

სასწავლო კურსის/მოდულის სილაბუსი

|                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| სასწავლო კურსის სახელწოდება | <b>თანამედროვე ფემინისტური თეორიები (ფემინისტური ფილოსოფია)</b><br><b>Contemporary Feminist Theories (Feminist Philosophy)</b>   |
| ავტორი (ავტორები)           | თამარ ცხადაძე  |
| ლექტორი (ლექტორები)         | თამარ ცხადაძე, გენდერის კვლევის ასოცირებული პროფესორი, სოციალურ და პოლიტიკურ მეცნიერებათა ფაკულტეტი, თსუ<br><a href="mailto:tamunats@gmail.com">tamunats@gmail.com</a> , 899516876   |
| სასწავლო კურსის კოდი        |  |
| სასწავლო კურსის სტატუსი     | 1. სოციალურ და პოლიტიკურ მეცნიერებათა ფაკულტეტი<br><br>2. სწავლების საფეხური - დოქტორანტურა<br><br>3. სავალდებულო  |
| სასწავლო კურსის მიზნები     | კურსი მიმოიხილავს თანამედროვე ფემინისტური თეორიების კონცეპტუალურ და ნორმატიული საკითხებს: ურთოერთობა სქესსა და გენდერს შორის, ძალაუფლება და ცოდნის წარმოება, რეზისტენტულობა, გენდერის, რასის, კლასისა და სექსუალობის ურთოერთდამოკიდებულება, დებატები საკითხზე ქალები ქალების წინააღმდეგ, ურთოერთობა ფემინისტურ თეორიასა და აქტივიზმს შორის. განხილული იქნება როგორც დასავლური, ასევე არა-დასავლური ფემინისტური დისკუსიები.<br>კურსი შედგება სამი ნაწილისგან: ნაწილი 1 (1-4 კვირა), რომელიც ასევე წარმოადგენს შესავალ ნაწილს, ფოკუსირდება ქალთა შევიწროვების გამოცდილების თეორიზაციას და ფემინისტურ მცდელობებზე, აიხსნას ამ ფენომენის წარმოშობა; სხვადასხვა თეორიული მიდგომის პოლიტიკური საფუძველიც იქნება განხილული; ნაწილი 2 (5-12 კვირა), კურსის ძირითადი ნაწილი, მოიცავს სხვადასხვა იდენტობებისა და განსხვავებულობების ფემინისტურ თეორიზაციას, ასევე იდენტობის პრობლემას ფემინისტურ პოლიტიკაში. |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>სექსუალობის, რასის, კლასის, რელიგიის, ეთნიკურობის, ა.შ. ურთოერთკავშირსა და ქალებისა და ფემინიზმის არა-იმპერიალისტური, არა-ექსკლუზიური კონცეფციების შესაძლებლობებს. დასკვნითი მესამე ნაწილი მოიცავს ფემინისტურ ეპისტემოლოგიას.</p>  |
| <p>კრედიტების რაოდენობა და სათების განაწილება სტუდენტის დატვირთვის შესაბამისად (ECTS)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⌋ სასწავლო კურსის კრედიტები - 10 ECTS;</li> <li>⌋ სტუდენტის საკონტაქტო მუშაობის საათების რაოდენობა სემესტრული გათვლით - 30 საათი;</li> <li>⌋ სტუდენტების დამოუკიდებელი მუშაობის საათების რაოდენობა სემესტრული გათვლით - 220 საათი</li> </ul>   |
| <p>დაშვების წინაპირობები</p>  | <p>წინაპირობის გარეშე</p>   |
