

Spring 2002
ADVANCED FEMINIST THEORY
WST 6560-911 (cross-listed: WST, PHIL, POLS)

Tuesdays 6:00-8:50
Professor: Carolyn DiPalma
Phone: 974-0979
Fax: 974-0336

FAO 196
Office: FAO 163
E-mail: cdipalma@chuma1.cas.usf.edu
Office Hours: by appointment

This course will highlight debates that currently serve as points of tension and potential growth in feminist theories. Since feminist theory is, or should be, integrally related to feminist politics, these theoretical debates have real implications for feminism in general. The course will demonstrate these connections, thereby helping you learn to apply the theoretical tools and perspectives we will study.

COURSE OBJECTIVES:

1. To develop an understanding of theory as an awareness of how we know, understand, categorize, divide, and generally cut-up the world.
2. To learn how to investigate the silent assumptions, expectations, and implications of theoretical practices. (Being critical about theory.)
3. To develop the ability to wield theoretical tools. (Ways to apply theory.)
4. To become familiar with recent feminist perspectives on, and debates about, issues such as: essentialism, representation, authority structures, subjectivity, identity and difference.

*****See page 6 of this syllabus for strongly recommended readings prior to beginning the course.*****

REQUIRED TEXTS: (Available at USF Bookstore on campus in the Marshall Center.)

- Adele Clarke and Virginia Olesen, eds. *Revisioning Women, Health, and Healing: Feminist, Cultural, and Technoscience Perspectives*. New York: Routledge, 1999.
- Kathy Ferguson. *The Man Question: Visions of Subjectivity in Feminist Theory*. Berkeley, CA: U of California, 1993.
- Valerie Lehr. *Queer Family Values: Debunking the Myth of the Nuclear Family*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple, 1999.
- Linda Nicholson, ed. *The Second Wave: A Reader in Feminist Theory*
- Uma Narayan. *Dislocating Cultures: Identities, Traditions, and Third World Feminism*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Chela Sandoval. *Methodology of the Oppressed*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota, 2000.
- *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. 26.2 (Winter 2001)
- Readings on **Electronic Reserve** in the library(<http://www.lib.usf.edu/virtual/index.html>) [see p. 2]
- Readings in packet at **Pro-Copy** (5219 E. Fowler Ave. 988-5900) [see p. 3]

RECOMMENDED (OPTIONAL) TEXTS:

- Sonya Andermahr, Terry Lovell and Carol Wolkowitz, eds. *A Concise Glossary of Feminist Theory*. London: Arnold, 1997.

Note: The USF Bookstore has notified me that this book is now out-of-print and, therefore, is unavailable. I include it here in case you come across a used copy for sale.

- Maggie Humm. *The Dictionary of Feminist Theory*. New York: Prentice Hall, 1995.

Note: This dictionary is still in print. I did not order it from the bookstore because I do not think it is as good as the one listed above. I include it here in case you want to look at it to see if you think it would be helpful to you.

PRIOR READING (strongly suggested)

Joan Scott, “Deconstructing Equality—versus—Difference: Or, the Uses of Poststructuralist Theory for Feminism,” *Feminist Studies* 14.1 (Spring 1988) 33-50.

Nancy Hartsock, “The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism” in *Feminism and Methodology*, Sandra Harding, ed. (Bloomington, IN: Indiana U, 1987) 157-180.

WEEK 2

Geoffrey Bowker and Susan Leigh Star. “Categorical Work and Boundary Infrastructures: Enriching Theories of Classification” in *Sorting Things Out: Classification and its Consequences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT, 2000. 285-317 (notes: 333).

Noël Sturgeon. “Theorizing Movements: Direct Action and Direct Theory” in *Cultural Politics and Social Movements*. Marcy Darnovsky, Barbara Epstein, and Richard Flacks, eds. Philadelphia, PA: Temple, 1995. 35-51

Trinh T. Minh-ha. “Not You/Like You: Postcolonial Women and the Interlocking Questions of Identity and Difference” in *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation, and Postcolonial Perspectives*. Anne McClintock, Aamir Mufti, and Ella Shohat, eds. Minneapolis, MN: U of Minnesota, 1997. 415-419.

WEEK 3

Deborah McDowell. “Transferences: Black Feminist Discourse: The ‘Practice’ of ‘Theory,’” in *Feminism Beside Itself*. Diane Elam and Robyn Wiegman, eds. New York: Routledge, 1995. 93-118.

WEEK 5

Judith Butler. “Preface 1999” in *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1999. vii-xxvi (notes: 191-193).

WEEK 11

Katie King. “Producing Sex, Theory, and Culture: Gay/Straight ReMappings in Contemporary Feminism (1990)” in *Theory in its Feminist Travels: Conversations in U.S. Women’s Movements*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University, 1994. 138-150 (notes: 178-183).

WEEK 12

Aida Hurtado. “On a Reflexive Theory of Gender Subordination” in *The Color of Privilege: Three Blasphemies on Race and Feminism*. Ann Arbor, MI: U of Michigan, 1996. 123-160 (notes 179-181).

WEEK 13

Christine Helliwell. “It’s Only a Penis: Rape, Feminism, and Difference.” *Signs*. 25.3 789-816.

Ann Cahill. “Foucault, Rape, and the Construction of the Feminine Body.” *Hypatia*. 15.1 (Winter 2000). 43-63.

WEEK 16

Shari Stone-Mediatore. “Chandra Mohanty and the Revaluing of ‘Experience.’” *Hypatia* 13.2 (Spring 1998) 116-133.

