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**Introduction**

 In order to clarify the method and purpose of this course, let us begin with stating what this course is NOT. This course is not a philosophical debate about the ontology of race/racism, gender/sexism/ homophobia, and class/inequality (i.e. it does not question *whether* these realities exist). Rather, it begins with the assumption that these *are* realities which have an observable history and which have been an intimate part of the systemic whole of modernity’s distorted distribution of power, wealth and influence in the world – socially and politically. This course is also not a “touchy-feely,” experiential, role-playing exercise in exploring the embodiment of our individual experiences of oppression (e.g., an undergrad Race / Gender 101 course). While there will indeed be moments in our course discussions when we will share personal experiences, we will use these as a bridge to build a theoretical understanding of racism, sexism, class discrimination, and other forms of systemic social exclusion that are so integral to our experience in a late-capitalist, liberal democratic state.

 That brings us to what this course actually IS. We will engage in a critical analysis that allows us to both examine the evidence and to understand the theoretical discourse that attempts to interpret and explain the evidence in the most helpful manner. It will also be important for us to explore strategies of action that might best help us to resist, counter, and overcome the harms which result from these malignant and wholly systemic assertions of power.

In other words, our approach addresses how inequality is a social phenomenon created by human action. Thus, responsibility for change rests with human agency. Using careful and incisive critical analysis our seminar will seek to name and describe the underlying systemic reasons that have generated these powerful forces of oppression.

One key concept that we consistently see in our readings for this course is the notion of race, gender, class, and sexuality as articulated or intersecting categories of social interaction. The intersection or articulation of race, gender, class, and sexuality is not neutral, nor is it devoid of political consequences. It is not a four-way stop with a common knowledge and acceptance of existing rules and regulations that allow for the orderly and predictable flow of social “traffic.” These are intersections with hard and sharp edges, constantly scraping – and, at times, lacerating – against each other. In other words (risking the banality of a pun), there are many collisions at the intersection of race, gender, class, and sexuality. Throughout the course, we need to keep in mind that this intersection is a zone of contestation and conflict.

There are two other aspects of the race, gender, class categories which we will attend to during this seminar. First, it will be important to approach this problem from a theological perspective as well as from a social-scientific perspective in order to give students a broader set of tools for both analysis and for strategic resistance. Secondly, even as we vision the function of church in deconstructing race, gender and class, we need to name the participation of institutional church structures in the actual development and emergence of these categories of oppression.

**Overview of the Course [Goal]**

 Students will develop a critical and analytical understanding of and develop the skills and strategies to respond to the complex interrelationship of race, gender and class as we settle into a new millennium where globalization—the dominant socio-political discourse of the world arena—has not resolved but rather has contributed to deepening inequalities in the world. Students will articulate the significance of these social forces in contemporary society as they affect social institutions, community life and the vision of a new just world order.

**Course Objectives**

**By the end of the quarter, seminar participants will be able to:**

1. Explain why the complex intersections of race, gender and class must be seen within the systemic whole of the development/modernization paradigm, rather than as isolated phenomena of social injustices.

2. Move beyond politically correct rhetoric towards written and oral argumentation sustained by critical analysis. How do we arrive at a determination of what is true or accurate in assessing situations of injustice and conceiving of the remedies which will have long-range effects for real social change?

3. Articulate the fundamental tenets of the leading debates and theoretical schools in the discourse on race, gender, and class with accuracy and authenticity. The students will be expected to identify various schools of thought on race, gender, and class such as Marxism, liberal capitalism, liberation theology, indigenism, womanism, and feminism.

4. Understand the history of the modernization project in the western world and its importance in the analysis of how these social forces of racism, sexism, and class discrimination are integral components of the goals of modernization and liberalism, both at the individual and community level.

5. Develop an emerging set of ideas and strategies for addressing current events and issues in the public arena as they arise during the quarter. Mastering the tools of this analysis will enable or empower students to envision and implement long-range strategies of social change at several levels: local community, church, regional organizations and institutions.

6. Engage in on-going reflection on possible strategies for effecting social change with respect to race, gender and class. A key question that must be constantly raised in our discussions is this: What can we do to change the socially constructed world of which we are a part?

**Readings**

There are two required texts, listed below, which we will read in their entirety. In addition, there will be articles and chapters from a variety of other sources, available on Canvas. The readings for each class session are listed in the “Course Schedule” part of this syllabus.

