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**ASSIGNMENTS**

1. Oral Book Review OR 4-6 page critical commentary 15%
2. Paper Proposal + Bibliography 15%
3. Research Paper: 70%

**1. Book Review/Critical Comment**

Students select EITHER a book review OR a critical comment. For those opting for the book review: select a book from the list below to read and present in class (on the dates specified). The book review should be about 15-20 minutes long, followed by 10 minutes for discussion, and should provide an overview of the book, the main approach/theoretical orientation of the author, the book’s main themes/arguments, and finally a discussion on the book in relation to the readings in the course, and for that week in particular. For example, how do the arguments/analysis in the book relate to the rest of the readings for that week? Do they confirm or complicate the analyses? What particular questions does the book help illuminate or, conversely, leave unaddressed? Do you think the authors of the articles you read for the class would agree/disagree with the arguments in the book? Why or why not?

**book choices:**

- bell hooks. *From Margin to Center.* (Southend).
- Patricia Williams. *The Alchemy of Race and Rights*
- Sherene Razack. * Casting Out: The Eviction of Muslims from Western Laws and politics* (UTP 2008);
- Constance Backhouse, *Colour-Coded: A Legal History of Racism in Canada, 1900-1950*
Critical comment

Students can select EITHER an oral book review OR write a 4-6 page commentary on ONE of the readings in a given week (sign up list to be distributed in class). An article commentary sets out the author’s argument and then considers how the author’s argument pertains to, challenges, reinforces, questions, complicates the course themes and particularly the RELATED themes emerging from that week’s material. In some cases, the article under review may more directly engage with readings from an earlier week. In that case, a good critical commentary will reflect on those readings. A critical commentary should NOT be a descriptive summary of one of the readings.

1. Paper proposal and bibliography [required]

This is a 3 page paper proposal that sets out the topic of your research, your main research questions, and the avenues and directions you hope to pursue. A proposal should contain a brief discussion of the background to your topic: what are the events or developments with which your paper is concerned, what developments/directions has the theoretical literature taken, where does your research fit into this background? You are also required, in addition to the 3 page proposal, to annotate 3 sources (ie books or academic journal articles) that you have used in preparing your proposal or that you might use in your research paper. Each annotation should be about 2 paragraphs long, and set out the author’s main focus, argument and approach, and why you think this will be useful to your research.

2. Research paper

This should be about 15-20 pages long (and no more than 25) on a topic to be agreed with me. It must be typed and double-spaced.

MATERIALS

Materials, unless otherwise noted, have been compiled into a reading pack and are for sale at Octopus Books, 116 3rd Avenue, Ottawa, ph: 233 2589.

SCHEDULE AND READINGS

Sept 15  Introduction to Course

Sept 22  Feminist Methods


Sept 29  Feminism and Law

Oct 06  
**Motherhood, Child care and the Family**  

OCT 13  
**Human Rights and Equality**  
This week we will look at a Supreme Court of Canada decision and its rethinking by the Women’s Court of Canada (see Majury, below). The type face for the extracts of the original SCC decision in Gosselin is very small and I apologise. If you have difficulties, you can find the decision on-line at the SCC website under 2002, vol 4. As you are reading the two different decisions in Gosselin, consider whether or not you think the WCC decision is a 'feminist' rewriting? What makes it feminist (if anything)? How radical (or not) is the idea of the WCC?


Oct 20  
**Race and the Veil**  
**Book Review:** Sherene Razack *Casting Out: The Eviction of Muslims from Western Laws and politics* (UTO 2008)  
*Constance Backhouse, Colour-Coded: A Legal History of Racism in Canada, 1900-1950*  

Oct 27  
**Religion and polygamy**  
**Book Review:** Patricia Williams. *The Alchemy of Race and Rights*  
*bell hooks. From Margin to Center.* (Southend)  
- Further reading TBA
Nov 3

Sexual Violence and Legal Knowledge


- Karen Busby, "'Not a Victim until a Conviction is Entered': Sexual Violence Prosecutions and Legal 'Truth'", in Elizabeth Comack, ed. *Locating Law*.

Nov 10

Migration, Immigration and Refugees


- Sherene Razack. 1998. 'Policing the Borders of Nation: The Imperial Gaze in Gender Persecution cases” in Looking White People in the Eye: Gender, Race, and Culture in Courtrooms and Classrooms. (Toronto: UTP)

Nov 17

Feminism and Internationalism/s


- Hilary Charlesworth, Christine Chinkin, and Shelley Wright. 1991. 'Feminist Approaches to International law' *American Journal of International Law* 65: 819 [on line].

Nov 24

Gender, Sexuality and the International


Dec 1

Student Presentations