

LOUISVILLE PRESBYTERIAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Whiteness and Racial Justice Spring 2023

Course:	Whiteness and Racial Justice TH 4243
Time and Place:	4:30pm – 6:00pm Tuesdays and Thursdays, in Nelson 119
Prerequisite:	None
Instructor:	Gerardo Martí, PhD
My Office:	Pre-scheduled appointments meet phone, Zoom, or office @ Gardencourt 303
Email:	gmarti@lpts.edu
Assignments:	All papers uploaded on Canvas or sent via Email
Office Hours:	By appointment.

Course Description:

This course introduces *whiteness* as central to the analysis of our American society, especially as it relates to inequality, power, and social change. Understanding *whiteness* has consequences for the understanding and achievement of efforts toward racial justice in our contemporary United States.

Generally, sociologists have focused their efforts toward explaining the broad contours of modern Western society, especially its defining characteristics and its most pressing problems. Some theorists seek to understand the dangers and possibilities inherent in the major transformations of Western society in the modern era, including the rise of modern capitalism and the modern nation-state, the challenges and contradictions of democratic ideals, the increasing prominence of science and bureaucratic organization, and evolving forms of authority, privilege, marginalization, and constraint. Our goal will be to make clear how *whiteness* is central to these social transformations through an analysis of racialized features of society – whether explicit or obscured – and the dilemmas and contradictions confronting it: What accounts for the which ethnic/nation/racial groups are deemed most representative of modern Western society? How does the structure of power and politics shape the racial hierarchy over time? What accounts for persistent racial gaps in opportunity and wealth? How are racial attitudes embedded in religious and political structures? What are the prospects for human happiness and fulfillment for racial groups that are discounted, dismissed, or otherwise discouraged within our society? And what is the proper role for people who seek to study, and perhaps change, that society?

Because race is central to social life, we may have occasion to touch on a variety of basic concerns: How does *whiteness* impinge on everyday life even if unseen and ignored? For example, how does *whiteness* contribute to the definition of the self (and not just “white people”)? How are individual lives shaped by their larger racial context? What do *whiteness* and associated racialization processes reveal about the essence of human nature? Who benefits from everyday *whiteness* and often unquestioned allocation of roles, hierarchies, and responsibilities? As we approach a discrete number of writers systematically, reading texts closely, we are encouraged to search for the inner logic rather than simply pulling out a few “interesting” insights.

Much of sociology in particular centers on dynamics of solidarity–how individuals connect to each other through a sense of belonging. However, this course will focus on domination, i.e. how individuals are subject to hierarchies of authority, opportunity, and privilege. The writers will look to explain the origins and workings of *whiteness*, often as part of the constructed legitimacy of oppressive actions enforced by the State and accelerating the accumulation of wealth by particular groups. Indeed, much of what we will discuss lies at the root of understanding core processes of our modern

world (i.e. from the conquest of the Americas and the vast, transformative developments of economics and trade). By the end of this course, you should be able to acknowledge an array of historical developments and to contextualize a variety of events and debates over time.

We will begin the course by specifying the assumptions embedded in theories of “social contract” (core aspect of “classic liberalism”) that focus on the productive powers of individuals and lead to notions of fairness through market exchange and free trade. The philosopher Charles Mills and WEB Du Bois will be especially important for these discussions, which will provide a foundation for later material. Subsequent material will direct attention to thinkers providing a variety of evidence that question the validity of assumptions found in notions of social contract. Those theorists will also create and/or build on conceptual frameworks for grasping the dynamics of power and domination that are often obscured by idealizations of the social contract, an inheritance of classic liberalism. You should also be able to apply their concepts and ideas to understanding more fundamental structures of power in the social world that surrounds you today, and thereby to assess their contemporary relevance.

The selection of perspectives for this course is selective but not arbitrary. Within the limits of our course structure, we will attempt to engage writers who engage in robust empirical research as well as writers possessing a more conscious historical sensitivity in their focus on long standing structures of racialized inequality and oppression. Although the focus will concentrate (mostly) on development of the United States, the ambition of our writers is to understand the development of the modern world, such that their theorizing includes – or at least is related to – larger global structures.

I have attempted to shorten readings to the best of my ability while allowing a breadth of information and insight required to move past our personally established paradigms. Most often we will read sources (i.e. article or book selections) and work through it together. Everyone is encouraged to pursue other scholarly readings on your own – although these will not be accepted as substitutes for your own annotations and integrations from reading each of the texts assigned for this course. Students are also strongly encouraged to meet together with other students outside of class time for group-study, sharing annotations and resourcing each other’s thinking, so as to more thoroughly explore insights, make connections, and draw out implications which we are not able to fully be discussed while we are in class together. Of course, you are more than welcome to consult me for guidance.

While some of this class will involve focused discussions by the instructor, much of my own comments and “mini-lectures” will be based on *our* careful discussion of *your* close readings of primary theory texts. The readings may not always be easy. Many are packed with complex conceptual content – our job will be to “unpack” these ideas. This is a collective enterprise. You should not expect to be able to be a “free rider” who benefits solely through the efforts of others. Therefore, we will read, and more importantly, talk theory together. If ideas or concepts remain abstract and you cannot see how they relate to real world situations, you do not yet understand the material. You are expected, then, to come to class prepared to discuss what we read. This does not mean that when you come to class you have a complete understanding of all the material. Class discussion is not only encouraged but expected. You may find some of the material unclear and have questions about it. You will have questions, other students will too – and I do too. Together we will attempt to clarify them.

The recommended procedure is to read material thoroughly (a fairly thick portion of the assigned primary source) and perhaps get some exposure to the secondary literature on the theorist before the day on which it is assigned, and then have annotations from the text ready for discussion in class. Often learning – especially from unfamiliar paradigms -- is difficult. Understanding this material cannot come from memorization. Students will read from sometimes difficult sources and work toward writing integrative essays that demonstrate an ability to unpack accurately the core analytic insights from texts, compare their ideas with one another, and, eventually, recognize how concepts

used for social analysis connect with the contemporary social world around them. Much of these are readings to study and analyze, not simply skim over. Don't be discouraged if you find some readings difficult. A second reading will help (and is often necessary). In addition, we will spend a substantial amount of class time talking through the readings -- often engaging in textual analysis. It is important therefore to bring whatever text we are working on to class (whether bound, printed out, or online with laptop or tablet), as well as any initial ideas and questions you may have accumulated. Things will begin to fall into place. Your own knowledge will acquire a new sense of unity, relevance, and even excitement.

Finally, note that social scientists are not merely committed to observation of the world. The significance of their work is placed in relation to the possibilities for constructive change. As we go through the class, the following questions are among those that prompt our work together:

- How does *whiteness* relate to a broader conception of the current epoch of human society ("capitalism," "modernity," "postcolonialism," "neoliberalism," or however characterized), including its particular problems and likely tendencies?
- What effects does *whiteness* have on the relationship between "individuals" and "society"? How do the individual and society relate to one another? What capacity do individuals have for self-determination?
- How does each writer explicitly or implicitly contribute to understanding of *whiteness* and its consequences for racial justice? Similarly, how does, or how might, each theorist critique, oppose, expand not only *whiteness* but also alternative approaches to racial justice?
- How does the concept of *whiteness* and associated racialization processes affect the understanding the social world and potential (re-)shaping of the social world? What sort of initiatives -- whether investigative questions, congregational efforts, or advocacy interventions -- emerge from a richly resourced grasp of *whiteness*? More generally, how does a substantive understanding of *whiteness* serve to orient our priorities in relation to racial justice?