Spring 2002

WST 6560-911 ADVANCED FEMINIST THEORY

Carolyn DiPalma

Citations for Articles available at Pro-Copy (5219 E. Fowler Ave. 988-5900)

WEEK 2

Patricia Williams. "On Being the Object of Property." *Signs*. 14.1 (Autumn 1988) 5-24.

WEEK 3

Joan Scott. "Experience" in *Feminists Theorize the Political*. Judith Butler and Joan Scott, eds. New York: Routledge, 1992. 22-40.**Jane Flax.** "Postmodernism and Gender Relations in Feminist Theory" in *Feminism/Postmodernism*. Linda Nicholson, ed. New York: Routledge, 1990. 39-62.**Susan Bordo.** "Feminism, Postmodernism, and Gender-Scepticism" in *Feminism/Postmodernism*. Linda Nicholson, ed. New York: Routledge, 1990. 133-156.

WEEK 5

Chandra Mohanty. "Under Western Eyes" in *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism*. Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo, and Lourders Torres, eds. Bloomington, IN: Indiana U, 1991. 51-80.**Donna Haraway.** "Situated Knowledges." *Feminist Studies*. (Fall 1988) 14.3 579-599.**Celina Romany.** "Ain't I a Feminist?" in *Critical Race Feminism: A Reader*. Adrien Katherine Wing, ed. New York: New York U, 1997. 19- 26.

WEEK 6

Sandra Harding. "From the Woman Question in Science to the Science Question in Feminism" and "Valuable Tensions and a New 'Unity of Science'" in *The Science Question in Feminism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell, 1986. 15-29 and 243-251.

WEEK 8

Wendy Brown. "Wounded Attachments" in *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity*. Princeton: Princeton U, 1995. 52-76.

WEEK 9

Siobhan Brooks. "Exotic Dancing and Unionizing: The Challenges of Feminist and Antiracist Organizing at the Lusty Lady Theater" in *Feminism and Antiracism: International Struggles for Justice*. France Winddance Twine and Kathleen Blee, eds. New York: New York U, 2001. 59-70.

WEEK11

Irene Costera Meijer and Baukje Prins. "How Bodies Come to Matter: An Interview with Judith Butler." *Signs*. 23.2 (Winter 1998). 275-286.**Evelynn Hammonds.** "Black (W)holes and the Geometry of Black Female Sexuality." *differences* 6.2 + 3 (Summer-Fall 1994). 126-145.

WEEK 12

Ellen Scott. "From Race Cognizance to Racism Cognizance: Dilemmas in Antiracist Activism in California" in *Feminism and Antiracism: International Struggles for Justice*. France Winddance Twine and Kathleen Blee, eds. New York: New York U, 2001. 125-149.

WEEK13

Sharon Marcus. "Fighting Bodies, Fighting Words" in *Feminists Theorize the Political*. Judith Butler and Joan Scott, eds. New York: Routledge. 385-403.**Angela Harris.** "Race and Essentialism in Feminist Legal Theory" in *Critical Race Feminism: A Reader*. Adrien Katherine Wing, ed. New York: New York U, 1997. 11-18.

WEEK 14

Wendy Brown. "Liberalism's Family Values" in *States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity*. Princeton: Princeton U, 1995. 135-165.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS:

As a general rule, it is best to notify me as soon as possible if you have circumstances which will affect your ability to fulfill your obligations to the course. Nevertheless, be advised that *most negotiations will entail some grade penalty.*

Grades: Seminar participation: 30%
 Oral presentation: 10%
 Working papers: 15%
 Final Paper: 45%

This formula will be guided by improvement during the semester, and other intangibles such as effort.

Grading scale:

Grades will be based on a standard scale of 100 points. The equivalent letter grades are:

97-99: A+
 93-96: A
 90-92: A-
 87-89: B+ , etc.

Seminar Participation:

Much of our time in this course will be spent examining feminist arguments from different points of view and trying to interpret and evaluate competing theories. The more each of you contributes your own *respectful, thoughtful, and informed* interpretation and point of view to these discussions, the more the seminar as a whole will benefit. For this reason, you will be expected to complete the assigned readings and prepare several thoughtful (written) discussion questions prior to class meetings, attend class regularly, participate actively and thoughtfully in class discussions, and listen respectfully to all authors and discussants.

Please note that “active and thoughtful participation” is in no way limited to providing “correct answers” to questions; rather, it means any participation in discussion that is a sincere attempt to come to terms with the material and/or advance the class’s consideration of the issue at hand. Such attempts may include raising your own questions about the text, pointing out connections that you see, responding to another student’s comments, and so forth. “Listening respectfully” means taking the texts’ and other students’ ideas seriously, and making an honest effort to understand their basis, even when those ideas are not agreeable to you. Listening respectfully also applies to yourself; it means taking your own ideas seriously, and speaking them when appropriate, *while allowing your ideas to develop over time, and while pursuing an understanding of their basis.*

Grading policies and standards for participation:

All students will start with a 75 (a C) for participation. Students who are active and thoughtful participants in discussion will raise this grade proportionately. Lack of respect for others (including verbal hostility and/or monopolizing the conversation), and their thoughts and work, will not be tolerated and will negatively affect the evaluation of your participation and your grade. You can not participate if you are not present (even if you have a very good reason for not being present). I will note attendance each class session. More than one absence will negatively affect the evaluation of your participation and your grade, while in borderline cases no absences may favorably affect your grade.