**Required Texts:**

* Richard Delgado and Jean Stefancic, ed. *Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000).
* Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (Routledge, 1995).

Doctoral Students Required Reading:

* Willie James Jennings, *The Christian Imagination: Theology and the Origins of Race*, Yale University Press, 2010.

**Assignments**

**All Students (masters and doctoral level)**

 We conceive of this seminar as a forum for critical discussion, based first of all on the common readings assigned. Hence, a careful reading of the materials by each participant is important to the success of the seminar for all of us. It is vital that you ***complete assigned readings and are prepared to discuss*** ***them*** for the designated class meetings. It is crucial that our discussion be informed and helpful for all. Needless to say, *meaningful* **participation** will form an important part of your grade for the seminar: twenty percent. It should go without saying that seminar **attendance** (including punctuality) is therefore critical. Absences will necessarily bring down the final grade. Given the new block scheduling at Iliff, every missed class session is ten percent of the course total.

There are two parts to the written work expected from each student through the quarter, plus a separate set of assignments for doctoral students. Each week, through week nine, the student is required to post a short, coherent essay of 200 words on our seminar Canvas site. Please see the separate explanation of the posting process appended to this syllabus. Secondly, there will be a “take-home” final exam. The exam will be distributed by the time of our week 8 seminar meeting to give students at least two weeks to complete the exam. Your work is expected to be a finished, professional product: typed, well-annotated, correct spelling and punctuation (because we are not your editors), with a clear thesis statement and coherently argued. Please do submit them electronically in an MSWord compatible format.

The purpose of these exercises can be expressed in these terms: 1) they will give you opportunity to demonstrate the breadth and depth of your reading of the assigned materials; 2) they will enable you to demonstrate your comprehension and integration of the seminar content; and 3) they will give you an opportunity to demonstrate your critical and analytical skills in dealing with these materials. To prepare for writing the final exam, you will want to keep track of your notes on readings and viewings; you will want to look over both your postings and any comments that the instructors might have had on your earlier work. Do not quote yourself extensively in the final, but do use the ideas you have already begun to develop.

These assignments will count 80% toward your grade for the seminar. The postings as a whole will be weighted 40%; the final take-home exam will be weighted 40%.

**Doctoral Students**

 There will be other expectations of doctoral students, including extra reading assignments and some part in directing the discussion for one of our blocks during the quarter. We will explain our expectation of you by the beginning of the quarter.

**PLEASE NOTE –**

**YOU WON’T SUCCEED IN THIS CLASS IF YOU IGNORE THIS SECTION**:

***Please DO NOT engage in side conversations with your neighbor during the seminar. This is distracting to everyone. We must all give our attention to the person who holds the floor at any given moment during class discussion***.

**Students with Disabilities**:

Iliff engages in a collaborative effort with students with disabilities to reasonably accommodate student needs. Students are encouraged to contact their assigned adviser to initiate the process of requesting accommodations. The advising center can be contacted at advising@iliff.edu or by phone at 303.765.1146.

**Incompletes**:

Iliff has a clearly stated “incomplete policy.” If you are in a position where you have no other choice but to request an incomplete, do look the policy up in the “Masters’ Student Handbook” or retrieve a copy of it from Iliff Student Services or the Registrar, Carmen Baca Doster. Because it is difficult for a teacher to read a paper and evaluate it fairly outside of the context of reading other students papers which were turned in on time, work turned in late will always suffer some lowering of the grade—depending on how late the work is submitted but regardless of the legitimacy of the excuse for the late submission. This also (necessarily) applies to work submitted to satisfy an incomplete.

**Zero Tolerance for Plagiarism**:

Please understand clearly that plagiarism is considered an **academic crime**. It is punishable by the issuing of a failing grade for the class in which it occurs and possible dismissal from school. If you are not sure what constitutes plagiarism, please do look the word up. Reference your academic Handbooks for an explanation. Read up on the definition on-line or in a variety of library resources.