Course Goals:

- Provide a deep understanding of select, substantive works to achieve a systematic grasp of concerns central to *whiteness* and historic processes of racialization;
- Consider the origins of our contemporary racial hierarchy, including relevance and implications for immigration, naturalization, and citizenship;
- Identify key points of various historical and social scientific works exploring *whiteness* and associated processes of racialization, especially answering the questions "How has power been racialized?", "What informs racial identity construction and group formation?", and "What alternatives exist for social change to overcome racialized structures of marginalization and oppression?";
- Understand the significance of central concepts of sociological theories of race so that they can not only be described but also know what is being explained especially in the revealing of unseen, often ignored dynamics consequential to the well-being of others.;
- Relate the concept of *whiteness* to contemporary issues, especially as they relation to class, gender, and hierarchies of power as well as ongoing developments in our national politics;
- Acquire a sense of the diverse ways in which concepts and insights can be appropriated and adapted in relation to one another through critique, opposition, and expansion of ideas;
- Consider the uses of rigorous knowledge and theory not only to understand the social world but also the potential for radically (re-)shaping the social world; and
- Participate in the relational practice of discussion, respect, attuning to others, and experiencing an energizing community of mutual learning.

Required Readings for All Students on Moodle:

- Weekly Required Readings and Sources.
- Also Included are Weekly Strongly Suggested and Recommended Readings and Sources.

Specific Requirements:

<i>Participation, Discussion, and Peer Sharing</i>	10%
<i>Weekly Annotations of Readings and Audio Sources</i>	20%
<i>Persons & Possessions Integration Paper</i>	25%
<i>Power & Practices Integration Paper</i>	25%
<i>Final Integration Paper</i>	<u>20%</u>
Total Grade =	100%

Participation, Discussion, and Peer Sharing are all related to my expectation that students attend class regularly and participate in class discussions, exercises, and group sharing, as required or appropriate. Class sessions will focus mostly on primary readings and sources, most all of which are available on Canvas.

Weekly Annotations are papers that quote from text (with page numbers) or audio (with approximate time stamps) and provide easier access for describing and discussing the most important concepts and arguments encountered in the core sources for the week. Instructions for annotations are below. Please use 1 inch margins, 12 point Times Roman font. Beyond mere summary, the goal is to draw out a deeper understanding of each text. Wherever possible, it is helpful to indicate proposed implications of arguments in relation to other writers as well as in relation to actually explaining the workings of whiteness as a form of domination and power in the social world. Annotations help students build toward their analytic papers.

Annotations should always focus on: Key Concepts, Core Arguments, Compelling Quotes.

Annotate core readings and sources. I recommend creating a shareable Google Doc for each annotation source (text & audio). This document can then be shared with others.

Here is the formula for annotations:

TEXT SOURCE TITLE (eg. Thomas Hobbes. 1647 [1997]. *On the Citizen [De Cive]*)
p. 45 "QUOTE" which is EVIDENCE >> INSIGHT, INTERPRETATION
p. 52 "QUOTE" which is EVIDENCE >> INSIGHT, INTERPRETATION

AUDIO SOURCE TITLE (eg. "Thomas Hobbes Hates Your Book Club." *What's Left of Philosophy*)
0.12 min "QUOTE" which is EVIDENCE >> INSIGHT, INTERPRETATION
1.26 min "QUOTE" which is EVIDENCE >> INSIGHT, INTERPRETATION

This simple annotation method will build your thinking and prepare you for writing.

- Aim for a series of substantive annotations per source overall.
- Your annotations might:
 - Point out especially important statements that are key to the source, eg. define, summarize, etc.: "Here is the author's goal... Brief overview of argument... Find 5 key points here..."
 - Name a *concept* and provide the definition.
 - Make a connection to other pages or other sources or something discussed or read or heard: "This point connects to page XX... Reminds of another quote on page XX... Yes, this expands on... It is helps me to connect this to..."

- Build up interpretations from the evidence of the text (concept, historical happening, illustration) to explicate further: "This demonstrates how... I can see better that... This reveals..."
- Note when an explanation is provided, which is different from a mere example or an illustration.
- Ask a probing question about meaning within the source: " Does this mean... and does it tie into previous reading...?"
- Build on someone else's comment of the same source: "As Elena mentioned..." "This makes me think of..."

Remember: SYNTHETIC INTEGRATION = ANALYTICAL WRITING THAT DRAWS TOGETHER KEY CONCEPTS, CORE ARGUMENTS, COMPELLING QUOTES VIA THE PATTERN OF INSIGHT, EVIDENCE, INTERPRETATION.

A resource for for text-based annotations is Hypothes.is, a Chrome app that allows for shared annotation. You may also take notes in an "old fashioned" manner on paper/document.

The basic approach to annotation in any reading is this:

- The "QUOTE" with a page # from a reading is EVIDENCE >> Immediately after this, your "NOTE" conveys an INSIGHT or INTERPRETATION or both.
- As you continue read, INTEGRATE when possible, by which I mean writing an ANALYTICAL NOTE THAT DRAWS TOGETHER INSIGHT, EVIDENCE, INTERPRETATION

Hypothes.is is a free online tool used alongside Moodle integrated into Chrome browsers as an Extension. Use of this tool is optional, however there are many benefits, including making notes shareable and public for others. Once you orient yourself to it, the basic Annotation in Hypothes.is:

- Open PDF in Chrome browser.
- Highlight a sentence or paragraph you wish to comment upon. You will immediately see an option to "Annotate" or "Highlight." Clicking "Annotate" will pop out a side-bar on the right-hand side of your screen.
- There, you can write a short (or long!) note.
- A class group might share annotations. To see others' annotations, click on the little left-pointing arrow that will appear in the top right corner of your screen for the group label you share once Hypothesis is on. That will show all the annotations attached to a text.
- You can also just click on the highlighted text, and the comments attached to that snippet will appear in the sidebar.
- On top of Hypothesis sidebar, "Annotations" are anchored to selected reading passages. On the right, "Page Notes" are general comments for the whole document that are not anchored to a particular text.

Integration Papers are **4,000 to 5,000 word papers (20-25 paragraphs)** that vividly conveys a precise, analytically rich, and textually resourced understanding of sociological concepts /theories / perspectives and their implications for the understanding of social dynamics/ processes/ structures of domination in relation to notions of "the social contract". For this class, there are **two** "Integration Papers" focused on sources assigned for the course. The first paper is due in about 5 weeks, followed by another in the next 5 weeks, then a slightly longer final integration paper about two weeks after that second paper. Each integration paper will focus on core insights from the course, especially drawn from class readings. In each paper, you are expected to write vividly, clearly, and intelligently your integration of your learnings and their implications. This is not about your life experience or growing observations of things around you. Instead, it works to provide a clear understanding of the sociological understandings conveyed through the text and builds on that understanding to provide

implications of those understandings for things beyond the text itself. The paper should also draw on ideas provided from our class discussions. As our time together moves along, each integration paper should compare/contrast cumulative concepts/ideas up to that point.