Oral Presentation(s):

In order to initiate class discussion of the readings, each student will be required to make one (or two) short presentation(s) (depending on the number of students) of approximately 15-20 minutes to the class. The presentation *should not simply summarize the reading for the day; rather it should highlight the key issues that you believe it to address and the important questions that you believe it to raise. In addition, presentations should make a serious attempt to pull themes from the various readings for the day and to put those themes in conversation with each other and/or in conversation with themes from previous readings in the course.* Presenters should provide *several thoughtfully prepared discussion questions* and they should be ready to entertain specific questions from the class about the material or their reading of it.

Grading policies and standards for oral presentation:

Presentations should be WELL PREPARED, clear, accurate, organized, and focused on raising key issues for discussion. A schedule for presentations will be arranged early in the term; modifications of the schedule will be allowed only in the event of serious, unexpected problems, and only with the consent of other students (and—even with such consent—may entail a grade penalty).

Working Papers/Writing Groups:

Writing is a way of thinking. As you proceed through this course, you will be expected to “think on paper” about the material in an ongoing process. You will also be expected to respond to each other’s written thoughts by exchanging your papers in small writing groups (size will depend on the number of students in the class, no more than 3 or 4 students per group). Following the first several weeks of the course, you will be required to write a short paper in which you work out a thematic relationship or set of relationships that you see between two of the authors from this section. Each member of a writing group will be required to provide written feedback and suggestions for revision to the papers of the other members of the group. Upon receiving these comments, the authors of the papers will be expected to take them into account in writing their next working paper, which will add (at least) one author from the next several weeks of the course to the conversation between the first two authors. A total of three working papers, each building upon the previous one, will be required.

Grading policies and standards for working papers and feedback:

Beginning with approximately 3 pages, each paper adds approximately 3 pages to the previous paper. The first working paper should be 3-4 pages in length, the second 5-7 pages, and the third 8-10. While working papers need not make an argument that goes beyond an interpretation of the material, they should address relevant features of the theories at hand, demonstrate a serious effort to come to terms with the material, provide reasonable definitions of the key concepts used, support their interpretations with plausible evidence, counter major potential objections to their interpretations, properly acknowledge the sources of their ideas, be well organized, clearly written, focused on the topic, and follow standard spelling, grammar, and formatting conventions. Written feedback on other students’ papers will be evaluated according to its thoroughness, accuracy, and constructive approach in responding to the author’s ideas. *Feedback should include marginal comments as well as at least a paragraph of responsive summary.* The evaluation of your writing group participation will be factored into your participation grade.

It is your responsibility to come to class with an appropriate number of copies of your paper (one for me, and one for each member of your writing group). I will also need a copy of the comments made by each member of the writing group. Each commentator should place her or his name at the top of the paper upon which comments are being written. It is the responsibility of the commentator to come to class with an appropriate number of copies (one for me, one for the author, and one for each member of the writing group).

Papers are due at the beginning of class. Late papers and comments are a problem, especially since the work schedule and planning of other students will be affected by your late paper or comments. Therefore, late papers will be docked one full letter grade per day (an A paper received on Wednesday would receive a B). Late comments will lower your participation grade in class (a second instance of late comments will, additionally, result in a grade reduction of one full letter grade of the commentator’s own paper.) Late papers should be handed in directly to the members of your writing group, who will be allowed one week from that time to return them to you. Exceptions will be made rarely and only in very extreme circumstances.

Final Paper:

The purpose of a final paper is to provide you with an opportunity to make use of, but *go beyond*, what you have developed in your working papers. Going beyond developing your working papers means developing your relationship to these theories, integrating your voice with other theorists, constructing your own arguments, and considering the ramifications of these theories. In short, becoming a theorist yourself, joining in the discussion with your own informed and thoughtful perspective.

Grading policies and standards for final papers (read and follow this carefully):

The final paper should pose an interesting and significant question or problem, present a clear thesis addressing the question, provide reasonable definitions of the key terms used, support its thesis with plausible evidence, counter major potential objections to its argument, properly acknowledge the sources of its ideas, be well organized, clearly written, and focused on the topic, and follow standard spelling, grammar, and formatting conventions. A helpful internet resource with links to style guides, citation manuals online, and writing resources can be found at:

<http://www.lib.usf.edu/~ifrank/guides/cite.html>

Final papers should be 15-20 pages in length.

FINAL PAPERS ARE DUE AT MY OFFICE (PLACED IN THE HOLDER ON THE WALL NEXT TO MY DOOR, FAO163) BY MONDAY, APRIL 29 AT 5:00PM. (Exceptions will be made in only the most extreme cases, and all exceptions will include a significant grade reduction—a minimum of at least one full letter grade for each late day.) Any papers submitted after the deadline should be delivered during business hours and signed with the date and time by a women’s studies office person or by another women’s studies faculty member. No late papers will be accepted after Wednesday, May 1 at 5:00 pm.

All students will be expected to learn and follow the guidelines on academic honesty detailed in the *USF Graduate Catalog*. You must acknowledge the source of any quotation or *paraphrased idea* in your papers. Furthermore, although you are encouraged to help each other by discussing ideas and providing feedback, papers must be the product of your own work, written in your own words. *As a matter of intellectual honesty and respect, any help you receive from anyone in understanding a question, thinking through ideas, coming up with examples, interpreting the text, refining your writing, and so forth must be acknowledged in a note at the beginning or end of the paper (this should include members of your writing group).* Violations of academic honesty will at the very least result in a lowered grade for the assignment, and may also be reported to the Dean’s Office.

MISC.