**Cell Phones, Instant Messaging, Text Messaging, Web-Surfing, Etc.:**

We owe each other our strict and undivided attention during a seminar session. Our process of discussion builds an intellectual intimacy that is immediately shattered by someone’s attention to other business. This is a professional obligation. Turn off all cell phone and communications devices for the duration of the seminar time. And do not log on to any laptop wireless or other communications networks. You are certainly permitted to use a laptop for taking notes during discussions. But that must be the only purpose for opening a laptop during class times. NO on-line surfing during class. No blogging; no tweeting; no texting; etc. We need to give each other our full and undivided attention during all class time discussions and lectures. Activities that would be a violation of our trust with one another in the classroom would include: receiving or sending text messages via cellphones; receiving or sending twitter messages or engaging in other social media; reading or composing and sending email messages; surfing the net; stepping outside the classroom to take a cellphone call; and all other sorts of related activities.

**ATTENDANCE:**

Faithful attendance throughout the seminar is fully expected. This seminar cannot be successfully passed without faithful attendance since so much of the actual learning is dependent on classroom discussion of the assigned literatures. Moreover, it is a professional obligation, since the dynamics of classroom discussion depend on everyone’s participation. If you must miss class for any reason, please do inform the instructors as a matter of courtesy. An absence will usually result in a five point reduction in final grade for the first absence and increasing in value with each subsequent absence. By the third absence, the student should certainly consider withdrawing from the class. Likewise, tardiness is unprofessional and may result in a deduction from the final grade if it is deemed excessive or becomes habitual.

 ***Canvas IST 3007 Postings Assignment***

***Winter Quarter 2014***

***Assignment Instructions and Sample Posting***

For eight weeks of class (after the first class session), you will research current news events that are relevant to our readings and discussions on race, gender, class, and sexuality. You will write a minimum 200-word post, submitted to Canvas on the discussion pages already set up, in which you present a coherent but **brief** summary of the news article that you read, and provide a clear explanation of how the current event you researched is theoretically and conceptually connected to our readings and discussion in the classroom. 400 words would be the outside maximum. The posting should coherently and effectively point to the connections, but in a short posting, you will not be expected to do an in-depth analysis. Rather, think of each posting as an opportunity to signal to the others in the class how key points from the assigned readings are being lived out in current events. This will provide a platform for our in-class discussions each week. Please DO read each other’s postings and comment on them, both on Canvas and in class. The instructors will grade each posting privately (it will not be public, of course), and will send feedback for each posting to the students individually. Each posting will count for 12.5 points (to make a possible maximum of100 points by the time all eight are completed). The deadline for each posting is each Sunday by midnight (January 12, 19, 26, February 2, 9, 16, 23, and March 2). Below is a sample posting of 266 words, including details that we expect to see in postings, such as a heading, the number / date of the posting, and references. PLEASE NOTE THAT YOU MUST INCLUDE REFERENCES FOR ALL POSTINGS. The references do not count in the word limit – only the text of your actual posting will make up the minimum-200 words.

Loring Abeyta

Posting #1 for January 15, 2012

According to Sasha Houston Brown, Columbus Day, Halloween, and Thanksgiving are “…the three days when Native peoples actually enter the mass psyche of American culture” (Brown, “Nothing Says Native American….”, 1st para.). She goes on to write about the many instances of non-indigenous peoples parading around in native costumes and legitimizing it “…under the guise of ‘ignorance’ or ‘appreciation’” (Brown, 3rd para.). Her argument focuses on how women are impacted by these annual American rituals: “Native women, stripped of their humanity, are still objectified as a sexual fetish or exotic other. In fact, these kind of derogatory stereotypes have become a fixture of both American mythology and pop culture” (Brown, 6th para.) Anne McClintock’s discussion of the “porno tropics” (McClintock: 21) is particularly apropos to Brown’s discussion. McClintock notes that “…within the porno-tropics tradition, women figured as the epitome of sexual aberration and excess” (McClintock: 22) – which we certainly see in the Victoria’s Secret model photo featured in Brown’s blog posting. McClintock also notes that “…fear of being engulfed by the unknown is projected onto colonized peoples as *their* determination to devour the intruder whole” (McClintock: 27). In a strange reversal of this, do the descendants of the colonizers now project *back* these insulting caricatures of the native cultures that were dominated by settler populations? Is this a new way of expressing the fear of engulfment? Finally, McClintock notes that in claiming the achievement of “discovery,” colonizers “…arrogate to themselves the power of origins” (McClintock: 29). Does this suggest yet another facet of the motivation to “play Indian” on these “high holy days” of American culture?