Suggestions for Writing Paper

Generally, I seek *analytical depth*, which for me is usually associated with the following:

- Compression of information, such that a lot of information is presented in each sentence/paragraph/paper.
- Precision, displaying accuracy with respect to particular “facts” (people, incidents, etc) and concepts (dynamics, processes, theories) discussed.
- Breadth of scope, encompassing a broad swath of course material in terms of historical period, texts assigned, material provided for consideration.
- Clear and cogent argumentation, offering an explanation by building a narrative that either continually ties to significant and constantly developing thematic thread(s) ~OR~ cumulative insights that build over the course of paragraphs and culminates in ever greater sophistication.

This is NOT A FORMULA; yet, because students have asked for help starting their paper a suggested structure for your integration papers is provided below. This constitutes the principles of analytical writing generally found in the social sciences. The social sciences are interested in *explanation*, and explanation is really a process of *argumentation*:

GENERALLY, THE BUILDING BLOCKS OF ARGUMENTATION ARE:

INSIGHT (1st sentence of each paragraph)

EVIDENCE (middle sentences of each paragraph)

INTERPRETATION (last sentence or two of each paragraph)

IMPORTANTLY, THE FIRST SENTENCE OF EVERY PARAGRAPH SHOULD EASILY AND CLEARLY FLOW TOGETHER FROM ONE TO ANOTHER.

FIRST PARAGRAPH what is the stated purpose of the writer; identify in your own words key objective(s) of their concepts and arguments; overall description and purpose of their theorizing and its significance:

What is the general question/issue/problem/concern of analytical focus?

What arena of social life does the writer explain?

How does it relate to the concepts/themes/findings/ideas/theories from the rest of the class?

What significant implications about social life do you find most important?

SECOND (AND MAYBE THIRD AND FOURTH) PARAGRAPH summarize the key ideas and concepts of the writers’ sources:

What are each writer’s arguments?

What are key terms/concepts and how are they defined?

How do arguments and concepts work together to reveal sociological processes and dynamics?

How does the text relate to the work of other sociologists?

NEXT PARAGRAPH (AND OTHERS) connect writer’s concepts and arguments from each source with other sociological ideas/insights/concepts/arguments:

What makes the quoted source important? How do other sources add or amend the source?

*How does it connect with important topics and themes of interest to a sociological lens?
How do the implications of this source (in light of the implications of other sources) matter?
How does the source extend, amend, and/or affirm other ideas from a sociological perspective?
Do ideas/insights/concepts/arguments from others extend, amend, and/or affirm those presented in this source?*

FINAL PARAGRAPH on my assessment of the significance of ideas and implications to me/others in understanding structures of domination in relation to “the social contract”::

*What did you learn about structures of domination that was not evident to you before?
How does this writer contribute insight into to our culture/historical time period?
What are the implications of this writer on understanding power and human sociality?*

Finally, keep in mind the basics –

- Isolate key arguments & concepts using annotations from each source *before* you write,
- use page numbers and/or time stamps from sources to indicate where ideas are found
- cite sources in-text following this pattern (AuthorLastName, Year:page#/time stamp) ,
- explicate key arguments and concepts with precision,
- be clear on theoretical framework for author’s evidence, findings, and conclusions,
- demonstrate the interrelationships between arguments and concepts,
- pursue analytical depth in your discussion of arguments and concepts,
- focus on accurately conveying the unique perspective of the author,
- make clear claims, and support them using evidence from sources,
- use subheadings,
- avoid personal anecdotes or life experiences,
- avoid "I think, I feel, I believe" trap, or even name calling instead of analytical insights,
- avoid analogies and metaphors,
- do not trust research sources gained from blogs, etc., found on the internet,
- trust research from 1) course materials, 2) academic journal articles (e.g. JSTOR is an excellent database), 3) scholarly books (books from university presses and other academic publishers), and 4) recorded talks from writers themselves.
- sequence ideas in each paragraph, usually Main Point followed by Supporting Points,
- write a good topic sentence in a paragraph; structure your paragraph, then sum it up before moving on or make a good transition to the next paragraph,
- connect ideas in thoughtful, unforeseen, non-obvious ways,
- transition ideas from paragraph to paragraph using Transition Sentences,
- get to the point quickly with intro and conclusion, being clear on sociological relevance and on the significance of the work (e.g. avoid personal stories or Webster’s dictionary).
- don’t waste time on “I liked / I didn’t like” but focus on “writer defines / writer demonstrates” drawing on sources.
- implications are sentences where you take what you know from what you’ve learned and expand further to what is not explicitly said, “Taken together, this implies...”

Full letter penalty after start of class, another full letter for every additional 24 hour period.

Finally, the **Final Integration Paper** (5,000-6,000 word papers (30-35 paragraphs) is a dense, more comprehensive discussion comparing two major writers. This semester, you seek to *analytically integrate the concepts, insights, and argumentation derived from course content*. This final paper provides the opportunity for further analytical depth. All papers are expected to demonstrate thoughtful synthesis and critical commentary. You have wide latitude in selecting themes/focal points, but in all cases your paper should demonstrate how the readings from the course address

overarching/integrative questions about whiteness as a form of domination and power. Original writing is expected, please do not under any circumstances "Google" or "AI generate" your paper. To enrich your paper, you may consult sociologically relevant journals and books for *scholarly* writing relevant to your writers. The paper should include understanding of primary sources by the writers and may include reference to secondary scholarly sources (like those provided throughout the syllabus). Students are also welcome to discuss, share notes, and consult with each other for this (and really any) paper. And of course, you may come talk to me as well about your papers - well before the submission due date.

The focus of your paper should be a discussion of structures of domination in relation to notions of "social contract."

For your final paper, **I would suggest organizing your paper as follows:**

GENERALLY, THE BUILDING BLOCKS OF ARGUMENTATION ARE:

INSIGHT (1st sentence of each paragraph)

EVIDENCE (middle sentences of each paragraph)

INTERPRETATION (last sentence or two of each paragraph)

IMPORTANTLY, THE FIRST SENTENCE OF EVERY PARAGRAPH SHOULD EASILY AND CLEARLY FLOW TOGETHER FROM ONE TO ANOTHER.

Introduction (500-1,000 words, about 5 paragraphs). Introduce your writers and briefly situate them in terms of the overarching topics and questions that concern our understanding of the social world. By the end of the second paragraph it is suggested that you have told me what the purpose of your paper is and any core themes of your paper. If you read the first two paragraphs of your paper and the goals and purpose of the paper are not very clear, please revise. I would also suggest a "map" paragraph at the end of the introduction that tells me where we will be going in the paper. (For example, "I first explain....then argue....by presenting evidence about three themes....")

Body (3,000 to 4,000 words, about 20-25 paragraphs). In this section please present and develop your arguments by providing several distinct pieces of information / evidence in support of it. Keep in mind a comparative framework throughout your paper regarding developments, amendments, and disagreements that exist between your writers and other writers.

If there is any relevant background to explain about your thesis / argument present that first. (For example, key terms may need a paragraph to articulate what you mean. Perhaps a brief paragraph or two about the core sources you will discuss and their relevance to your argument would be helpful). A section providing background is not essential for everyone. You need to decide whether it is necessary to help your reader(s) understand. Think of your audience as me and other people in the class.

Develop topics and themes by clearly presenting the evidence you have gathered in support of it. For example, if you are comparing two or more arguments, this section will be organized around the themes around which you are doing the comparison. There are two ways to structure a compare and contrast paper. Pick the one that works best for you.

Theme 1

Argument/Theory A

Argument/Theory B

Theme 2

Argument/Theory A

Argument/Theory B

etc.

