

FRAN 6200 01 | RE-THINKING THE HUMAN

Instructors: Professor Carla Rice with Class Co-Developers: Maggie Addison, Fitsum Areguy, Aly Bailey (UG Post Doc), Heather Craig, Jade Crimson Rose Da Costa (Visiting Graduate Student Plan), Sabrina Douglas, Valérie Grand'Maison, Megan Hutchison, Magdalena Karakehayova, Skylar Sookpaiboon, Anya Swain, Lisa Tang, Angela Underhill (Independent Reading Course/joining the class on occasion), Leslie Veseley, Rachel Schenk Martin

CLASS MEETING COORDINATES

COURSE TIME: Thursdays @ 830AM to 11:30AM, Sept 5 to Nov 28, 2019

COURSE LOCATION: Re•Vision: The Centre for Art and Social Justice | REDLAB | University of Guelph | 70 Trent Lane | Blackwood Hall (Rm 103)

Carla's Office: REDLAB | Revisioning Differences Mobile Media Arts Lab, 103 Blackwood Hall, Trent Lane, College of Social and Applied Human Sciences

OFFICE HOURS: by appointment

COORDINATES: email: carlar@uoguelph.ca | p: 519 824-4120 ext. 54942

CELL: 1 (416) 779-8930

COURSE OVERVIEW

In this course, we identify and engage with emerging directions and critical dialogues in the inter- and trans-disciplinary study of the "human". We collectively determine course topics, pedagogy and assessment methods. This allows us to centre professor/student collaboration in innovative ways that open up space for all to actively engage in teaching and learning. Fusing critical pedagogy, methodology and theory, the course provides a unique opportunity for students to become immersed in important new directions in theory and to gain greater familiarity with emergent and creative methods for understanding, and appreciating, the diversity of human experience. Emphasis will be placed on student research interests and on emergent notions of the human and of human experience as becoming.

COURSE ACCESSIBILITY STATEMENT

We expect that students in this class have many different physical, mental, sensorial and emotional ways of being, learning, and engaging in the classroom. We also expect that as a class, we will collectively attend to and respect all of these needs/interests. As such, we will begin this class with a discussion about accessibility and how we can collectively, and perhaps creatively, make the classroom accessible to everyone. If you do not feel comfortable sharing your accessibility needs in class, please talk to me or visit: Student Accessibility Services at 519-824-4120 ext. 56208 or email accessibility@uoguelph.ca or refer to the Accessibility Services website (<https://wellness.uoguelph.ca/accessibility>). If you want to pursue the question of access and accommodation more fully please consider checking out "Beyond Compliance" <http://bcccsyracuse.wordpress.com/>, which is a radical accessibility statement. As a class, we have agreed on the following:

- Our classroom will be scent-free (please refer to email from Carla Rice regarding alternative products that can be used to ensure a scent-free environment)
- Eating in class is acceptable

- Fostering a culture of “calling in” all class members into discussions. Given that we are coming from different disciplinary perspectives, we will foster this culture in two ways:
 - I. **The garden.** *We will develop a collaborative glossary for the class. This glossary will develop over time through the use of a poster that is brought to each class (referred to as the “garden”). Throughout our meetings, everyone is welcome to contribute terms/ideas to the garden that they would like to ‘grow’ throughout the class. We also encourage all co-designers to reach out to others regarding specific terminology/theories that are raised in discussion but not elaborated due to time.*
 - II. **Assumption of wanting to learn.** *We begin this course with an assumption that everyone is here with the intention to learn with and from one another, and we shall proceed with gentle questioning and respectful discussion where we diverge and where we inadvertently hurt each other. Students commit to engaging in open and respectful discussion with peers about sometimes difficult readings that may be interpreted differently based on each class member’s social location and areas of interest. For students and instructor, part of this engagement will involve avoiding monopolizing conversations and being sure to engage in active listening rather than always talking.*

COURSE THEMES AND TOPICS

This is an open topics course. Based on the interests of those who came to our organizing meetings, held on May 21, June 26, and July 25, 2019 we decided on course themes and readings, established course learning goals and objectives, and developed assignments and processes for assessment. Our areas for theoretical and methodological exploration are as follows:

- ❖ Critical Pedagogy and Theory
- ❖ Decolonization, Kinship and Intimate Relations
- ❖ Critical Childhood Studies
- ❖ Gender, Sex and Sexuality Theory
- ❖ Theories of the Body, Embodiment, Identity and Subjectivity
- ❖ Intersectional Approaches in Theorizing and Research
- ❖ Corporeal, New Materialist and Becoming Theories of the Human
- ❖ Feminist Post-humanism
- ❖ Theorizing Time, Memory and Futurity
- ❖ Emergent and Creative Approaches to Research

This course will start in September 2019, running for 13 weeks. We will meet once on Thursday from 8:30 pm to 11:30 am and then decide our final meeting time to accommodate as many schedules as possible. Masters and doctoral students and post-doctoral “fellows” from across and beyond the University of Guelph are eligible and welcome. Now that the course has been designed with the students who are already enrolled, enrolment is closed. To register for the class, everyone must fill out a permission to enroll form that I sign.