Sasha Houston Brown, “Nothing Says Native American Heritage Month Like White Girls in Headdresses,” *Racialicious.com*, Nov. 12, 2012, <http://www.racialicious.com/2012/11/12/nothing-says-native-american-heritage-month-like-white-girls-in-headdresses/>, accessed on December 30, 2012.

Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender, and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*, Routledge, 1995.

### Course Schedule

Please note that no syllabus is ever a finished product, and this one is subject to alterations and additions by the instructors as the course progresses. We may add occasional readings as the course develops, or make other minor changes to the schedule. We will certainly provide students with sufficient advance notice of any changes to this syllabus.

Also note that we expect students to come prepared to discuss readings the first session of our seminar. Please do **read in advance of our first meeting**. The reflection questions are intended to be used for guidance as you are reading; they do not require any formal written responses and you may use them as a kind of “prompt” when you are writing your postings, but it’s not required.

**1. January 8**

*Race, Gender, Class and Other Social Constructions of Modernism*

Read / listen before class. These readings will give a foundation for our first seminar discussion. Both are posted on Canvas:

1. Ian F. **Haney-López**, “The Social Construction of Race,” in Delgado and Stefancic, pp. 163-175 [13 pp.]. Haney-López argues that race and races do exist, although they have no biological, genetic reality. Rather they are constructs that society manufactures or invents for its own purposes.
2. Colin Kidd, *The Forging of Races: Race and Scripture in the Protestant Atlantic World, 1600-2000*, pp. 1-52.
3. “House Rules,” a broadcast of This American Life regarding race, housing, and how where one lives can impact every facet of their life. <http://www.thisamericanlife.org/radio-archives/episode/512/house-rules>

(click the little white arrow in the purple circle to listen; you can also click on the “Transcript” tab).

**Reflection Questions:**

* How does the racial social construction of American society work?
* What are its roots?
* How can it be successfully challenged?
* How do the broader social structures within the body politic (of the US) affect the systemic structures of oppression and privileging?
* Explain how US global aspirations also affect the systemic structures of oppression and privileging – in the US? And in the Third World?
1. **January 15**

*Class and Colonialism at the Intersection of Race and Gender: Core Arguments for Analysis: The “Angel of Progress”*

 Video Segment: Where the Green Ants Dream (15 min.)

**Preparation:**

* Robert A. **Williams**, Jr., “Documents of Barbarism: The Contemporary Legacy of European Racism and the Colonialism in the Narrative Traditions of Federal Indian Law,” in Delgado and Stefancic, pp. 94-105. [12 pp.]
* Margaret E. **Montoya**, “Máscaras, Trenzas y Greñas,” in Delgado and Stefancic, pp. 514-524. [11 pp.]
* Ian F. **Haney-López**, “White by Law,” in Delgado and Stefancic, pp. 626-634. [9 pp.] This essay describes the judicial struggle to define whiteness and establish the legal basis for white privilege.
* Derrick **Bell**, “Property Rights in Whiteness—Their Legal Legacy, Their Economic Costs,” in Delgado and Stefancic, pp. 71-79. [9 pp.] This is a *social-construction* essay, demonstrating the broad-based entitlements that have been invented to privilege White people and insure their status of superiority.
* Anne **McClintock**, “Introduction: Postcolonialism and the Angel of Progress,” *Imperial Leather*, pp. 1-17. [17 pp.]
* **McClintock,** “Lay of the Land,” *Imperial Leather*, pp. 21-74. [54 pp.]

**Reflection Questions:**

* How are race, gender and class connected as categories of experience and cognition in the world? How are they distinct?
* What are “privilege” and “privileging”?
* What are the mechanisms for socially constructing discrimination and privileging?
* Who is it that actually privileges “men” in American society?
* What are the mechanisms for socially constructing discrimination and privileging?
* Did the women from these readings change systems of oppression or challenge systems of oppression? Is there a difference in these outcomes—thinking in terms of the difference between having real power or (mere) influence?

**3. January 22**

***Gender Discrimination and Male Privileging: Racial Purity and Policing Women’s Sexuality***

**READ:**

* **McClintock**, “‘Massa’ and Maids,” *Imperial Leather*, pp. 75-131. [57 pp.]
* **McClintock**, “Imperial Leather: Race, Cross-Dressing and the Cult of Domesticity,” *Imperial Leather*, pp. 132-180. [49 pp.]