Or

Argument/Theory A

Theme 1

Theme 2

Argument/Theory B

Theme 1

Theme 2

etc.

This is certainly not the only way to structure your paper, and you have the opportunity to craft your paper as you please. Please use section headings in this section and throughout the paper if it helps you organize your thoughts and presentation.

Conclusion (750-1,000 words, about 5 paragraphs): By this point, your arguments and all of your evidence should be clearly presented. Briefly summarize any key themes / arguments here and their broad significance for understanding social structures/processes/dynamics. If your findings raise questions about other topics covered in this class, please make those connections briefly here.

**After you have finished writing your paper, go back and read the introduction, the first sentence of each of your paragraphs, and your conclusion. From this, the point of your paper should be very clear. If parts of your argument are embedded in the middle of other paragraphs (so you don't see them when doing this little test), restructure your paragraphs. Also make sure that you don't conclude something that contradicts or is very different from what you say in the introduction. After finishing their first draft, most people need to take the conclusion to their paper and use it to rewrite their introduction!

Finally, keep in mind the basics -

- organize thinking *before* you write,
- focus on significant comparisons of concepts, insights, and arguments,
- make clear claims, and support them,
- use subheadings,
- avoid juvenile "I think, I feel, I believe" trap, or even name calling instead of analytical insights,
- do not trust research sources gained from blogs, etc., found on the internet,
- do trust research from 1) course materials, 2) academic journal articles (e.g. JSTOR is an excellent database), and 3) scholarly books (books from university presses and other academic publishers),
- cite properly in-text or in a "bibliography" or "works cited" page,
- write a good topic sentence in a paragraph; structure your paragraph, OR sum it up before moving on,
- connect ideas in thoughtful, unforeseen, non-obvious ways,
- sequence ideas in a paragraph,
- transition ideas from paragraph to paragraph,
- use subheadings as necessary,
- write a good intro and conclusion.

About the Grading Scale

I will use the following guidelines to grade your written assignments:

A Outstanding Work (90-100%) Demonstrates outstanding sophistication and relevant implications of course material above and beyond general understanding of material. Exceptional critical skills, creativity, or originality is also evident. Fully incorporated sociological perspective. Shows evidence of using full scope of all readings: required, strongly suggested, and even recommended readings. Outstanding precision, accuracy, insight, grasp of arguments, and drawing out of implications are exceptional in comparison with other students in the course who have the same assignment, same resources, and same time constraints.

B Above Average (80-89%) Goes above and beyond completing requirements of the assignment to reveal learned sophistication of course material above and beyond competent work. Represents required sources with excellence. Shows clear evidence of resourcing strongly suggested and recommended sources. Precision, accuracy, insight, grasp of arguments, and drawing out of implications are clearly evident in comparison with other students in the course who have the same assignment, same resources, and same time constraints. Considerable effort, extra achievement or significant improvement over semester often evident. Clear demonstration of developed sociological perspective.

C Average (70-79%) A "C" paper explicitly fulfills all aspects of the assignment with obvious competence and grace in comparison with other students in the course. A thorough and satisfactory understanding of basic course material and incorporation of a sociological perspective. Precision, accuracy, insight, grasp of arguments, and drawing out of implications present in discussions and submitted work. Shows evidence of resourcing strongly suggested and recommended sources. Completes assignment as assigned and expected.

D Below Average (60-69%) A "D" paper represents marginally satisfactory understanding of basic course material. Surface level grasp or application of a sociological perspective. A "D" may indicate lack of precision, accuracy, insight, grasp of arguments, and drawing out of implications. Lack of resourcing strongly suggested and recommended sources. It may also indicate failure to follow directions, failure to implement specific recommendations, or failure to demonstrate personal effort and improvement in comparison with other students in the course. Late papers can easily become "D" or worse in grading. At times, some aspect of the assignments has not been fulfilled, or a preponderance of errors (more than one or two per page) interferes with clear communication.

F Lack of demonstration of satisfactory understanding of basic course material. Failure to grasp or apply a sociological perspective. Lack of resourcing strongly suggested and recommended sources. Not Acceptable, either because the student did not complete the assignment as directed, or because the level of writing skill is below an acceptable level for college work. Excessive lateness of papers.

****All papers and/or reviews must be completed to receive a passing grade in this class****

In addition to these five grades, a student may receive a grade of R. R stands for "Redo" and means the student has both the opportunity and the responsibility to do the assignment over. Usually this is given because the student appears to have misunderstood the assignment, or because some particularly egregious error prevents the paper from achieving its purpose, or because I believe that the student has made a good faith effort to excel but has run into significant difficulties with the assignments. If you receive a grade of R, you have 48 hours to contact me for a phone or face-to-face appointment. In our appointment, we will discuss what went wrong with the assignment, and we will contract a way and a time to redo the assignment. If you fail to turn in a revision according to the individual contract, the student will receive a 0 on the assignment.

My scale for final averages is as follows:

94-100 A

90-93	A-	73-76	C
87-89	B+	70-72	C-
84-86	B	67-69	D+
80-83	B-	63-66	D
77-79	C+	60-62	D-
		1-59	F

LPTS CLASSROOM POLICIES:

As with all LPTS classes, this course will honor these Seminary policies:

Use of Inclusive Language

In accordance with seminary policy, students are to use inclusive language in class discussions and in written and oral communication by using language representative of the whole human community in respect to gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, age, and physical and intellectual capacities. For more information see: <http://lpts.libguides.com/content.php?pid=469569&sid=4083885>

Direct quotations from theological texts and translations of the Bible do not have to be altered to conform to this policy. In your own writing, however, when referring to God, you are encouraged to use a variety of images and metaphors, reflecting the richness of the Bible's images for God.

Academic Honesty

All work turned in to the instructors is expected to be the work of the student whose name appears on the assignment. Any borrowing of the ideas or the words of others must be acknowledged by quotation marks (where appropriate) and by citation of author and source. Use of another's language or ideas from online resources is included in this policy, and must be attributed to author and source of the work being cited. Failure to do so constitutes plagiarism, and may result in failure of the course. Two occurrences of plagiarism may result in dismissal from the Seminary. Students unfamiliar with issues related to academic honesty can find help from the staff in the Academic Support Center. For more information, see The Code of Student Conduct, 6.11; the Student Handbook, p. 19.

Citation Policy

Citations in your papers should follow the Seminary standard, which is based on these guides:

American Psychological Association. *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association*. 6th ed. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2010.

Turabian, Kate L., Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb, and Joseph M. Williams. *A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations: Chicago Style for Students and Researchers*. 8th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2013.

The Chicago Manual of Style. 16th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.

Copies of these guides are available at the library and in the Academic Support Center.

Special Accommodations

Students requiring accommodations for a documented physical or learning disability should be in contact with the Director of the Academic Support Center (bherrintonhodge@lpts.edu) during the first two days of class (or, even better, before the class begins) and should speak with the instructor as soon as possible to arrange appropriate adjustments. Students with environmental or other sensitivities that may affect their learning are also encouraged to speak with the instructor.