COURSE LEARNING OBJECTIVES

This course has nine collectively-determined objectives:

1. Establish a critical and an applied or practical appreciation of contemporary feminist-informed gender, sex, and sexuality theory; critical race and Indigenous pedagogies; intersectionality, identity and

- difference; critical theories of de-colonization, embodiment, subjectivity, the life-course (childhood, aging), time, and futurity; and post-structuralist, new materialist, affect and post-humanist theory;
2. Critically engage with texts and theories introduced by collectively reflecting on materials and discussions in class; interact with and listen to others as sites of knowledge, as having insightful interpretations and understandings of theory based upon different lived experiences.
 3. Practice active listening, using inclusive language and framing, and calling out and in; find meaning in contributions that are made and build on these contributions in a positive, supporting manner—this could mean acknowledging oppressive language that enters our space and addressing it.
 4. Approach and critically engage with theory through an inter- and intra-disciplinary lens by teaching and learning with individuals who bring rich and diverse academic backgrounds, who may be situated inside or outside of one's own specific discipline.
 5. Begin the process of unearthing structurally- and culturally-imbued embodied understandings of the world embedded in white, settler-colonial, and westernized knowledge systems. Deconstruct taken-for-granted assumptions carried and delineate ways of reconstructing critical understandings of the world that are less eurocentric, ethnocentric and anthropocentric.
 6. Employ creative, artistic, and emotive/embodied avenues for learning about and processing critical theory beyond those sanctioned by the social sciences or sciences. Explore how artistic and embodied approaches (movement, physical body and visceral/emotional reactions) can serve as alternative avenues to critically engage with/understand the world; Take risks' and experiment with theory and the presentation of theory through artistic creation and reflection on one's creations; For those interested in digital technologies and creative approaches, engage in a 'hands on' examination of course and other texts, and through an interactive mode (blogging, digital storytelling, digital fiction, video making, on-line story making/gaming) to understand how digital tools can reveal new meanings.
 7. Develop and enhance facilitation and communication skills by discussing theoretical knowledge in an accessible, comprehensive way, and by offering both verbal and written feedback to peers who explore their own theoretical knowledge.
 8. Integrate theory-work introduced in the course and identify how this theory might help to fill gaps in prior theorizing around gender, sex and sexuality development, subjectivity, identity and difference, decolonization, embodiment/materialization, affect/emotion, and beyond the humanist human/ the posthuman.
 9. Develop proficiency in collaborative student-led inquiry, including cooperative curriculum development and course delivery, and collective determination of types of assignments and assessments; Experience the process and benefits of engaging in positive and collaborative learning environments, and how individuals can come together to build new and unique understandings of the world.

PRINCIPLES OF ENGAGEMENT

How might we enact a classroom space where, as Mia Mingus writes, people are “able to stay in our bodies as much as possible, take care of our disabled [and non-disabled] selves, and be part of the community that [is] coming together”? How can we together create a space where, as Margaret Price often describes it, people are invited to “do what you need [...] to take care of yourself. You may need to take up a different position, engage in some manual activity—knitters, feel free to take out your work—or you may simply need to leave.” How can we create a space where we can acknowledge, as Katherine McKittrick argues, the ways in which spaces themselves carry histories of trauma including academic spaces, which “engendered by and through violent exclusion,” “are, already, sites of pain” (Hudson 238)? And finally, paraphrasing Andrea Smith, how do we create a critical intellectual space that recognizes “that intellectual work is not disembodied and without material effects? How do we collectively reduce harm in [this] intellectual and

political space?” **What needs to be present, at the individual, collective and interpersonal levels that will enable people to trust enough to show up with their full selves?**

We understand that “respect” is a fundamental requirement for teaching and learning. We have developed eleven collectively-determined principles to guide us in enacting respectful and reciprocal relations in this class. These entail mutual commitment to:

1. Create and sustain an open learning space. This means people have permission to “not know” and an open invitation to ask for additional explanation/unpacking of concepts and theories without feeling they are being “tested” or judged, and without having to know the “right” answer in advance. It also means that we strive to maximize learning, and personal and intellectual growth by inviting each other into discussion but also allowing space for silent reflection. We foster an environment where learners are free to interject when requiring further clarification and where they are encouraged to ask questions and share insights. We respect and integrate different learning styles, which can include sharing in smaller groups, partner work, quiet work alone for reflection, and working together as a big group, understanding that variety help to maximize learning. In summary, we commit to caring for others and for the space.

2. Lead and learn from and across our differences. Since we have different disciplinary backgrounds social and political positionalities and learning styles and needs, we strive to speak in accessible language, refrain from making assumptions about what others know/don’t know (intellectually or politically), and to slow down/stop if something requires additional explanation of issues, concepts and theories raised. We use verbal and physical cues to signify when we require further clarification. Learners might use hand gestures (waving, putting up their hand, making eye contact) to alert speakers that they would like to ask a question or make a comment; and speakers and instructors check in with learners to see if they are accessibly capturing the content (ie Is everyone comfortable with the concepts/language/theory being discussed? Does anyone need further clarification?). We agree to provide an accessible point of entry into the conversation through creating a glossary terms or definitions at the beginning of the seminar (or woven throughout our presentations) or a running dictionary as our lesson plan unfolds to ensure that lectures and teaching tools (i.e. slides) are accessible to all levels of learning. Students agree that use of so-called “expletives” is generally acceptable except in the case of words that cause insult or injury to marginalized / justice-seeking groups and/or people’s religious beliefs.

3. Lead and learn with curiosity, compassion and challenge. Whether it is because someone is struggling emotionally or academically with a concept or because people are disagreeing, we bring compassion and an ethic of, to use Jennifer Nash’s words, vulnerability and radical relationality into our interactions. We enact an umbrella of non-judgment in the class and at the same time, we open space for difference by inviting compassionate challenge and by challenging ourselves to be receptive to compassionate challenges. When engaging in critical discussion, we understand that critical analysis of one’s ideas is not critical analysis of one’s self or worth. In doing so, we foster an environment that quells defensiveness when digging into difficult learning. During difficult discussions, we agree to take care of our own fragility. We make an effort to listen actively and empathetically, read body language, and show emotional intelligence. In particular we make sure that good relationships are a priority. This means making a commitment to discussing matters constructively, to making relational and emotional repair over time, and aspiring to making relationships anchored in mutual health and well-being.

