>Does a few of the following: Evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of the book, addresses the use of primary and secondary sources, literary style, and addresses the author’s biases.</td>
<td>Does only one of the following: Evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of the book, addresses the use of primary and secondary sources, literary style, and addresses the author’s biases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td>A general analysis of the salient features of the book, as opposed to a general summary, and identifies the development of the author’s thesis throughout the book</td>
<td>Demonstrates knowledge of the topic and provides supporting evidence and adequate detail</td>
<td>Minimal analysis, is repetitious, or and lacks development of salient features of the book being reviewed</td>
<td>No analysis, but merely a description of summary of the book’s content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style/Mechanics/Organization</strong></td>
<td>Sophisticated sentence structure and paragraph development The mechanics of the paper are correct. It is well written with no grammar or punctuation errors, and little or no use of the passive voice. Must be exceptionally well organized with an introduction, body, and conclusion and follows the thesis throughout the paper.</td>
<td>Effective Use of Language Few errors The review is reasonably well organized</td>
<td>Simplistic sentence structure and imprecise use of language Errors are present that interfere with the presentation of ideas and arguments The review has a semblance of structure but its coherence is minimized by poor organization</td>
<td>Incorrect sentence structure and use of slang, jargon, or inappropriate language Excessive errors in grammar and punctuation. The review is disorganized and incoherent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annotations/Outline</strong></td>
<td>Outline of the book covers major events/developments</td>
<td>Outline of the book covers some major events/developments</td>
<td>Outline of the book covers few major events/developments</td>
<td>No outline or annotations of the book</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Score:** _____________/100