Note: Please Complete Readings Before Tue/Thu Classes; Topics & Assignments May Shift; Changes Will Be Announced

<u>Week</u>	<u>Writer</u>	<u>Read, Think & Explore</u>	<u>Analyze, Write & Create</u>
1 February --/2	<u>Introduction</u>	<p>**Before Class Begins:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Review Syllabus. ● Be sure you can access online materials on Canvas. ● Read ahead for first class, Thursday below. <p><u>Introductory Reading & Sources:</u></p> <p><u>Thursday</u></p> <p>Rachel C. Schneider and Sophie Bjork-James. 2020. "Whither Whiteness and Religion?: Implications for Theology and the Study of Religion." <i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i> 88(1):175-199.</p> <p>Andrew Gardner and Gerardo Martí. 2022. "From Ordaining Women to Combating White Supremacy: Oppositional Shifts in Social Attitudes between the Southern Baptist Convention and the Alliance of Baptists." <i>Religion and American Culture</i> 32(2): 202-235.</p> <p>Glenn E. Bracey II. 2022. "The Spirit of Critical Race Theory." <i>Sociology of Race and Ethnicity</i> https://doi.org/10.1177/23326492221114814. Epub ahead of print.</p> <p><u>Recommended:</u></p> <p>Peggy McIntosh. 1998. "White privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack." Pp. 147-152 in M. McGoldrick (Ed.), <i>Re-Visioning Family Therapy: Race, Culture, and Gender in Clinical Practice</i>. The Guilford Press.</p> <p>David R. Roediger. 2001. "Critical Studies of Whiteness, USA: Origins and Arguments." <i>Theoria</i> 48(98): 72-98.</p> <p>Monica McDermott and Frank L. Samson. 2005. "White Racial and Ethnic Identity in the United States." <i>Annual Review of Sociology</i> 31: 245-261.</p> <p>Lee Bebout. 2020. "Whiteness." In <i>Keywords for American Cultural Studies, Third Edition</i>. New York University Press.</p> <p>Raka Shome. 2000. "Outing Whiteness." <i>Critical Studies in Mass Communication</i>. 17(3): 366-371.</p> <p>Gustavo Gutiérrez. 1983. "Theology from the Underside of History." Pp. 169-221 in <i>The Power of the Poor in History</i>. SCM. 9780883443880 (Original Spanish article 1979).</p> <p>Tom Beaudoin and Kathrerine Turpin. 2014. "White Practical Theology." Pp. 251-269 in Kathleen A. Cahalan and Gordon S. Mikoski (eds.) <i>Opening the Field of Practical Theology: An Introduction</i>. Rowman & Littlefield.</p> <p>Sameer Yadav. 2019. "Willie Jennings on the Supersessionist Pathology of Race: A Differential Diagnosis" Pp. 357-368 in <i>T&T Clark Companion to Analytic Theology</i>. T&T Clark.</p> <p>bell hooks. 1997. "Representing Whiteness in the Black Imagination." Pp. 165-179 in <i>Displacing Whiteness: Essays in Social and Cultural Criticism</i>, edited by Ruth Frankenberg. Duke University Press.</p>	<p><i>Finding sources: All sources found on Canvas. If you have trouble, look up through our library and/or search the internet using information here to locate items.</i></p> <p><i>Suggestion: As a potential resource to your work, set up Hypothes.is account, add extension to Chrome browser.</i></p> <p>Annotate sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Key concepts ● Core arguments ● Compelling quotes
2 February 7/9	<u>Ignorance</u>	<p><u>Tuesday</u></p> <p>Jennifer C. Mueller. 2020. "Racial Ideology or Racial Ignorance? An Alternative Theory of Racial Cognition." <i>Sociological Theory</i> 38 (2):142-169.</p> <p>Jennifer C. Mueller. 2017. "Producing Colorblindness: Everyday Mechanisms of White Ignorance." <i>Social Problems</i> 64(2): 219-238.</p> <p><u>Thursday</u></p> <p>Vivian M. May. 2007. <i>Anna Julia Cooper, Visionary Black Feminist: A Critical Introduction</i>. New York: Routledge. (pp. 107-118, 132-139, 142-162.)</p>	<p>Annotate sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Key concepts ● Core arguments ● Compelling quotes ● IN ADDITION, FOCUS ON EPISTEMOLOGY OF IGNORANCE

		<p>Strongly Suggested:</p> <p>bell hooks. 1984. <i>Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center</i>. South End Press. 9780896082212 (Chapter 1, "Black Women: Shaping Feminist Theory" pp. 1-15)</p> <p>Stephanie M. Wildman. 2005. "The Persistence of White Privilege." 18 <i>Washington University Journal of Law & Policy</i> 18(1):245-265.</p> <p>Recommended:</p> <p>George A. Martinez. 2020. "Law, Race, and the Epistemology of Ignorance." <i>Hastings Race & Poverty Law Journal</i> 17(2): 507-552.</p> <p>Jason Torkelson and Douglas Hartmann. 2021. "The Heart of Whiteness: On the Study of Whiteness and White Americans." <i>Sociology Compass</i> e12932. https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12932.</p> <p>Stella M. Nkomo. 1992. "The Emperor Has No Clothes: Rewriting 'Race in Organizations.'" <i>Academy of Management Review</i> 17(3): 487-513.</p> <p>Michael Hout, and Joshua R. Goldstein. 1994. "How 4.5 Million Irish Immigrants Became 40 Million Irish Americans: Demographic and Subjective Aspects of the Ethnic Composition of White Americans." <i>American Sociological Review</i> 59(1): 64-82.</p> <p>Santiago Castro-Gómez. 2021. "Zero-Point Hubris: Science, Race, and Enlightenment in Eighteenth-Century Latin America (Reinventing Critical Theory)." Translated by George Ciccariello-Maher and Don T. Deere. Rowman & Littlefield. 9781786613776. Original Spanish published 2005. (Chapter 1)</p> <p>Ruth Frankenberg. 1993. "Growing Up White: Feminism, Racism and the Social Geography of Childhood." <i>Feminist Review</i> 45(Autumn): 51-84.</p> <p>Jacqueline Yi, Helen A. Neville, Nathan R. Todd, and Yara Mekawi. 2022. "Ignoring Race and Denying Racism: A Meta-Analysis of the Associations between Colorblind Racial Ideology, Anti-Blackness, and Other Variables Antithetical to Racial Justice." <i>Journal of Counseling Psychology</i> May 23. doi: 10.1037/cou0000618. Epub ahead of print.</p>	
3 February 14/16	<u>Social Contract</u>	<p>Tuesday</p> <p>AUDIO "Thomas Hobbes Hates Your Book Club." <i>What's Left of Philosophy</i> (1 hour).</p> <p>Thomas Hobbes. 1647 [1997]. "On the Citizen [De Cive]." Edited by Richard Tuck and Michael Silverthorne. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press. 9780521437806. (pp. 21-40, 102-105, 115-126.)</p> <p>Thursday</p> <p>C.B. Macpherson. 1962. <i>The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke</i>. London and New York: Oxford University Press. 0198810849. (pp. 46-61, 70-87, 95-100, 105-106.)</p>	<p>Annotate sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key concepts • Core arguments • Compelling quotes • IN ADDITION, FOCUS ON SOCIAL CONTRACT
4 February 21/23	<u>Social Contract</u>	<p>Tuesday</p> <p>John Locke. 1690. [1980] "Two Treatises of Government." Edited by Peter Laslett. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press. 9780521357302. (pp. 283-285, 291-302.)</p> <p>C.B. Macpherson. 1962. "The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke." London and New York: Oxford University Press. 0198810849. (pp. 197-238.)</p> <p>Thursday</p> <p>Charles W. Mills. 2008. "Racial Liberalism." <i>Publication of the Modern Language Association of America (PLMA)</i> 123, no. 5.</p> <p>Charles W. Mills. 1998. "Blackness Visible: Essays on Philosophy and Race." Cornell University Press. 9780801484711 (Chapter 8, "Whose Fourth of July? Frederick Douglass and 'Original Intent'")</p> <p>Recommended:</p> <p>Charles W. Mills. 2000. "Race and the Social Contract Tradition." <i>Social Identities</i> 6(4):441-461.</p> <p>Charles W. Mills. 1998. "Blackness Visible: Essays on Philosophy and Race."</p>	<p>Annotate sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key concepts • Core arguments • Compelling quotes • IN ADDITION, FOCUS ON SOCIAL CONTRACT