4. Learn from designated instructors while taking responsibility for our own learning. We understand that leaders may guide the group towards better understanding of theory; however, they are not expected

to be the ultimate knowers and arbiters of knowledge. In the process of being a leader, one is also a learner and is not expected to have all the knowledge or answers. For their part, learners also actively engage in the process of learning through active listening. To foster inclusive spaces, we welcome learners' requests for pause to process content.

5. Enact reciprocal teaching/learning relationships. We understand that the teaching/learning relationship is necessarily iterative, interactive and engaging. It is not top-down, but rather reciprocal. All must work together to foster open learning spaces. We also understand that mutual accountability is central as we move through difficult and potentially uncomfortable subject matter. Cognizant of the difficult and sensitive nature of material discussed, we orient to how such material might affect individuals who are members of the group under discussion. We recognise that a person is not wholly summed up by an idea expressed or by a singular aspect of their identity.

6. Create space for sharing ideas and affects through various mediums. We strive to convey ideas through speech, film, sound, poetry, music, visual images and other media. We also create space for expressing a full range of emotions in class. We agree to practice "checking in" and "checking out" to provide all an opportunity to briefly explain our dispositions both pre- and post-seminar. This process gives insight into how we all are coming into the space and leaving it. Direct responses or symbolism may be relied upon to do this.

7. Break group think through learning to listen across difference. We invite learners to express experiences and knowledges that may differ from those held by the instructor or by others in the group. We have permission to interrogate, with compassion and vulnerability, ideologies/perspectives that are often omitted from institutional discourse/values. At the same time, we enact social justice values in our class as an ongoing, iterative process. Part of the process of hearing across difference and disagreement is to "listen first, talk second." We listen to what the other person is saying before defending our own position. We try to understand another's point of view in order to better grasp of why they have adopted their position. They might say something that changes our mind. We understand listening to be a skill, one that must be practised and though undervalued in western spaces, one is highly valued for learning from (rather than about) others and the world. To that end, we agree to not interrupt when someone else is speaking.

8. Give and receive peer feedback. If asked, we give written feedback (both positive and constructive) to others about the substance of their work including feedback on their teaching, and on their final assignments. We can ask for feedback from more than one peer and we can ask others to provide written feedback and evaluation of our assignments through the rubrics we provide. We agree to provide that feedback within two weeks of being asked to do so.

9. Foster trusting spaces. "Take the learning but leave the stories" means that we show sensitivity to the experiences, stories and voices expressed. We learn from and with what is shared, and honour people's privacy by agreeing not to share personal or intimate details of stories outside of the learning space. We invite and encourage each other to share our learning widely.

10. Separate people from problems/positions. Recognize that, in many cases, real and valid differences can lie behind conflicting positions. By separating the problem/position from the person, we discuss issues without damaging relationships. While the goal is to build relationships and to care for each other, we also acknowledge that the majority of students in the class are white, non-disabled, heterosexual (is that true?), normatively sized, settler, and cis-gendered on a campus that reflects these normative demographics in a

society steeped in white supremacy, and structured by settler colonialism, ableism, sanism and patriarchal values. To expand possibilities for making our class transformative, we have agreed that our rules of engagement explicitly name, reflect on and work to transform such power relations. Pragmatically, the commitment to caring and respectful interactions should not preclude a range of emotional responses that racialized, disabled, fat, queer, gender fluid, female-identifying, trans and otherwise minoritized students may have to the course content, or to the responses of other more normatively positioned students. We encourage each other to speak honestly without fear of being framed by egregious stereotypes such as the "the angry Black man".

11. Recognize and accept that not everyone can be fully present at all times. We agree to check-in with ourselves prior to, during and after class about our own emotional temperature. We also commit to working through challenges--whether from other learners/ instructors and/or from the readings and other material. We agree to trust that the challenges raised come from good intent. **We also commit to reflecting on our guiding principles, and revisiting them throughout the term. Some of these principles adapted from guidelines for constructive conflict resolution.** Retrieved from https://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/newLDR_81.htm

We are creating these guidelines preemptively to work towards building a space together that fosters all of our learning. As we move through the course, we may find that some guidelines need to be revisited, revised, or added. We commit to learning from those experiences that spark discussions about how to engage with one another in new ways.

EXPLANATION OF COURSE ASSIGNMENTS AND ASSESSMENT

- 30% Self-Evaluation, Scrapbook OR Written Reflection Format (Due week 6).
- 20% Classroom Teaching (Due as part of final portfolio).
- 50% Portfolio (Due 1 week following our last class together).

30% Self-Evaluation – Written Reflection or Scrapbook Format

30% of the student's grade will be determined through one self-assessment completed at the midpoint of the course (Week 6). Each student will be required to assess their own level of engagement in the course through a written reflection (2-4 pages single or 3 to 8 pages double spaced) or a scrapbook format (weekly record of responses to class readings, presentations, and discussions that can include learners' writing, resonant images collected, tweets, and Instagram and Facebook posts, references to other readings and classes, etc.). The Self Evaluation should also address how they met the course objectives, their own personal goals for the course and their justification for their self-assigned mark.

20% Classroom Teaching

Over the course of the semester, students and instructor will engage in a deep reading of major theoretical texts introduced in the course. Class members will take turns selecting/ assigning readings, and teaching course content; and the person(s) assigned to the week will develop a presentation of the key ideas introduced in the assigned text(s), their interpretation of the text(s), and its applicability to their main area of interest.

Prior to the presentation, the presenter will be required to develop a lesson plan that will be included in their final portfolio assignment. This lesson plan should outline the plan for the presentation, along with the key ideas discussed, their interpretation of these ideas, and ideas and questions that they have regarding the texts. Instructor/presenters will generate and circulate guiding / provoking questions at least two days prior to the presentation to allow peers to reflect on them prior to class time.