Notes or tapes of the course are not permitted for purposes of sale.

Religious Preference Absence Policy: Students who anticipate the necessity of being absent from class due to the observation of a major religious observance must provide advance notice of the date(s) to the instructor, in writing. I will need these notices by the end of the second class meeting.

Strongly recommended reading, prior to beginning the semester in *Advanced Feminist Theory*:

- Joan Scott, “Deconstructing Equality—versus—Difference: Or, the Uses of Poststructuralist Theory for Feminism,” *Feminist Studies* 14.1 (Spring 1988) 33-50. [A good, basic, foundational and accessible essay that demonstrates and describes some important contested issues in feminist theory. You are expected to be familiar with the issues in this essay.]
 - Nancy Hartsock, “The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism” in *Feminism and Methodology*, Sandra Harding, ed. (Bloomington, IN: Indiana U, 1987) 157-180. [A “classic” and foundational feminist theory essay. Many of the authors we read will either be responding to or mobilizing this essay.]
 - If you’d like an additional prior reading, you might consider an initial reading of Chapter 1, “Interpretation and Genealogy in Feminism,” of Kathy Ferguson’s required book for the course, *The Man Question: Visions of Subjectivity in Feminist Theory* (Berkeley, CA: U of California, 1993). [Consider this a preliminary reading. If you have not been exposed to these debates this reading is likely to be difficult. Nevertheless, reading it through once will familiarize you with some of the terms and issues at stake in a number of feminist debates. Do not spend enormous amounts of time trying to tease these arguments apart; rather, read it through once now, and read it more carefully, again, after being introduced to other material in the course.]
-

Please read articles in the order listed. Any changes will be announced.
[ER] =Electronic Reserve; [PC] = Pro Copy

CLASS SCHEDULE

WEEK 1

January 8

1st half of class

Introduction

2nd half of class

In-class readings:

- **Katie King**, “Productive agencies of feminist theory: The work it does” *Feminist Theory* 2.1 [4 pgs]
- **Joan Nestle**, “The Politics of Thinking,” *This is What Lesbian Looks Like*, Kris Kleindienst, ed. Firebrand, 1999 [7 pgs]
- **Audre Lorde**, “Uses of the Erotic,” *Sister Outsider* (Freedom, CA: Crossing, 1984) [7 pgs]
- **Kathy Ferguson**, “Preface” to *The Man Question : Visions of Subjectivity in Feminist Theory* (Berkeley, CA: U of California, 1993) [3 pgs]
- **and others. . . .**

Reading prompts /guides /suggestions/ questions /inquiries /connections:*

How does what “counts” as theory matter? To whom? For what purposes? What sort of “theory” do you need for your own projects? What does it feel like to eavesdrop on conversations in communities of practice other than your own? In other words, what does it feel like to investigate areas of different focus or theorizing locations other than those with which you are most familiar? How do movements of power matter in various communities of practice? What “counts” as power? In what ways is “doing theory” an action that “counts” as practice? How would you describe what “counts” as “feminist theory.” * I am indebted to Katie King for the example on her syllabus of providing questions (some of which I have used); and, to Kathleen Earle for making King’s syllabus available to me and for her own comments on this one.

PART I: THEORY/EPISTEMOLOGY/KNOWLEDGE(I strongly recommend reading articles in the order listed.)

WEEK 2

January 15 [76 pages]

- **Geoffrey Bowker and Susan Leigh Star**, “Categorical Work and Boundary Infrastructures: Enriching Theories of Classification” [ER] [32 pgs]
- **Noël Sturgeon**, “Theorizing Movements: Direct Action and Direct Theory” [ER] [11 pgs]
- **Elsa Barkley Brown**, “What Has Happened Here: The Politics of Difference in Women’s History and Feminist Politics,” *The Second Wave: A Reader in Feminist Theory* [9 pgs]
- **Patricia Williams**, “On Being the Object of Property” [PC] [20 pgs]
- **Trinh T. Minh-ha** “Not You/Like You: Postcolonial Women and the Interlocking Questions of Identity and Difference” [ER] [4 pgs]

Reading prompts /guides /suggestions/ questions /inquiries /connections:

While reading Bowker and Star respect and note the associations that emerge for you; read it as poetry. What kind of categorical work is being done in Sturgeon, Brown, Williams and Trinh? What “counts” as a category in each? What, if any, “new” categories and/or boundaries became evident to you? How does the emergence of new categories and/or boundaries affect your reading? In what ways are Sturgeon’s ideas about “direct theory” useful? What concepts are made more visible by the term “direct theory”? How can we understand Brown, Williams and Trinh in terms of Sturgeon’s ideas about “direct theory”? Taken together, how do these readings help us to understand the contexts and conditions of the production of feminist theory? Why are questions of classification political questions? In what ways are questions about categories or disciplinary differences also questions about social movements? What points of similarity can you find between the theoretical ideas of Brown and Trinh; between the theoretical ideas of Williams and Brown? How do the notions of “membership” in communities of practice, boundary infrastructures, and “naturalization” of objects help us understand what it means to “become a theorist”—in your field/discipline and/or in your social movements? How does it help us think about how to speak beyond our own communities of practice, not taking them for granted, being willing to hear and value the languages and projects of others? How does adopting Brown’s recognition of differences as relational affect the notion of what “difference” means?