 **READ:**

* Stephanie M. **Wildman** and Adrienne D. **Davis**, “Language and Silence: Making Systems of Privilege Visible,” in Delgado and Stefancic, pp. 657-663, [7 pp.]
* Tina Grillo and Stephanie M. **Wildman**, “Obscuring the Importance of Race: The Implication of Making Comparisons between Racism and Sexism (or Other -isms),” in Delgado and Stefancic, pp. 648-656. [9 pp.]
* Paulette M. **Caldwell**, “A Hair Piece: Perspectives on the Intersection of Race and Gender,” in Delgado and Stefancic, pp. 275-285. [11 pp.]

**Reflection Questions:**

* Who decided (when? and where?) that men ought to be privileged above women?
* Reflect on ways that this privileging can be very subtle and thus extremely difficult to identify.
* How do people (i.e., people of color; women; poor people) engage in resistance against structures of privileging? In what ways did women and people of color participate in the act of oppression itself? In other words, how do the oppressed participate generally in their own oppression?
* If there are examples of people engaging resistance against structures of privileging, why does the system not change? What forces maintain the system and its structures of privileging?
* If race, gender, and class can be analyzed as articulated categories, how do we take Grillo and Wildman’s argument seriously and respect the disparateness of race as a category of analysis?

**4. January 29**

**PART I: *Racial Discrimination and White Privileging***

## Guest Leader: Dr. Antony Alumkal

**Preparation:**

* Howard **Winant**, “United States: The End of the Innocence.” Chapter 7, in *The World Is a Ghetto: Race and Democracy Since world War II*. Basic Books, 2001. Pp. 147-176; [30 pp.] plus notes, pp. 341-347. [Posted on Moodle.]
* **Delgado** and **Stefancic**, edd., “Critique of Liberalism,” in Delgado and Stefancic, *Critical Race Theory*, Part I, pp.2-38. [37 pp.]
* Sheri Lynn **Johnson**, “Black Innocence and the White Jury,” in Delgado and Stefancic, pp. 152-162. [11 pp.]
* Thomas **Ross**, “Innocence and Affirmative Action,” in Delgado and Stefancic, pp. 635-647. [13 pp.] Traces the Bakke and post-Bakke court anguish over the perceived innocence of White victims of affirmative action—and the corresponding assumption of undeservedness of Black and other beneficiaries of affirmative action. Structural vs. individualist concern, and the latter has been winning consistently since Bakke.

PART II: **Intersection of Gender, “Sexual Preference,” and Race**

**Guest Leader: Ms. Heike Peckruhn, JDP Ph.D. Student**

**Preparation:** [Copies of King and Jakobsen are available on the Fourth Floor for your reading there or for copying.]

* **McClintock**, “Psychoanalysis, Race and Female Fetishism,” *Imperial Leather*, pp. 181 - 203. [23 pp.]
* Katie **King**, “’There Are No Lesbians Here’: Lesbianisms, Feminisms, and Global Gay Formation,” in Cruz, et al, *Queer Globalizations*, pp. 33-45. [13 pp.]
* Janet R. **Jakobsen**, “Can Homosexuals End Western Civilization as We Know It? Family Values in a Global Economy,” in Cruz-Malavé, et al, *Queer Globalizations*, pp. 49-70. [22 pp.] [Available outside TT’s office.]
* T. **Tinker**, “Osage Kettle Carriers: *Marmitons*, Scullery Boys, Deviants and Gender Choices,” manuscript version of Chapter 8 (Proposed title: Savage Sophisticates: American Indian Religious Traditions of Spirit, Power, Balance and Harmony. Fulcrum Publishers. Long in-press.) Available on Canvas.

**Reflection Questions:**

* How do these readings “rearrange” the “usual” categories of analysis that seem to function in society generally?
* To what extent is sexual preference a social construction?
* How will we distinguish between morality and social construction?
* What is intimacy? And how does it interact with inequality and power?