Following the presentation, presenters may solicit comments about their presentation by asking the whole class, specific learners in the class (including the course director), and/or their co-presenter to identify i) what they, in their role as scholar/instructor, did well; and ii) what skills and knowledges they might want to develop further. The presenter may choose to ask any or all of the above to provide written feedback on the presentation in response to the above two points or in response to a set of evaluative questions (or a scale) that the presenter themselves generates. This evaluation is intended to support the growth of the presenter, and it can be included in the final portfolio.

50% Portfolio

The portfolio assignment is intended to be the cumulative assignment. Throughout the semester, students will complete and document a collection of activities (course prep, written reflection, scrapbook) that reflect their engagement in the class. They will assemble these into a portfolio including the following: documentation of the power-points, interactive activities, and talking points that they developed for their presentation; peer/course director/self/co-presenter evaluations of their presentation; *and* a final conventional academic or creative assignment that they develop. **This final assignment—whether creative or conventional—must demonstrate that they have engaged with some of the key theories introduced in the class and how they are thinking through these theories in relation to their area(s) of interest/research. Students may also wish to incorporate into their final assignment insights provoked by other course readings and discussions.**

The design of the final assignment is completely up to the student. Students who decide to do a creative assignment may choose to post commentary and insights about theory and its relationship to their research/praxis/areas of interest in an interactive mode online—such as in a website or a blog with photographic or video content. Alternatively, those interested in digital storytelling, digital fiction, or video-making might opt to develop a digital story/fiction/short film that animates and explicates some of the theory examined in the class and how it might relate to their own work. Those who decide to do a more standard assignment might opt to complete a trial draft of a mock thesis proposal or mock qualifying exam proposal that incorporates theory introduced in the class as it relates to their area of research/interest. Others might opt to conduct an annotated literature review/bibliography on their research areas. Still others may decide to prepare a manuscript for publication in an academic journal. Students may decide to create a hybrid final assignment that combines traditional academic work with more abstract/artistic work. Students are invited and encouraged to propose other creative and more standard final assignments.

THE UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH ACCESSIBILITY STATEMENT

The University of Guelph is committed to creating a barrier-free environment. Providing services for students is a shared responsibility among students, faculty and administrators. This relationship is based on respect of individual rights, the dignity of the individual and the University community's shared commitment to an open and supportive learning environment. Students requiring service or accommodation, whether due to an identified, ongoing disability or a short-term disability should contact the

Centre for Students with Disabilities (soon to be re-named Student Accessibility Services) as soon as possible. For more information, contact CSD at 519-824-4120 ext. 56208 or email csd@uoguelph.ca or refer to the [CSD website](#). The standard statements are available on the [AVPA website](#) (undergraduate courses) or from the Office of Graduate Studies (Graduate Courses).

TIMELY FEEDBACK ON WORK

Feedback to students on work completed or in progress is an integral part of teaching and learning in that it allows you to measure your understanding of material and your progress on learning objectives. All University of Guelph instructors must provide meaningful and constructive feedback to students prior to the 40th class day.

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

It is the responsibility of all members of the University community – faculty, staff, and students – to be aware of what constitutes academic misconduct and to do as much as possible to prevent academic offences from occurring. University of Guelph students have the responsibility of abiding by the University's policy on academic misconduct; faculty, staff and students have the responsibility of supporting an environment that discourages misconduct. Students need to remain aware that instructors have access to and the right to use electronic and other means of detection. Please note: Whether or not a student intended to commit academic misconduct is not relevant for a finding of guilt. Students who are in any doubt as to whether an action on their part could be construed as an academic offence should consult with a faculty member or faculty advisor. The Academic Misconduct Policy is detailed in the Graduate Calendar: http://www.uoguelph.ca/registrar/calendars/graduate/current/genreg/sec_d0e1609.shtml

Reading List – WHOLE LIST FOR DISCUSSION

September 5 to November 28, 2019

Introduction

WEEK 1 • SEPTEMBER 5, 2019

Terms of Engagement: Critical, Decolonizing and Feminist Pedagogies • All to Lead

Required:

Jade to Lead: Arvin, M., Tuck, E., & Morrill, A. (2013). Decolonizing feminism: Challenging connections between settler colonialism and heteropatriarchy. *Feminist Formations*, 25(1), 8-34.

Watts, V. (2013). Indigenous place-Thought and agency amongst humans and non humans (First Woman and Sky Woman go on a European world tour!). *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 2(1), 20-34.

Heather to Lead: Arao, B., & Clemens, K. (2013). From safe spaces to brave spaces. In *The art of effective facilitation: Reflections from social justice educators*, (135-150). Stylus Publications.

Valérie to choose one and lead:

Castrodale, M. A. (2017). Critical disability studies and mad studies: Enabling new pedagogies in practice. *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, 29(1), 49-66.

Kafer, A. (2016). Un/safe disclosures: Scenes of disability and trauma. *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies*, 10(1), 1-20.

Fitsum to Lead: Britzman, D. P. (1998). "That lonely discovery": Anne Frank, Anna Freud and the question of pedagogy. In *Lost subjects, contested objects: Toward a psychoanalytic inquiry of learning*. (pp. 113-135). Suny Press.

Calla or Aly to Lead: McPhail, D. Brady, J. & Gingras, J. (2017) Exposed social flesh: Toward an embodied fat pedagogy, *Fat Studies*, 6:1, 17-37, DOI: 10.1080/21604851.2016.1142813

WEEK 2 • SEPTEMBER 12, 2019

The Intersectional Imagination • Carla Rice to Lead

Required:

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 139-167.

McCall, L. (2005). The complexity of intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 30(3), 1771-1800.