		<p>Cornell University Press. 9780801484711 (Chapters 1, “Non-Cartesian Sums: Philosophy and the African-American Experience,” 4, “Dark Ontologies: Blacks, Jews, and White Supremacy”)</p> <p>Arun Kundnani. 2021. “The Racial Constitution of Neoliberalism.” <i>Race & Class</i> 63(1): 51- 69.</p>	
5 February 28/ March /2	<u>Persons</u>	<p>Tuesday</p> <p>Charles W. Mills. 2005. “Kant's untermenschen.” In Andrew Valls (ed.), <i>Race and Racism in Modern Philosophy</i>. Cornell University Press. 9780801472749 (pp. 169 – 93.)</p> <p>Carole Pateman and Charles Mills. 2007. Contract and Domination. Cambridge and Malden, MA: Polity. 9780745640044 (pages from “The Settler Contract” pp. 41-61.)</p> <p>Richard Drinnon. 1997. Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian-Hating and Empire-Building. University of Oklahoma Press. 9780816609789. (pp. 46-53, 65-69, 81-89.)</p> <p>Thursday</p> <p>Gerardo Marti. 2020. <i>American Blindspot: Race, Class, Religion, and the Trump Presidency.</i> Rowman & Littlefield. 9781538116098 (Chapters 2, 3, 4).</p> <p>Adam Dahl. 2018. <i>Empire of the People: Settler Colonialism and the Foundations of Modern Democratic Thought.</i> University Press of Kansas. (selected pages)</p> <p>Strongly Suggested:</p> <p>Joy James. 2016. “The Womb of Western Theory: Trauma, Time Theft, and the Captive Maternal.” <i>Carceral Notebooks</i> Volume 12, edited by Perry Zurn and Andrew Dilts. (pp. 253-286.)</p> <p>AUDIO 2019 “Joy James on the Academy, Captive Maternal, Central park Five, Prison Abolition, and Simulacra.” <i>Time Talks</i> ep 13 (1:16min)</p> <p>AUDIO 2020 Joy James “We Are Not Our Ancestors' PT. 3 w/ Joy James.” <i>The Black Myths Podcast</i> Aug 26 (1:09 min)</p> <p>AUDIO 2021 “We Remember The Attempts To Be Free / Joy James on Black August and the Captive Maternal.” <i>Millennials Are Killing Capitalism</i> Aug 12 (First 1:22 min, Full 2:24 min if you are able.)</p> <p>AUDIO 2020 Joy James “Black ‘Maternals’ Yoked to the Wheel of Group Survival” Margaret Kimberley <i>Black Agenda Radio</i> on SoundCloud Sept 7 (Start @ 11:20 min - Last 15 min.)</p> <p>Lisa Baraitser and Sigal Spigel. 2020. “Editorial” <i>Studies in the Maternal</i> 13(1), p.1. doi: https://doi.org/10.16995/sim.313</p> <p>Recommended:</p> <p>Elizabeth Naranjo Hayes. 2021. “Black Latinos are recognized, but the 2020 Census is finally legitimizing the Native heritage of many Latinx.” https://enhayes.people.ua.edu/blacklatinos2020censusnativelatinx.html. Online blog post. UPDATED PDF HERE</p>	<p>Annotate sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key concepts • Core arguments • Compelling quotes • INCLUDE QUALIFICATION OF “PERSONS”
6 March 7/9	<u>Property Law</u>	<p>Tuesday</p> <p>K-Sue Park. 2022. “The History Wars and Property Law.” <i>The Yale Law Journal</i> https://www.yalelawjournal.org/pdf/1.Park_phow1961.pdf</p> <p>Introduction... 1065</p> <p>I. Historical Erasure in Property-Law Casebooks ... 1071</p> <p>A. The Erasure of Conquest... 1074</p> <p>B. The Erasure of Slavery... 1080</p> <p>II. Discovery & the Racial Hierarchy of Commercial Empire... 1091</p> <p>Thursday</p> <p>K-Sue Park. 2022. “The History Wars and Property Law.” <i>The Yale Law Journal</i> https://www.yalelawjournal.org/pdf/1.Park_phow1961.pdf</p> <p>III. The Labor of Property Creation in Theory and Practice... 1100</p> <p>A. The Labor Theory and Property Value... 1102</p> <p>B. Producing Property, Property Law, and Property Institutions in the Colonies... 1110</p> <p>IV. Possession by Dispossession ... 1121</p>	<p>Annotate sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key concepts • Core arguments • Compelling quotes • INCLUDE RELATION TO TERRA NULLIUS <p>Submit Integration Paper on “Persons & Possessions”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INSIGHT (1st sentence of each paragraph) • EVIDENCE (middle sentences of each paragraph)