**5. February 5**

# Gender and Race at the Intersection

**Preparation:**

* **McClintock**, “Soft-Soaping Empire: Commodity Racism and Imperial Advertising,” *Imperial Leather*, pp. 207-231. [25 pp.]
* **McClintock**, “The White Family of Man: Colonial Discourse and the Reinvention of Patriarchy,” *Imperial Leather*, pp. 232-257. [26 pp.]
* Monica J. **Evans**, “Stealing Away: Black Women, Outlaw Culture and the Rhetoric of Rights,” in Delgado and Stefancic, pp. 500-513. [14 pp.]
* Mary L. **Dudziak**, “Desegregation as a Cold War Imperative,” in Delgado and Stefancic, pp. 106-117. A great insight on the desegregation/civil rights movement of the fifties and sixties. She argues that it was not at all a justice movement on the part of the US government. Rather, it involved international politics of the Cold War era and establishing US credibility in the world, especially the Third World. [12 pp.]
* Mark A. **Noll**, “The Civil Rights Movement as the Fulcrum of Recent Political History,” and “Theological Conclusion,” in *God and Race in American Politics: A Short History* (Princeton University Press, 2008) pp. 136 – 181. [46 pp.] Taylor Library E185.N655 2008

**Reflection Question:**

**6. February 12:**

1. Please view the movie “Salt of the Earth.” Part of our initial class period will be spent in discussing this classic movie. It is available at Penrose; but it is also public domain and available on-line:
2. New url (2013): <http://archive.org/details/clacinonl_SaltOfTheEarth>

# Affirmative Action, Commodity Racism and the Liberal Dilemma

**Preparation:**

* Richard **Delgado**, “Affirmative Action as a Majoritarian Device: Or, Do You Really Want to Be a Role Model?” In Delgado and Stefancic, pp. 397-403. [7 pp.]
* Alan D. **Freeman**, “Derrick Bell -- Race and Class: The Dilemma of Liberal Reform,” in Delgado and Stefancic, pp. 573-578. [6 pp.]
* Derrick **Bell**, “Serving Two Masters: Integration Ideals and Client Interests in School Desegregation Litigation,” in Delgado and Stefancic, pp. 236-246. [11 pp.] Bell is trying to distinguish between the immediate needs of the oppressed and the systemic change agenda of the professionals and activists who speak out for them. Much of civil rights litigation, he argues, has been fueled by Whites and middle class Blacks rather than by rank-and-file oppressed Black folk.
* **Delgado** and Jean **Stefancic**, “Images of the outsider in American Law and Culture: Can Free Expression Remedy Systemic Social Ills?” In Delgado and Stefancic, pp. 225-235. [11 pp.] A really good essay that shows how the center uses “free speech” to keep the margins out.

**Reflection Questions:**

* We have read about several women and seen “Salt of the Earth.” How have these different persons (women and men) been doing gender?
* What historic social forces have generated their patterns of behavior and resistance?
* How have the categories of “equality” and “equal opportunity” been inverted over the past forty years to be used against the very marginalized people who created the language in the 1960s?
* What are some of the more useful complexities around the topic of affirmative action? Has it been an unmitigated good for women and people of color?

**7. February 19**

**PART I: Colonialism and White Women**

**Preparation:**

# McClintock, “Olive Schreiner: the Limits of Colonial Feminism,” pp. 258-295. [38 pp.]

# PART II: Essentialism and Anti-essentialism

* Angela P. **Harris**, “Race and Essentialism in Feminist Legal Theory,” in Delgado and Stefancic, pp. 261-274. Critiques White feminist essentialism (particularly MacKinnon) as an “insult to Black women.” According to Harris, MacKinnon creates a paradigmatic “woman” who is, as it turns out, a White woman. [14 pp.]
* Regina **Austin**, “‘The Black Community,’ Its Lawbreakers, and a Politics of Identification,” in Delgado and Stefancic, pp. 290-302. Austin struggles to identify the “Black Community” over against the essentialist/anti-essentialist dilemma. She gets there by focusing on the “lawbreakers” in the Black community. [13 pp.]
* Lisa C. **Ikemoto**, “Traces of the Master Narrative in the Story of African American/Korean American Conflict: How We Constructed ‘Los Angeles,’” in Delgado and Stefancic, pp. 302-312. [11 pp.]
* Randall L. **Kennedy**, “Racial Critiques of Legal Academia,” in Delgado and Stefancic, pp. 313-318. [6 pp.]
* Robert S. **Chang**, “Toward an Asian American Legal Scholarship: Critical Race Theory, Post-Structuralism, and Narrative Space,” in Delgado and Stefancic, pp.354-368. [15]
* Richard **Delgado**, “Rodrigo’s Sixth Chronicle: Intersections, Essences, and the Dilemma of Social Reform,” in Delgado and Stefancic, pp. 250-260. [11 pp.] An intersection of race and gender. Concluding point: “[T]he history of revolution is, by its nature, iterative” (257).