Puar, J. K. (2012). "I would rather be a cyborg than a goddess": Becoming-Intersectional in assemblage theory. *PhiloSOPHIA*, 2(1), 49-66.

Decolonizing Intersectionality: Alfred, T. (2017). It's all about the land. In McFarlane, P., & Schabus, N. (2017). *Whose land is it anyway? A manual for decolonization*. Federation of Post-Secondary Educators of BC.

A chapter from: Nash, J. C. (2018). *Black feminism reimagined: After intersectionality*. Duke University Press. I suggest: Love in the time of death.

Kimberlé Crenshaw - The urgency of intersectionality: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=akOe5-UsQ2o>

Kimberlé Crenshaw - On Intersectionality - keynote - WOW 2016:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-DW4HLgYPIA>

Kimberlé Crenshaw - <http://www.chronicle.com/article/The-Intersectionality-Wars/240095?key=2LXo1L2mwMRA4ctYVJ7Z8RU7OeqPve8tYncIU5JLak0xfUcr98FsqlgzcuIQ-z9OWXuNI9gejJ0VnQxY1F1Q245NWhHTi10bmd3bldmZF9scGJBMkk2d2NGVQ>

Section 1: Gender, Power, Difference: An Overview

WEEK 3 • SEPTEMBER 19, 2019

Decolonizing and Queering Sex, Gender and Sexuality Studies • Skylar Sookpaiboon to Lead Required

Ahmed, S. (2006). Chapter 2: Sexual orientation. *Queer phenomenology: Orientations, objects, others*. Duke University Press, 65-107.

Halberstam, J. (1994). F2M: The making of female masculinity. Laura Doan, (Eds.) *The Lesbian Postmodern*. New York: Columbia University Press, 210-228.

Haraway, D. J. (1991). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge, 183-202.

Hunt, S., & Holmes, C. (2015). Everyday decolonization: Living a decolonizing queer politics. *Journal of Lesbian Studies*, 19(2), 154-172.

Recommended

Hunt, S. (2015). Embodying self-determination: Beyond the gender binary. Greenwood, Margo, Sarah De Leeuw, and Charlotte Reading, (Eds.) *Determinants of Indigenous Peoples' Health in Canada: Beyond the Social*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press, 104-109.

Morgensen, S. L. (2016). Conditions of critique responding to indigenous resurgence within gender studies. *TSQ: Transgender Studies Quarterly*, 3(1-2), 192-201.

WEEK 4 • SEPTEMBER 26, 2019

The Linguistic Construction of Sex and Gender • Maggie Addison to Lead

Required

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York and London: Routledge.

Preface to the 1999 Edition, Preface to the 1990 Edition + Chapter 1: Subjects of Sex/Gender/Desire, 1-9

Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of "sex."* New York and London: Routledge. Preface, pp. ix-xiv; Introduction, 1-23.

Chen, M. Y. (2012). Language and mattering humans. In *Animacies: biopolitics, racial mattering, and queer affect* (pp. 23–55). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Sutherland, O., Lamarre, A., Rice, C., Hardt, L., Le Couteur, A. (2017). New sexism in couple therapy: A discursive analysis. *Family Process*, 56(3), pp. 686–700.

Recommended:

Judith Butler - Philosophin der Gender: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PIcmB---sT4>

Examined Life - Judith Butler & Sunaura Taylor: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k0HZaPkF6qE>

WEEK 5 • OCTOBER 3, 2019

Deconstructing, Decolonizing, and Materializing Masculinities and Femininities • Heather Craig to Lead Masculinities and Rachel Schenk Martin to Lead Femininities

Required - Masculinities

Connell, R. W., & Messerschmidt, J. W. (2005). Hegemonic masculinity: Rethinking the concept. *Gender & Society*, 19(6), 829-859.

Two of the following

Halberstam, J. (2004). Female masculinity. In J. Rivkin & M. Ryan (Eds.), *Literary Theory: An Anthology* (2nd ed., pp. 935–956). Maiden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

McKegney, S., Van Camp, R., Cariou, W., Scofield, G., and Justice, D. H., (2015). In Innes, R. A., & Anderson, K. (2015). *Indigenous Men and Masculinities: Legacies, Identities, Regeneration*. (pp 243-265). Winnipeg, MAN: University of Manitoba Press.

Sedgwick, E. K. (1996). Gosh Boy George, You must be awfully secure in your masculinity! In *Constructing Masculinity* (pp. 11-20). London: Routledge.

Required-Femininities

Blair, K. L., & Hoskin, R. A. (2015). Experiences of femme identity: Coming out, invisibility and femmephobia. *Psychology & Sexuality*, 6(3), 229-244.

Hoskin, R. A. (2017). Femme theory: Refocusing the intersectional lens. *Atlantis: Critical Studies in Gender, Culture & Social Justice*, 38(1), 95-109.

Riley, S., Evans, A., Elliott, S., Rice, C., & Marecek, J. (2017). A critical review of postfeminist sensibility. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 11(12), e12367.

Recommended

Coyote, I., Spoon, R. (2015, March 16). Danger Danger Danger: An Excerpt from Gender Failure.

Performed for The Writers Festival. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DwrPlkcBS8c>

Hokowhitu, B., (2015). Taxonomies of masculinity: Indigenous heterosexual patriarchal masculinity.

In Innes, R. A., & Anderson, K. (2015). *Indigenous Men and Masculinities: Legacies, Identities, Regeneration*. (pp 80-95). Winnipeg, MAN: University of Manitoba Press.

Atkinson, M. (2011). *Deconstructing men & masculinities*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

Introduction: Masculinity in Crisis?

Coyote, I. E., & Spoon, R. (2014). *Gender failure*. Arsenal Pulp Press.