WEEK 3**January 22** [82 pages]

- **Joan Scott**, “Experience” [PC] [15 pgs]
- **Jane Flax**, “Postmodernism and Gender Relations in Feminist Theory” [PC] [15 pgs]
- **Susan Bordo**, “Feminism, Postmodernism, and Gender-Scepticism” [PC] [15 pgs]
- **Gayatri Spivak with Ellen Rooney**, “In A Word: Interview,” *The Second Wave: A Reader* [19 pgs]
- **Deborah McDowell**, “Transferences: Black Feminist Discourse: The ‘Practice’ of ‘Theory’” [ER] [18 pgs]

Reading prompts /guides /suggestions/ questions /inquiries /connections:

How are the “post” terms like “postmodern” or “postcolonial” used in these essays? Are they synonymous? Why do some authors prefer some terms/meanings over others? What are Joan Scott’s concerns with *experience*? Since Scott is not suggesting that “experience” be done away with, what *is* she suggesting? How and why is early standpoint perspective rendered problematic and ambiguity and partiality encouraged by Flax’s postmodern feminist thinking? How does Bordo’s position contrast with that of Flax? How does Spivak’s phrase “strategic essentialism” work to avoid attributing a real or ontological “essence” to womanhood, yet maintain positive ideas about being a “woman” for the sake of political action? What, if anything, is politically gained or lost in a comparison between McDowell’s use of various markers and Bowker’ and Star’s use of categories? What is McDowell’s notion of theory and how does her notion of “counter history” matter for feminism? Taken together, how do these readings help us understand what politics are at work in Scott’s notion of experience? In what way might Flax’s self-reflexive writing, Bordo’s gender-scepticism, Spivak’s strategic essentialism, and McDowell’s notions of counter history be described using Sturgeon’s terms of “direct action” and “direct theory”?

WEEK 4**FIRST WORKING PAPER DUE****January 29** [183 pgs]

- **Kathy Ferguson**, *The Man Question: Visions of Subjectivity in Feminist Theory* [183 pgs]

Reading prompts /guides /suggestions/ questions /inquiries /connections:

Read and reflect on this book in two stages.

1) Preface, Chapters 1 & 2. What is metatheory? What is at stake for feminism in Ferguson’s contrast of women’s experience and voice with the deconstruction of the category women through her mapping of the metatheories: interpretation and genealogy? What are some characteristics that help define interpretation and genealogy? In what ways are they dependent on one another? Why and when might you use one over the other and how does the use of irony aid in that determination? What does Ferguson mean by the term “subjectivity” and how does the act of making Hegel strange (and, therefore, a male-ordered view of identity strange) work to help her distill subjectivity into three thematizations within contemporary feminist theory? How does the concept of “kitsch” work within Ferguson’s project (in other words, why does she need it)?

2) Chapters 3-6. What are the characteristic strengths and weaknesses of the three thematizations of feminist subjectivity? Choose an example of each that you find particularly helpful. Can you identify some recognizable moments of each of the three realms in previous readings in this course and in your own theoretical thinking or communities of practice? How does such recognition and identification work to clarify the infrastructure of any underlying assumptions? What are Ferguson’s concerns with essentialism? How do “mobile subjectivities” avoid the trap of essentialism? How does reading Ferguson help to understand the contexts and conditions of the production of feminist theory?

WEEK 5**COMMENTS ON FIRST WORKING PAPER DUE****February 5** [88 pgs]

- **Chandra Mohanty**, “Under Western Eyes” [PC] [30 pgs]
- **Donna Haraway**, “Situated Knowledges” [PC] [22 pgs]
- **Judith Butler**, “Imitation and Gender Insubordination,” *The Second Wave: A Reader* [13 pgs]
- **Judith Butler**, “Preface 1999” [ER] [17 pgs]
- **Celina Romany**, “Ain’t I a Feminist?” [PC] [6 pgs]

Reading prompts /guides /suggestions/ questions /inquiries /connections:

According to Mohanty, what is the relationship between self-presentations of Western feminists and their representation of Third World women? How does power work to produce these discursive categories? In what ways does Haraway’s project of “situated knowledges” expand the notion of feminist standpoint and how is that expansion allegedly more useful to feminist politics? How might “situated knowledges” be used to respond to Mohanty’s

concerns? Where in Ferguson's typology of subjectivities would Butler's idea of the subject (as prior to rather than the effect of our actions) fall? Why? How might you mobilize Butler's notion of using regulatory identity categories as a means to destabilize the regimes they are intended to support with Mohanty and Haraway's ideas? How does showing the derivative nature of gender and sex *from* sexuality subvert the regime of compulsory heterosexuality, according to Butler? What did you learn about the potential progress of politics, power and intellectual processes of theoretical practices through Butler's discussion in the 10th Anniversary Preface of *Gender Trouble*? How does this relate to Sturgeon's "direct theory"? How might Romany's arguments be put into productive conversation with those of Mohanty, Haraway, and Butler? How does Romany engage the essentialism/antiessentialism debates as described by Ferguson? Identify moments of interpretation and genealogy in each of these essays. Taken together, how do these readings help us to understand the contexts and conditions of the production of feminist theory? Why are questions of classification political questions? In what ways are questions about categories or disciplinary difference also questions about social movements?