**Reflection Question:**

* Does the category “feminism” only apply to White women? Who determines what women’s experience is?
* At some level, the master narrative always essentializes. How so?
* How does essentialism function to oppress, suppress and limit?
* At the same time, “anti-essentialism” is too often used as a new source of control of the periphery by the center. How does this function?

**8. February 26**

# Pedagogy, Legal Discourse, Theology, Race and Racism

**Preparation:**

* Ward **Churchill**, “White Studies: The Intellectual Imperialism of U.S. Higher Education,” in *From a Native Son: Selected Essays on Indigenism, 1985-1995* (Boston: South End Press, 1996), pp. 271-293. [23 pp.] Available on Canvas.

Ward **Churchill**, “The New Racism: A Critique of James A. Clifton’s *The Invented Indian*,” in *Fantasies of the Master Race: Literature, Cinema and the Colonization of American Indians* (City Lights Press, 1999; rev. ed., 1992), pp. 121-136. [16 pp.] Available on Canvas.

* Peggy C. **Davis**, “Law as Microaggression,” in Delgado and Stefancic, pp. 141-151. [11 pp.]
* T.**Tinker**, “Abjection, Violence, Missions, and American Indians: Missionary Conquest in an Age of Pluralism,” in *American Indian Liberation: A Theology of Sovereignty* (Orbis Press, 2008), pp. . Available on Canvas as an e-manuscript (MSWord document).

This chapter was published originally as an American Indian response to an invitation to join a discussion initiated by Joseph C. Hough Jr., president of Union Theological Seminary through his essay titled, “Christian Revelation and Religious Pluralism.” Both essays appeared in the same issue of USQR; this issue also included Hough’s “Continuing the Discussion,” in which he addressed all seven of the scholars who had responded to his essay. Union SeminaryQuarterly Review 56, nos. 3-4 (2002), 65-80, 106-121.

* **Delgado**, “Words That Wound: A Tort Action for Racial Insults, Epithets, and Name-Calling,” in Delgado and Stefancic, pp. 131-140. [10 pp.]

**Reflection Question:**

#### What is “new” about what Churchill identifies as the new racism?

#### Why are there no “White Studies” departments at universities?

#### How does liberal White theological language end up being deeply racialized? Does it work the same way with gender or class?

**Exam:** The final exam will be distributed by today, February 26th. The completed exam is to be returned by **5 pm** on **March 14th**, the last day of the quarter.

**9. March 5**

* **McClintock**, “Dismantling the Master’s House,” *Imperial Leather*, Part 3, pp. 296-396. [Chapters 8-10 plus “Postscript.”] [101 pp.]
* Peter **McLaren**. “Unthinking Whiteness, Rethinking Democracy: Critical Citizenship in Gringolandia.” In *Becoming and Unbecoming White: Owning and Disowning a Racial Identity*, 1999. Pp. 10-55. [46 pp.]

**10. March 12**

# CLOSING THOUGHTS: Colonial History and (Post-) Modern Reality

**Preparation:**

* **Delgado and Stefancic**, eds., “Storytelling, Counterstorytelling, and ‘Naming One’s Own Reality,’” in Delgado and Stefancic, *Critical Race Theory*, Part II, pp. 41-90. [49 pp.]
* Tink **Tinker**, “Culture and Domination: A ‘Post-Colonial’ Quandary,” Chapter 7 in *American Indian Liberation: Towards a Theology of Sovereignty* (Orbis Press, 2008). Address, Iliff School of Theology, February 25, 1998. Available on Canvas as an e-manuscript.

**YOUR PARTICIPATION IN TODAY’S CLASS IS ESSENTIAL FOR INTEGRATING THE WHOLE OF OUR SEMINAR TOGETHER.**

**Final Exams** are due electronically the last day of the quarter, March 14th, by **five pm** at the latest.

Please do submit electronically. By 5pm. Please do not miss class to finish your exam. Our concluding discussion is an important moment of closure for our seminar. Timely submission is important, since we certainly want to be able to submit a grade for YOU when those grades are due at the Registrar’s office.