Reeser, T. W. (2009). *Masculinities in theory: An introduction*. John Wiley & Sons.

Introduction, 1-16; Chapter 1: Theorizing Masculinity, 17-54

Field, N. (2017). *Farewell Manly Strength: Masculinity and the Politics of Emotion*. A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts Department of Social Justice Education University of Toronto. Retrieved from <https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/handle/1807/79223> (pp. 20-37)

WEEK 6 • OCTOBER 10, 2019

Critical Disability Studies: Grappling with Cure, Care and Precarity • Valérie Grand'Maison to Lead Required

Kafer, A. (2013). *Feminist, crip, queer*. Indianapolis: Indiana UP. "Introduction: Imagined Futures" pp. 1-24.

Clare, E. (2017). *Brilliant imperfection: Grappling with cure*. Duke University Press. "Chapter 1: Ideology of Cure" and "Chapter 2: Violence of Cure" pp. 1-33

Puar, J. K. (2017). *The Right to Maim: Debility, Capacity, Disability*. Durham and London: Duke University Press. "Introduction: The Cost of Getting Better" pp. 1-32.

Piepzna-Samarasinha, L. L. (2018). *Care work: Dreaming disability justice*. Arsenal Pulp Press.

"Care Webs: Experiments in Creating Collective Access" pp.32-68, and "Crippling the Apocalypse: Some of My Wild Disability Justice Dreams" pp.122-135.

Loutzenheiser, L. W., & Erevelles, N. (2019). 'What's Disability Got To Do With It?': Crippin' Educational Studies at the Intersections. *Educational Studies*, 1-12.

Goodley, D., Lawthom, R., Liddiard, K., & Runswick-Cole, K. (2019). Provocations for critical disability studies. *Disability & Society*, 34(6), 972-997.

Supplemental readings

Connell, Raewyn. (2011). "Southern bodies and disability: Re-thinking concepts." *Third World Quarterly* 32 (8): 1369–81.

Erevelles, N. (2011). "Introduction: Bodies that do not matter" pp.1-24 in *Disability and difference in global contexts: Enabling a transformative body politic*. Springer.

Annamma, S., Ferri, B. A., & Connor, D. J. (2018). 21 Cultivating and expanding disability critical race theory (DisCrit). *Manifestos for the Future of Critical Disability Studies*, 1.

Erevelles, N. (2018). Toward Justice as Ontology: Disability and the Question of (In) Difference. In Tuck and Yang, (Eds.). *Toward What Justice?* (pp. 77-110). Routledge

Clare, E. (2015). *Exile and pride: Disability, queerness, and liberation*. Duke University Press.

WEEK 7 • OCTOBER 17, 2019

Childhood Studies and Social Justice Parenting • Anya Swain and Sabrina Douglas to Lead Required

Prout, A., & James, A. (2015). A new paradigm for the sociology of childhood? Provenance, promise and problems. In A. James & A. Prout (Eds.) *Constructing and reconstructing childhood: Contemporary issues in the sociological study of childhood* (Classic ed., pp. 6-28). New York, USA: Routledge.

Boyd, S. B. (2010). Autonomy for Mothers? Relational theory and parenting apart. *Feminist Legal Studies*, 18(2), 137–158.

Depouw, C., & Matias, C. (2016). Critical race parenting: Understanding scholarship/activism in parenting our children. *Educational Studies*, 52(3), 237–259.

Mainland, M., Shaw, S., & Prier, A. (2015). Fearing fat. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 47(2), 202–219.

Adamsons, K. (2010). Using identity theory to develop a midrange model of parental gatekeeping and parenting behavior. *Journal of Family Theory & Review*, 2(2), 137–148.

Recommended:

Kitzinger, J. (2015). Who are you kidding? Children, power, and the struggle against sexual abuse. In A. James, & A. Prout (Eds.), *Constructing and reconstructing childhood: Contemporary issues in the sociological study of childhood* (Classic ed., pp. 145-166). New York, USA: Routledge.

Spyrou, S. (2017). Time to decenter childhood? *Childhood*, 24(4), 433-437.

Burman, E. (2017). Chapter 1 - Origins: How animals, humans, colonial and gender dynamics structure the study of childhood. In E. Burman, *Deconstructing developmental psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 14-29). London, UK: Routledge.

Luttrell, W. (2010). 'A camera is a big responsibility': A lens for analysing children's visual voices. *Visual Studies*, 25(3), 224-237.

Dyer, H. (2017). Queer futurity and childhood innocence: Beyond the injury of development. *Global Studies of Childhood*, 7(3) 290–302.

Robinson, K. H. (2008). In the name of "childhood innocence": A discursive exploration of the moral panic associated with childhood and sexuality. *Cultural Studies Review*, 14(2), 113-129.

Section II: Bodies, Biopedagogies, and Becomings

WEEK 8 • OCTOBER 24, 2019

Politicized Bodies and Political Economies • Shehnoor Khurram to Lead
Politicized Bodies and Political Economies

FRAN6200 Rethinking the Human
Week 8 – October 24, 2019
Shehnoor Khurram

Required

Part I: Global Capitalism and Neoliberal Globalization

Barkawi, T., & Laffey, M. (2006). The postcolonial moment in security studies. *Review of International Studies*, 32(2), 329-352.

Brown, W. (2005). *Neoliberalism and the End of Democracy*. Theory and Event, 7.

Orelus, P. W., & Chomsky, N. (2014). Neoliberalism: The rich over the poor: Noam Chomsky and Pierre Orelus in dialogue. *Counterpoints*, 458, 65-76.