WEEK 6 SECOND WORKING PAPER DUE

- **February 12** [66 pages]**Sandra Harding**, "From the Woman Question in Science to the Science Question in Feminism" and "Valuable Tensions and a New 'Unity of Science'" [PC] [22 pgs]
- **Sylvia Walby** "Against Epistemological Chasms: The Science Question in Feminism Revisited" *Signs* 26.2 (Winter 2001) [20 pgs]
- **Sandra Harding**, "Comment on Walby's 'Against Epistemological Chasms: The Science Question in Feminism Revisited': Can Democratic Values and Interests Ever Play a Rationally Justifiable Role in the Evaluation of Scientific Work?" *Signs* 26.2 (Winter 2001) [13 pgs]
- **Joey Sprague**, "Comment on Walby's 'Against Epistemological Chasms: The Science Question in Feminism Revisited': Structured Knowledge and Strategic Methodology" *Signs* 26.2 (Winter 2001) [8 pgs]
- **Sylvia Walby**, "Reply to Harding and Sprague" *Signs* 26.2 (Winter 2001) [3 pgs]

Reading prompts /guides /suggestions/ questions /inquiries /connections:

What are various contentions about the structure and purpose of knowledge in these essays? What are the epistemological chasms? What markers are you using to "flag" recognizable moments of infrastructure or assumptions? How does the conversation between these authors illuminate and/or disrupt your own points of insight? How might you apply Scott's notion of experience to this debate? Can you find moments in these various arguments that might be captured by one or more of Ferguson's feminist realms; by interpretation and/or genealogy? How are notions such as: standpoint, strategic essentialism, gender-scepticism, situated knowledges, mobile subjectivities, and direct theory deployed in these conversations? Who benefits from the deployment? In what ways is this conversation illustrative of your own expectations of feminist theory? What are some practical outcomes from a debate such as this?

PART II: ESSENTIALISM/REPRESENTATION/IDENTITY/BODY

(I strongly recommend reading articles in the order listed.)

WEEK 7 COMMENTS ON SECOND WORKING PAPER DUE

February 19 [184 pages]

- **Chela Sandoval**, *Methodology of the Oppressed* [184 pgs]

Reading prompts /guides /suggestions/ questions /inquiries /connections:

As you read, be aware that Parts I and II lay the groundwork, while Parts III and IV contain the central ideas of the book. You need not concentrate on all the intricacies of her argument; rather, read for the themes and the politics in an effort to recognize and appreciate her overall project. What languages and communities of practice does Sandoval draw upon? What kinds of languages does she make up and why? Why would an activist Chicana write this kind of stuff? Who is it for? What role do such languages have in projects of emancipation? Upon what "stage" is this work set? What does Sandoval use "postmodern" for? What does she mean by an apartheid of theoretical domains? What does Sandoval think theory is for? What does Love have to do with that? What are these Trans-Languages? What does Sandoval's approach do to the now orthodox U.S. versions of theorists such as Roland Barthes? Why does Sandoval think U.S. Third World Feminists should care about it? About her book? What from her rewritings, rethinkings and methodologies can you use in your own work and thinking? In what ways does reading Sandoval reshape your thinking about specific previous readings from this course? What points of conversation seem available between Sandoval and Ferguson, Scott, Mohanty and/or Brown?

WEEK 8 THIRD WORKING PAPER DUE

- **February 26** [81 pages]**Norma Alarcón**, "The Theoretical Subject(s) of *This Bridge Called My Back* and

Anglo-American Feminism," *The Second Wave: A Reader in Feminist Theory*
[9 pgs]

- **Denise Segura and Adela de la Torre**, "La Sufrida: Contradictions of Acculturation and Gender in Latina Health" in *Revisioning Women, Health, and Healing: Feminist, Cultural, and Technoscience Perspectives* [8 pgs]
- **Paula M. L. Moya**, "Chicana Feminism and Postmodernist Theory" *Signs* 26.2 (Winter 2001) [39 pgs]
- **Wendy Brown**, "Wounded Attachments" [PC] [25 pgs]

Reading prompts /guides /suggestions/ questions /inquiries /connections:

Again, how are the "post" terms like "postmodern" or "postcolonial" used in these essays? Are they synonymous? Why do some authors prefer some over others? What similarities are there between Alarcón's notion of the subject and that of Ferguson or Mohanty? How does the concept of *multiple* subjectivities differ from the concept of *mobile* subjectivities? To what extent and in what ways do the approaches and arguments of subjectivity and identity in Alarcón and the issues of women's agency, identities and gender positions in Segura and de la Torre work with and against Sandoval's project? How does Moya's postpositivist realism contrast with the postmodernism of Sandoval and Alarcón? What does Moya think theory is for? What does Brown mean to indicate by the title phrase "wounded attachments"? How and why does Brown trouble the notion of identity politics? What future constructions does Brown recommend for displacing the role of identity? Can you imagine a discussion between Moya and Brown on the topic of identity? What issues might you expect to be the most contested? Are there areas of similarity? Do the concepts of either multiple subjectivities or mobile subjectivities affect Brown's analysis? What does Brown think theory is for? In what ways is this conversation illustrative of your own expectations of feminist theory? What are some practical outcomes from a debate such as this? How does Sturgeon's concept of direct theory work with these readings? How would you apply Scott's notions of experience to these readings? What would be the outcome of that application? How does "situated knowledges" apply to these readings?