		<p>A. The Homesteading Principle: Conquest by Settlement... 1122 B. Property Against Human Self-Possession... 1126 V. Expropriation and the Creation of American Property Law... 1134 Conclusion ... 1141</p> <p>Strongly Suggested:</p> <p>Cheryl I. Harris. 1993. "Whiteness as Property." <i>Harvard Law Review</i> 106(8): 1707-1791.</p> <p>Recommended:</p> <p>William E. Conklin. 2014. "The Legal Culture of Civilization: Hegel and His Categorization of Indigenous Americans." Pp. 55-79 in <i>Europe in its Own Eyes, Europe in the Eyes of the Other</i>, edited by David B. MacDonald and Mary-Michelle DeCoste. Wilfred Laurier University Press.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● INTERPRETATION (last sentence or two of each paragraph)
7 (March 14/16)	<u>READING & STUDY</u>	READING & STUDY, MARCH 13-17	
8 March 21/23	<u>WEB Du Bois</u>	<p>Tuesday</p> <p>Ella Myers, James Ford III, Aldon Morris, and Andrew J. Douglas. 2021. "Du Bois and Racial Capitalism: Symposium on Andrew J. Douglas, WEB. Du Bois and the Critique of the Competitive Society, Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2019." <i>Political Theory</i> 49(3) 483-507.</p> <p>Ella Myers. 2019. "Beyond the Psychological Wage: Du Bois on White. Dominion." <i>Political Theory</i> 47(1): 6-31.</p> <p>Thursday</p> <p>Katrina Quisumbing Kin. 2022. "The Global Color Line and White Supremacy: W.E.B. Du Bois as a Grand Theorist of Race." In <i>The Oxford Handbook of W.E.B. Du Bois</i> edited by Aldon Morris, et al. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190062767.013.54</p> <p>Damon Mayrl. 2022. "The Funk of White Souls: Toward a Du Boisian Theory of the White Church." <i>Sociology of Religion</i> srac009, https://doi.org/10.1093/socrel/srac009. Epub ahead of print.</p> <p>Strongly Suggested:</p> <p>WEB Du Bois. 1935. Black Reconstruction in America: An Essay Toward a History of the Part Which Black Folk Played in the Attempt to Reconstruct Democracy in America, 1860-1880. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co. (First Edition). (pp. "To The Reader" , 3-16, 19-25, 28-29, 39, 49-50,55-56, 666-667, 80-81, 121-123, 128-130, 167-179, 182-186, 206, 216-219, 230, 244-245, 259-260, 280-282, 341-344, 346-347, 357-360, 367 ,378-379, 381-383, 487-500, 531, 541-545, 581-586,591, 596, 605-610, 670-680, 690-702, 706, 714-728.)</p> <p>Recommended:</p> <p>Freeden Blume Oeur and Edward J. Blum. 2022. "Sociology of Religion and the Black Church." In <i>The Oxford Handbook of W.E.B. Du Bois</i> edited by Aldon Morris, et al. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190062767.013.28</p> <p>Reiland Rabaka. 2006. "The Souls of White Folk: W.E.B. DuBois's Critique of White Supremacy and the Contributions to Critical White Studies." <i>Ethnic Studies Review</i> 29(2): 1-19.</p> <p>Claire Parfait. 2009. "Rewriting History: The Publication of W. E. B. Du Bois's 'Black Reconstruction in America' (1935)." <i>Book History</i> 12: 266-294.</p> <p>AUDIO "Roundtable on W. E. B. Du Bois' 'Black Reconstruction in America' (1935)" <i>New Books in African American Studies</i>.</p>	<p>Annotate sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Key concepts ● Core arguments ● Compelling quotes
9 March 28/30	<u>Capitalism</u>	<p>Tuesday</p> <p>Yousuf al-Bulushi. 2022. "Thinking Racial Capitalism and Black Radicalism from Africa: An Intellectual Geography of Cedric Robinson's World-System." <i>Geoforum</i> 132(June): 252-262.</p> <p>Stephan Hebllich, Stephen J. Redding, and Hans-Joachim Voth. 2022. "Slavery and the British Industrial Revolution." Working Paper 30451</p>	<p>Annotate sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Key concepts ● Core arguments ● Compelling quotes ● IN ADDITION, FOCUS

		<p>Doi 10.3386/W30451.</p> <p>Thursday (Scheduled Visit from Special Guest)</p> <p>Gerardo Marti. 2020. <i>American Blindspot: Race, Class, Religion, and the Trump Presidency</i>. Rowman & Littlefield. 9781538116098 (Chapters 5, 6).</p> <p>Recommended:</p> <p>Robert Miles. 1986. <i>Anomaly or Necessity: Capitalism and Unfree Labour</i>. PhD thesis, University of Glasgow.</p> <p>Sylvia Winter. <i>Black Metamorphosis: New Natives in a New World</i>. Unpublished Manuscript.</p> <p>Matthew Canfield. 2022. <i>"The Ideology of Innovation: Philanthropy and Racial Capitalism in Global Food Governance," The Journal of Peasant Studies</i>, DOI: 10.1080/03066150.2022.2099739. Epub ahead of print.</p>	ON CAPITALISM
10 April 4/(6)	<u>Legitimation</u> (Holy Week Recess)	<p>Tuesday</p> <p>Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. 1997. <i>"Rethinking Racism: Toward a Structural Interpretation."</i> <i>American Sociological Review</i> 62(3):465-80.</p> <p>Michelle Christian. 2018. <i>"A Global Critical Race and Racism Framework: Racial Entanglements and Deep and Malleable Whiteness."</i> <i>Sociology of Race and Ethnicity</i> 5(2): 169-185.</p> <p>Thursday</p> <p>HOLY WEEK RECESS</p> <p>Recommended:</p> <p>Eduardo Bonilla-Silva. 2003. <i>"Racial Attitudes or Racial Ideology? An Alternative Paradigm for Examining Actors' Racial Views."</i> <i>Journal of Political Ideologies</i> 8(1): 63-82.</p> <p>Jonathan W. Warren and France Winddance Twine. 1997. <i>"White Americans, the New Minority?: Non-Blacks and the Ever-Expanding Boundaries of Whiteness."</i> <i>Journal of Black Studies</i> 28(2): 200-18.</p> <p>Neda Maghbouleh. 2020. <i>"From White to What? MENA [(Middle East and North Africa) and Iranian American Non-White Reflected Race."</i> <i>Ethnic and Racial Studies</i> 43(4):613-631.</p> <p>Ariela J Gross. 1998. <i>"Litigating Whiteness: Trials of Racial Determination in the Nineteenth-Century South."</i> <i>The Yale Law Journal</i> 108(1): 109-88.</p> <p>Tanya Golash-Boza and William Darity, Jr. 2008. <i>"Latino Racial Choices: The Effects of Skin Colour and Discrimination on Latinos' and Latinas' Racial Self-Identifications."</i> <i>Ethnic and Racial Studies</i> 31(5): 899-934.</p> <p>Jonathan B. Freeman, Andrew M. Penner, Aliya Saperstein, Matthias Scheutz, and Nalini Ambady. 2011. "Looking the Part: Social Status Cues Shape Race Perception." <i>PLoS ONE</i> 6(9): e25107. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0025107.</p> <p>Reanne Frank, Ilana Redstone Akresh, and Bo Lu. 2010. "Latino Immigrants and the U.S. Racial Order." <i>American Sociological Review</i> 75(3):378-401.</p> <p>Cybelle Fox and Thomas A. Guglielmo. 2012. <i>"Defining America's Racial Boundaries: Blacks, Mexicans, and European Immigrants, 1890-1945."</i> <i>American Journal of Sociology</i> 118(2): 327-79.</p> <p>Thierry Devos and Mahzarin R. Banaji. 2005. <i>"American = White?"</i> <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i> 88(3): 447-466.</p>	<p>Annotate sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key concepts • Core arguments • Compelling quotes • IN ADDITION, FOCUS ON LEGITIMATION
11 April 11/13	<u>Heathens</u>	<p>Tuesday</p> <p>Kathryn Gin Lum. 2022. <i>Heathens: Religion and Race in America</i>. Harvard University Press. 9780674976771 (pp. 7-20 "Introduction: The Heathen World," 125-174 "The Body Politic: Barometer, Exclusion.")</p> <p>Thursday</p> <p>Kathryn Gin Lum. 2022. <i>Heathens: Religion and Race in America</i>. Harvard University Press. 9780674976771 (pp. 195-271 "Inheritances: Preservation and Pushback, Resonances, Continuing Counterscripts."</p>	<p>Annotate sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key concepts • Core arguments • Compelling quotes • IN ADDITION, FOCUS ON "HEATHENS"