Part II: Effects of Neoliberalism

Day, M. (2018, January 22). Under Neoliberalism, you can be your own tyrannical boss. Retrieved from <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2018/01/under-neoliberalism-you-can-be-your-own-tyrannical-boss>

Harvey, D., & Risager, B. S. (2016, July). Neoliberalism is a political project. Retrieved from <https://www.jacobinmag.com/2016/07/david-harvey-neoliberalism-capitalism-labor-crisis-resistance/>

Lukacs, M. (2017, July 17). Neoliberalism has conned us into fighting climate change as individuals | Martin Lukacs. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/environment/true-north/2017/jul/17/neoliberalism-has-conned-us-into-fighting-climate-change-as-individuals?CMP=share_btn_fb&fbclid=IwAR0isVaHJXz_kM8hl8SsBnX_QwCBXke43LytAQzvg3kCTxQ1-Li-HvclHU

Petras, J. (1997). Imperialism and NGOs in Latin America. *Monthly review*, 49(7), 10.

Recommended

Young, B. (2002). Globalization and gender: A European perspective. In *Gender and Work in Transition* (pp. 49-82). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden.

Agathangelou, A. M., & Ling, L. H. (2004). Power, borders, security, wealth: Lessons of violence and desire from September 11. *International Studies Quarterly*, 48(3), 517-538.

Bakker, I. (2003). Neoliberal governance and the reprivatisation of social reproduction. In I. Bakker and S. Gill (eds.) *Power, Production and Social Reproduction*.

Ball, S. J., & Olmedo, A. (2013). Care of the self, resistance and subjectivity under neoliberal governmentalities. *Critical Studies in Education*, 54(1), 85-96.

WEEK 9 • October 31, 2019

Biopedagogies and Body Shame • Lisa Tang and Magdalena Karakehayova to Lead

Required

Wright J. (2009). Biopower, Biopedagogies and the obesity epidemic. In J. Wright & V. Harwood (Eds.), *Biopolitics and the 'Obesity Epidemic': Governing Bodies* (pp. 1-14). Routledge.

Wright, J., & Halse, C. (2014). The healthy child citizen: Biopedagogies and web-based health promotion. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 35(6), 837-855.

Wiklund et al. (2019). "'Strong is the new skinny': Navigating fitness hype among teenagers in northern Sweden". *Sport, Education and Society*, 24(5), 441-454

On shame:

Probyn, E. (2004). Everyday shame. *Cultural Studies*, 18(2-3), 328-349.

Dolezal, L. (2015). The phenomenology of shame in the clinical encounter. *Medicine, Health Care and Philosophy*, 18(4), 567-576.

Friedman, May. (2015) Mother blame, fat shame, and moral panic: "Obesity" and child welfare, *Fat Studies*, 4 (1), 14-27

WEEK 10 • NOVEMBER 7, 2019

The Politics of Contested Bodies • Aly Bailey and Calla Evans to Lead

Required Readings?

Cooper, C. (2016). Undoing. In *Fat Activism* (pp. 11-50). Bristol: HammerOn Press.

Cooper, C. (2016). Queering. In *Fat Activism* (pp. 191-218). Bristol: HammerOn Press.

Cottom, T. M. (2019). In the Name of Beauty. In *Thick* (pp. 33-72). New York City, NY: The New Press.

Mollow, A. (2014). Disability Studies Gets Fat. *Hypatia*, 30(1), 199-216

Owen, L. (2012). Living fat in a thin-centric world: Effects of spatial discrimination on fat bodies and selves. *Feminism & Psychology*, 22(3), 290-306.

Strings, S. (2019). *Fearing the black body: The racial origins of fat phobia*. New York, NY: New York University Press. Selected sections: "Being Venus"; "The Rise of the Big Black Woman"; "Good Health to Uplift the Race"; "Fat, Revisted"

WEEK 11 • NOVEMBER 14, 2019

After Humanism PART I • Jade De Costa to Lead and PART II • Leslie Veseley to Lead

PART 1: Black/Postcolonial/Queer Theories of the Human • Jade Da Costa to Lead: 73 - 77 pages

Oyewumi, O. (1998). De-Confounding gender: Feminist theorizing and Western culture, a comment on Hawkesworth's "Confounding Gender." *Signs*, 23(4), 1049-1062. 13 pages

Lorde, A. (2003). The master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. In Reina Lewis and Sara Mills, (Eds.), *Feminist postcolonial theory: A reader* (pp. 25-27). New York: Routledge. 3 pps

Weheliye, A. G. (2014). Blackness: The human in *Habeas Viscus: Racializing assemblages, biopolitics, and black feminist theories of the human* (pp. 17-32). Durham and London: Duke University Press. 16 pp.

TallBear, K. (2017). Beyond the life/not life binary: A feminist-Indigenous reading of cryopreservation, interspecies thinking, and the new materialisms. In Radin, Joanna, and Emma Kowal (Eds.), *Cryopolitics: Frozen life in a melting world*, (pp. 179-203). Boston: MIT Press. 24 pages

One of the following:

Ali, N. (2018). Emancipation in an Islamophobic age: Finding agency in nonrecognition, refusal, and self-recognition. *Journal of Critical Race Inquiry*, 5(1):1-26. 21 pages

Atluri, T. (2018). Black picket signs/white picket fences: Racism, space, and solidarity. In Haritaworn, J., Moussa, G., and Ware, S.M with Rodriguez, R (Eds.) *Queering urban justice: Queer of colour formations in Toronto* (pp. 148-168). Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 17 pages

Recommended: 82 pages

Mohanty, C. T. (1988). Under Western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. *Feminist Review*, 30. 61-88.

TallBear, K. (2013). Genomic articulations of indigeneity. *Social Studies of Science*, 43(4), 509-533.

Reardon, J., & TallBear, K. (2012). "Your DNA is our history": Genomics, anthropology, and the construction of whiteness as property. *Current Anthropology*, 53(S5), S233-S245.