WEEK 9

COMMENTS ON THIRD WORKING PAPER DUE

March 5

[91 pages]

- **Adele Clarke and Virginia Olesen**, "Revising, Diffracting, Acting," *Revisioning Women, Health, and Healing: Feminist, Cultural, and Technoscience Perspectives* [30 pgs]
- **Donna Haraway**, "The Virtual Speculum in the New World Order," *Revisioning Women, Health, and Healing: Feminist, Cultural, and Technoscience Perspectives* [35 pgs]
- **Emily Martin**, "The Woman in the Flexible Body," *Revisioning Women, Health, and Healing: Feminist, Cultural, and Technoscience Perspectives* [16 pgs]
- **Siobhan Brooks**, "Exotic Dancing and Unionizing: The Challenges of Feminist and Antiracist Organizing at the Lusty Lady Theater" [PC] [10 pgs]

Reading prompts /guides /suggestions/ questions /inquiries /connections:

In what ways do Clarke and Olesen hope to rupture the overly biomedicalized notions of women's health? Why do Clarke and Olesen find the metaphor/methodology of diffraction to be more useful than, say, the more linear mechanisms of reflection and representation? What does theory mean to Clarke and Olesen? Engaging naming as a part of seeing, how does Haraway use the visual speculum in order to mobilize the practice of theory for political ends? What is her vision for future feminisms? What do Clarke and Olesen mean when they describe Haraway's argument as "diffractive and interrogatory" (25)? How does Haraway theorize her notion of freedom projects? In what way does Martin reconfigure us to ourselves? How does Martin deploy theory to express her concerns about the "flexible body"? What, if any, epistemological (ways of knowing) and ontological (ways of being) considerations are shared by Haraway and Martin? How do the body politics of institutional racism operating in a strip club, as described by Brooks, affect union organizing and bodily practices? What theories are at work in her discussion? How might the body politics in Clarke and Olesen, Haraway, and Martin and the identity politics in previous readings be put in conversation with the project undertaken by Brooks? How do these various discussions of the body affect your own thinking? Which previous readings are in conversation with these readings?

WEEK 10 **SPRING BREAK**
March 12 No class

WEEK 11

March 19 [64 pgs]

- **Irene Costera Meijer and Baukje Prins**, “How Bodies Come to Matter: An Interview with Judith Butler” [PC] [11 pgs]
- **Evelynn Hammonds**, “Black (W)holes and the Geometry of Black Female Sexuality” [PC] [15 pgs]
- **Anne Balsamo**, “Public Pregnancies and Cultural Narratives of Surveillance,” *Revisioning Women, Health, and Healing: Feminist, Cultural, and Technoscience Perspectives* [18 pgs]
- **Valerie Hartouni**, “A Study in Reproductive Technologies,” *Revisioning Women, Health, and Healing: Feminist, Cultural, and Technoscience Perspectives* [9 pgs]
- **Katie King**, “Producing Sex, Theory, and Culture Gay/Straight ReMappings in Contemporary Feminism (1990)” [ER] [11 pgs]

Reading prompts /guides /suggestions/ questions /inquiries /connections:

What are the material effects of discursive cultural representations according to these authors? How does describing Butler’s theoretical efforts as “performative contradictions” and a “political fiction” work toward explaining her intent? What relationship does Butler see between typologies and the process of abjection? Can you compare that with the notion of categories in Bowker and Star? Why is Butler willing to take on the risks of rhetorical excess? Why are the notions of agency and actor problematic for Butler? How does this affect the political use of her arguments? How does Hammonds support her argument that black lesbians are “doubly silenced”? What becomes newly visible through the use of Hammonds’ notion of complex racialized sexualities? What does theory mean for Hammonds? How might Hammonds use “performative contradictions” and “political fictions” productively? How is thinking about reproductive technologies as formations a political project for Balsamo? How is subjectivity produced by the disciplining of female bodies through technological surveillance, according to Balsamo? How does Hartouni feature both gender and race? Is Hartouni producing “direct theory” as described by Sturgeon? What kind of categorical work is being done by Hartouni? How does the meaning of “technology” differ for Balsamo and Sandoval? How might notions of agency, identity and subjectivity be compared and contrasted between these authors? How do these various discussions of the body affect your own thinking? What does King mean by “Gay/Straight split”? In what ways are King’s “local” issues illustrative of large structural issues in feminist theory? How do King’s concerns inform your thinking about body politics? In what ways can you apply Butler’s notion of abjection to various arguments in Hammonds, Balsamo, Hartouni and King? How might you compare or contrast the historical moments and feminist conversations discussed in King with those of Butler, Hammonds, Balsamo, and Hartouni? How can you put these readings in conversation with previous readings? Can you find examples of various theoretical strategies at work here? What strategies are not represented? Why? How are these conversations illustrative of your expectations of feminist theory?

WEEK 12

March 26 [96 pages]

- **Sally Markowitz**, “Pelvic Politics: Sexual Dimorphism and Racial Difference” in *Signs* 26.2 (Winter 2001) [23 pgs]
- **Patricia Hill Collins**, “Will the ‘Real’ Mother Please Stand Up?: The Logic of Eugenics and American National Family Planning,” *Revisioning Women, Health, and Healing: Feminist, Cultural, and Technoscience Perspectives* [14 pgs]
- **Aida Hurtado**, “On a Reflexive Theory of Gender Subordination” [ER] [37 pgs]
- **Ellen Scott**, “From Race Cognizance to Racism Cognizance: Dilemmas in Antiracist Activism in California” [PC] [22 pgs]

Reading prompts /guides /suggestions/ questions /inquiries /connections:

Consider the explicit and implicit, analytic and personal ways that sexual and racial dynamics play roles in the theoretical apparatus used, constructed, and mobilized by each author. Upon what “stage” is each of these works set? Who are the actors? What is the scale and scope of the political interventions each attempts? How is the intersection of race and sex addressed by each author? How does that compare with your own notion of that intersection? How does the evidence (in these readings) of the epistemological chasms discussed in the debate about Sandra Harding’s *Science Question in Feminism* affect your understanding of the potential political and social uses for these arguments/discussions/theories? How might you apply Scott’s notion of experience or the notions of subjectivity from

Butler or Ferguson to these readings? How might these readings participate in a conversation with Sandoval, Mohanty, [Elsa Barkley] Brown or [Wendy] Brown and what topics would you expect to be included or omitted? Consider the explicit and implicit, analytic and personal ways that your own life practices (academic, social, political, relational, familial) matter in these theories. How do social movements shape these theoretical projects? How are these conversations illustrative of your expectations of feminist theory?