<p>12</p> <p>April 18/20</p>	<p><u>Local Churches</u></p>	<p><u>Tuesday</u></p> <p>Brandon C. Martinez and Kevin D. Dougherty. 2013. "Race, Belonging, and Participation in Religious Congregations." <i>Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion</i> 52(4):713-732.</p> <p>Jill Marsh. 2022. "Whiteness in Congregational Life: An Ethnographic Study of One Ethnically-Diverse Congregation in the UK." <i>Practical Theology</i> 15(1-2): 120-131.</p> <p><u>Thursday</u></p> <p>Jessica M. Barron. 2016. "Managed Diversity: Race, Place, and an Urban Church." <i>Sociology of Religion</i> 77(1): 18-36.</p> <p>Jelani Ince. 2022. "'Saved' by Interaction, Living by Race: The Diversity Demeanor in an Organizational Space." <i>Social Psychology Quarterly</i> 85(3): 259-278.</p> <p>Meredith Reitman. 2006. "Uncovering the White Place: Whitewashing at Work." <i>Social & Cultural Geography</i> 7(2): 267-282.</p> <p><u>Recommended:</u></p> <p>Jessica Barron and Rhys Williams. 2017. <i>The Urban Church Imagined: Religion, Race, and Authenticity in the City</i>. New York University Press.</p> <p>Korie L. Edwards. 2008. <i>The Elusive Dream: The Power of Race in Interracial Churches</i>. Oxford University Press.</p> <p>Korie L. Edwards. 2020. "Multiracial churches don't challenge racism until they challenge white supremacy." <i>Faith & Leadership</i> Sept 20.</p> <p>Ryon J. Cobb, Samuel L. Perry, and Kevin D Dougherty. 2015. "United by Faith? Race/Ethnicity, Congregational Diversity, and Explanations of Racial Inequality." <i>Sociology of Religion</i> 76(2):177-198.</p> <p>Christopher P. Scheitle and Kevin D. Dougherty. 2010. "Race, Diversity, and Membership Duration in Religious Congregations." <i>Sociological Inquiry</i> 80(3): 405-423.</p> <p>Sharan Kaur Mehta, Rachel C. Schneider, and Elaine Howard Ecklund. 2022. "'God Sees No Color' So Why Should I? How White Christians Produce Divinized Colorblindness." <i>Sociological Inquiry</i> 92(2): 623-646.</p> <p>Michael O. Emerson, Elizabeth Korver-Glenn, and Kiara Douds. 2015. "Studying Race and Religion: A Critical Assessment." <i>Sociology of Race and Ethnicity</i> 1(3):349-359.</p>	<p>Annotate sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key concepts • Core arguments • Compelling quotes • IN ADDITION, FOCUS ON LOCAL CHURCHES
<p>13</p> <p>April 25/27</p>	<p><u>National Politics</u></p>	<p><u>Tuesday</u></p> <p>Lee Drutman. 2021. "Elections, Political Parties, and Multiracial, Multiethnic Democracy: How the United States Gets It Wrong." <i>New York University Law Review</i> 96(4): 985-1020.</p> <p>Miles T. Armaly, David T. Buckley, and Adam M. Enders. 2022. "Christian Nationalism and Political Violence: Victimhood, Racial Identity, Conspiracy, and Support for the Capitol Attacks." <i>Political Behavior</i> 44: 937-960.</p> <p>Moore, Wendy Leo. 2014. "The Stare Decisis of Racial Inequality: Supreme Court Race, Jurisprudence and the Legacy of Legal Apartheid." <i>Critical Sociology</i> 40(1): 67-88.</p> <p>Neil Gotanda. 1991. "A Critique of 'Our Constitution Is Color-Blind.'" <i>Stanford Law Review</i> 44(1): 1-68.</p> <p>Quinn Lester. 2022. "Bound to Preserve the White Self: Speculative Frenzy and the Patriarchal Right to Self-Defense in John Locke and Ida B. Wells." <i>New Political Science</i> 44(2): 210-226.</p> <p><u>Thursday</u></p> <p>Gerardo Marti. 2020. <i>American Blindspot: Race, Class, Religion, and the Trump Presidency</i>. Rowman & Littlefield. 9781538116098 (Chapters 7, 9).</p> <p>Samuel L. Perry & Cyrus Schleifer. 2022. "My Country, White or Wrong: Christian Nationalism, Race, and Blind Patriotism." <i>Ethnic and Racial Studies</i> DOI: 10.1080/01419870.2022.2113420. Epub ahead of print.</p>	<p>Annotate sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key concepts • Core arguments • Compelling quotes <p>Submit Integration Paper on "Power & Practices"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INSIGHT (1st sentence of each paragraph) • EVIDENCE (middle sentences of each paragraph) • INTERPRETATION (last sentence or two of each paragraph)

		<p>Mitch Berbrier. 2000. “The Victim Ideology of White Supremacists and White Separatists in the United States.” <i>Sociological Focus</i> 33(2): 175-191.</p>	
14 May 2/4	<u>Progress (?)</u>	<p><u>Tuesday</u></p> <p>Louise Seamster and Victor Ray. 2018. “Against Teleology in the Study of Race: Toward the Abolition of the Progress Paradigm.” <i>Sociological Theory</i> 36(4): 315-42.</p> <p>Elijah Anderson. 2015. “The White Space.” <i>Sociology of Race and Ethnicity</i> 1(1): 10-21.</p> <p>Ashleigh Cartwright. 2022. “A Theory of Racialized Cultural Capital.” <i>Sociological Inquiry</i> 92(2): 317-340.</p> <p>Adia Wingfield and Koji Chavez. 2020 “Getting In, Getting Hired, Getting Sideways Looks: Organizational Hierarchy and Perceptions of Racial Discrimination.” <i>American Sociological Review</i> 85(1):31-57.</p> <p>Matthew W. Hughey. 2012. “Stigma Allure and White Antiracist Identity Management. Stigma Allure and White Antiracist Identity Management.” <i>Social Psychology Quarterly</i> 75(3):219-241.</p> <p><u>Thursday</u></p> <p>Megan R. Underhill. 2018. “Parenting during Ferguson: Making Sense of White Parents’ Silence.” <i>Ethnic and Racial Studies</i> 41(11):1934-1951.</p> <p>Brigitte Vittrup. 2018. “Colorblind or Color-Conscious: White American Mothers’ Approaches to Racial Socialization.” <i>Journal of Family Issues</i> 39(3): 668-692.</p> <p>Margaret A. Hagerman. 2019. “Racial Ideology and White Youth: From Middle Childhood to Adolescence.” <i>Sociology of Race and Ethnicity</i> 6(3): 319-332.</p> <p><u>Recommended:</u></p> <p>Saperstein, Aliya and Andrew Penner. 2012. “Racial Fluidity and Inequality in the United States.” <i>American Journal of Sociology</i> 118(3): 676-727.</p> <p>Joyce M. Bell and Douglas Hartmann. 2007. “Diversity in Everyday Discourse: The Cultural Ambiguities and Consequences of ‘Happy Talk’” <i>American Sociological Review</i> 72(6): 895-914.</p> <p>Karin A. Case. 2004. “Claiming White Social Location as a Site of Resistance to White Supremacy.” Pp. 63-90 in Jennifer Harvey, Karin A. Case, Robin Hawley Gorsline (eds.) Disrupting White Supremacy from Within: White People on what We Need to Do. Pilgrim Press.</p>	<p>Annotate sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Key concepts ● Core arguments ● Compelling quotes
15 May 8-11	<u>FINAL PERIOD</u>	<p><u>Recommended:</u></p> <p>bell hooks. 1989. “Choosing the Margin as a Space of Radical Openness.” <i>The Journal of Cinema and Media</i> 36: 15-23.</p>	<p>Final Integration Paper</p> <p>Include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Key concepts ● Core arguments ● Compelling quotes <p>Integrate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Persons ● Possessions ● Power ● Practices ● Progress (?) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Submit by May 11th @7pm