Mignolo W.D. (2015). Sylvia Wynter: What does it mean to be human? In Katherine McKittrick (ed). *Sylvia Wynter: On Being Human as Praxis* (pp. 183 - 202). Durham and London: Duke University Press.

Roy, D., & Subramaniam, B. (2016). Matter in the shadows. Pitts-Taylor, V. (Eds). *Mattering: Feminism, science, and materialism*, (pp. 23-65). New York: NYU Press.

After Humanism PART II: Affect Theory and Lived Experience • Leslie Veseley to Lead Required

Robinson, M. (2008). Within/without: Awareness and the practice of seeing. *Journal of Visual Culture* 7(3), 293-308. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1470412908096338>

Ahmed, S. (2014). *The cultural politics of emotion*. 2nd Ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Introduction: Feel your Way, 5-12; Chapter 3: The Affective Politics of Fear, 62-71

Escher, S, & Romme, M. (2011). The Hearing Voices Movement. *Hallucinations* 385-393. https://doi-org.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/10.1007/978-1-4614-0959-5_28

NBC News. (2018). Hearing voices others can't: How a growing movement fights mental health stigma. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yYdjojdOUw>

Recommended:

Ahmed, S. (2010). Happy objects. In Gregg, M. & Seigworth, G.J. (Eds.). *The Affect Theory Reader* (pp.29-51). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Classan, C. (1997). Foundations for an anthropology of the senses. *International Social Science Journal*, 401-412.

Sacks, O. (2003). The mind's eye. *New Yorker* 28, 48-59.

Seigworth, G. J., and Gregg, M. (2010). An inventory of shimmers. In Gregg, M. & Seigworth G.J. (Eds.). *The Affect Reader* (pp. 1-25). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Section III: The PostHuman Condition

WEEK 12 • NOVEMBER 21, 2019

What is the Posthuman? • Angela Underhill to Lead

Braidotti, R. (2013). *The Posthuman*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Introduction; Chapter 1: Post-Humanism: Life Beyond the Self

Plus 1 of the 3:

Haraway D. (1991). A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century in *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (pp. 149-181). New York: Routledge.

Balsamo, A. (1996). Reading Cyborgs, Writing Feminism. *Technologies of the Gendered Body: Reading Cyborg Women* (pp. 17-40). Duke University Press.

Lykke, N. (2000) Are Cyborgs Queer? Biological Determinism and Feminist Theory in the Age of New Reproductive Technologies and Reprogenetics.

Recommended:

Barad, K. (2003). Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding of How Matter Comes to Matter. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 28(3), 801-831.

Rosi Braidotti, Memoirs of a Post Humanist, 2017 Tanner Lectures on Human Values:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OjxeIMWLGC0>

Rosi Braidotti, Aspirations of a Post Humanist, 2017 Tanner Lectures on Human Values:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LNIYOKfRQks>

Goodley, D., Lawthom, R., & Cole, K. R. (2014). Posthuman disability studies. *Subjectivity*, 7(4), 342-361.

Luciano, D., & Chen, M. Y. (2015). Introduction: Has the Queer Ever Been Human? *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, 21(2), iv-207.

Apostolidou, S., & Sturm, J. (2016). Weighing posthumanism: Fatness and contested humanity. *Social Inclusion*, 4(4).

White, F. R. (2014). Fat/trans: Queering the activist body. *Fat Studies*, 3(2), 86-100.

TallBear, K. (2015). An indigenous reflection on working beyond the human/not human. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, 21(2), 230-235.

Tallbear, K. (2011). Why interspecies thinking needs Indigenous standpoints. In *American Anthropological Association Meeting, Montreal, CA*. <https://culanth.org/fieldsights/260-why-interspecies-thinking-needs-indigenous-standpoints>

WEEK 13 • NOVEMBER 28, 2019

Digital Bodies • Fitsum Aregay and Megan Hutchison to Lead

Required

Zhu, F. (2018). Computer gameplay and the aesthetic practices of the self: Game studies and the late work of Michel Foucault. *Transactions of the Digital Games Research Association*, 3(3).

Gibbons, S. (2015). Disability, neurological diversity, and inclusive play: An examination of the social and political aspects of the relationship between disability and games. *Loading...*, 9(14).

Nakamura, L. (2013). Identity tourism avatars and racial passing in textual and graphic chat spaces. *Cybertypes: Race, Ethnicity, and Identity on the Internet*. Routledge.

Longboat, M. (2017). Reset and redefine: Never Alone (Kisima Ingitchuna) and the rise of Indigenous games. *Transmotion*, 3(1), 170-170.

Ruberg, B. (2019). Introduction. In *Video games have always been queer*. New York University Press.

Read One Of:

Cheney-Lippold, J. (2018). Introduction. In *We are data*. New York University Press.

Cover, R. (2016). Introduction: Ubiquitous digital networks, identity, and the self. In *Digital Identities: Creating and Communicating the Online Self*. Academic Press.

Shaw, A. (2014). From Custer's Revenge and Mario to Fable and Fallout: Race, gender, and sexuality in digital games. In *Gaming at the Edge: Sexuality and Gender at the Margins of Gamer Culture*. University of Minnesota Press. 2014.

Game to download for class:

Never alone (available to download and play on PlayStation 4, Xbox One, PlayStation 3, Android, iOS)

Take a look at *Wafaa Bilal's* work before class

<http://wafaabilal.com/shoot-an-iraqi/>

<http://lemagazine.jeudepaume.org/blogs/shelleyrice/2012/10/01/domestic-tension-an-interview-with-wafaa-bilal-by-shelley-rice/>

Bonus readings Baudrillard, J. (1994). *Simulacra and simulation*. University of Michigan Press.