PART III: AUTHORITY/POWER/JURIDICAL SUBJECTS(I strongly recommend reading articles in the order listed.)

WEEK 13

April 2 [70 pages]

- **Luce Irigaray**, “This Sex Which is Not One,” *The Second Wave: A Reader in Feminist Theory* [6 pgs]
- **Sharon Marcus**, “Fighting Bodies, Fighting Words” [PC] [16 pgs]
- **Christine Helliwell**, “It’s Only a Penis: Rape, Feminism, and Difference” [ER] [25 pgs]
- **Ann Cahill**, “Foucault, Rape, and the Construction of the Feminine Body” [ER] [18 pgs]
- **Angela Harris**, “Race and Essentialism in Feminist Legal Theory” [PC] [5 pgs]

Reading prompts /guides /suggestions/ questions /inquiries /connections:

How does Irigaray’s title help to convey her project? In what ways is Irigaray’s argument both essentialist and not essentialist? Where does that lead us politically? What does “the body” mean in each of these readings? How does an understanding of the body as fluid affect the notion of the body as a site for the negotiation of power and resistance? What notions of subjectivity are at work in defining rape as assault? How do the issues of narrative, subjectivity and power interact to affect the definition(s) of rape? How can you apply Scott’s discussion of experience to these readings? How is the intersection of race and sex addressed by each author? How does that compare with your own notion of that intersection? What themes from specific previous readings do you find helpful in your own thinking about these readings; in other words, where can you identify moments of “direct theory,” “strategic essentialism,” “mobile subjectivities,” “multiple subjectivities,” “wounded attachments,” “identity politics,” “technologies” and/or “methodologies of the oppressed,” “processes of abjection,” “counter history,” “situated knowledges,” and other previously discussed strategies, categories, thematizations and typologies? In what ways is this conversation illustrative of your own expectations of feminist theory? What are some practical outcomes from debates such as this? What are your own unmet desires in this discussion?

WEEK 14

April 9 [177 pages]

- **Valerie Lehr**, *Queer Family Values: Debunking the Myth of the Nuclear Family* (Chap1-4 & 6) [147 pgs]
- **Wendy Brown**, “Liberalism’s Family Values” [PC] [30 pgs]

Reading prompts /guides /suggestions/ questions /inquiries /connections:

As you read, consider the previous readings from this course in terms of epistemology, ontology, power, oppression, gender, race, sex, institutional practices, subjectivity, identity, communities of practice, boundary objects, technologies, intellectual infrastructure, categories, and the work and strategy of theorizing. Where in Lehr can you identify moments of “direct theory,” “strategic essentialism,” “mobile subjectivities,” “multiple subjectivities,” “wounded attachments,” “identity politics,” “technologies” and/or “methodologies of the oppressed,” “processes of abjection,” “counter history,” “situated knowledges,” and other previously discussed strategies, categories, thematizations and typologies? What theories are at work in her discussion? In what ways is this conversation illustrative of your own expectations of feminist theory? What are some of Brown’s concerns and how might they be applied to Lehr’s arguments? What are some practical outcomes from debates such as these? What are your own unmet desires in this discussion?

WEEK 15

April 16 [188 pgs]

- **Uma Narayan**, *Dislocating Cultures: Identities, Traditions, and Third World Feminism* [188 pgs]

Reading prompts /guides /suggestions/ questions /inquiries /connections:

Again, as you read, consider the previous readings from this course in terms of epistemology, ontology, power, oppression, gender, race, sex, institutional practices, subjectivity, identity, communities of practice, boundary objects, technologies, intellectual infrastructure, categories, and the work and strategy of theorizing. Where in Narayan can you identify moments of “direct theory,” “strategic essentialism,” “mobile subjectivities,” “multiple subjectivities,” “wounded attachments,” “identity politics,” “technologies” and/or “methodologies of the oppressed,” “processes of abjection,” “counter history,” “situated knowledges,” and other previously discussed strategies, categories, thematizations and typologies? What theories are at work in her discussion? In what ways is this conversation illustrative of your own expectations of feminist theory? What are some practical outcomes from debates such as this? What are your own unmet desires in this discussion? What is Narayan’s account of the relationship between self-presentations of Western feminists and their re-presentation of Third World women and how does it compare with Mohanty’s and Sandoval’s accounts? How might you compare Narayan’s discussion with Elsa Barkley Brown’s discussion?

Note: Reading prompts /guides /suggestions/ questions /inquiries /connections for next week’s (4/23) readings will be distributed at the end of this class.

WEEK 16

April 23

1st half of class [31 pages]

1. **RE-READ: Joan Scott**, “Experience” [ER] [15 pgs]
2. **Shari Stone-Mediatore** “Chandra Mohanty and the Revaluing of ‘Experience’” [ER] [16 pgs]

Reading prompts /guides /suggestions/ questions /inquiries /connections: will be distributed at the end of the previous class (4/16).

2nd half of class

Wrap-up and evaluations

WEEK 17

Final papers due: Monday, April 29 by 5:00 pm at my office, FAO 163