| <p>სწავლის შედეგები</p>   | <p>კურსი ასწავლის სტუდენტებს დააფასონ ფემინისტური აზროვნების მრავალფეროვნება, გახდნენ სენსიტიურები ქალთა ცხოვრების სხვადასხვა ასპექტებისადმი, დაახელოვნონ კონცეპტუალური და თეორიული აპარატი სხვადასხვა თეორიული შეხედულებებისა და პოლიტიკური ნპროექტების ანალიზისა და შეფასებისთვის.</p> <p>კურსის წარმატებით დასრულების შემდეგ სტუდენტები გაეცნობიან ფემინისტური ფილოსოფიის ძირითადი ცნებები, საკითხები და ტრენდები. განუვითარდებათ უნარი კრიტიკულად შეფასონ ტექსტები, ერთმანეთთან დააკავშირონ და შეადარონ სხვადასხვა პოზიციები და არგუმენტები,, კრეატიულად გამოიყენონ შესწავლილი მასალა საკუთარი შეხედულების გასამყარებლად.</p>   |
| <p>სასწავლო კურსის შინაარსი</p>   |   |
| <p>სწავლების/სწავლის მეთოდები</p>   | <p><b>1) შეუალედური ესე:</b> სტუდენტები მოამზადებენ ერთ მოკლე ესეს (1600 სიტყვამდე) ლექტორის მიერ შეთავაზებული თემებიდან.</p> <p><b>2) საბოლოო ესე:</b> სტუდენტები მოამზადებენ საბოლოო ესეს (3000-4000 სიტყვა) წინასწარ შერჩეულ საკითხზე სავალდებულო ან რეკომენდირებული ლიტერატურიდან.</p> <p><b>3) ვიკიპედიას სტატია ან წიგნის მიმოხილვა:</b> თითოეული სტუდენტი ვალდებულია შეარჩიოს ერთი საკითხი ფემინიზმისა და გენდერის კვლევებიდან რომელზეც მოამზადებს სტატიას ვიკიპედიაზე გამოსაქვეყნებლად სემესტრის ბოლოსთვის. ალტერნატიული ვარიანტია მონოგრაფიის შერჩევა ფემინისტური თეორიების/გენდერის კვლევაში ბოლო 5 წლის მანძილზე გამოქვეყნებული ლიტერატურიდან და მისი მიმოხილვის მომზადება. (წიგნის სათაური წინასწარ უნდა იყოს შეთანხმებული ლექტორთან)</p> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p><b>4) ორი პრეზენტაცია:</b> თითოეულმა სტუდენტმა უნდა მოამზადოს (სემესტრის განმავლობაში 2-ჯერ) საკითხავი მასალის მოკლე მიმოხილვა, რომელიც განხილული იქნება კლასში.</p> <p><b>5) დასწრება და დისკუსიებში მონაწილეობა:</b> დისკუსიებში მონაწილეობა ემსახურება კვირის მიმდინარე საკითხავი მასალიდან არგუმენტებისა და პრობლემების სიღრმისეულ ანალიზს; აქტიური მონაწილეობა გულისხმობს, რომ სტუდენტი უნდა ერთვებოდეს დისკუსიაში, გამოხატავდეს საკუთარ აზრს და შეფასებას, აღწერდეს სხვადასხვა არგუმენტების ძლიერ და სუსტ მხარეებს, გამოხატავდეს, რომ წაიკითხა მოცემული მასალა და მოემზადა სემინარისთვის. გარდა ზეპირი კონტრიბუციისა, სტუდენტებმა უნდა წარმოადგინონ მოკლე შემაჯამებელი ესე ძირითადი საკითხებისა და განსახილველი კითხვების გარშემო.</p>  |
| შეფასების კრიტერიუმები                      | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) დასწრება და დისკუსიებში მონაწილეობა (20%)</li> <li>2) შუალედური ესე (10%)</li> <li>3) სტატია ვიკიპედიასთვის ან წიგნის მიმოხილვა (20%)</li> <li>4) პრეზენტაციები (10%)</li> <li>5) საბოლოო ესე (40%)</li> </ol>   |
| ძირითადი ლიტერატურა                         | <p><b>[Cudd and Andreasen]:</b> Ann E. Cudd and Robin O. Andreasen (ed.), <i>Feminist Theory, A Philosophical Anthology</i> (Blackwell Philosophy Anthologies) (Blackwell Publishing, 2004)</p> <p><b>[Nicholson]:</b> Linda Nicholson (ed.), <i>The Second Wave. A Reader in Feminist Theory</i> (New York and London: Routledge, 1997)</p> <p><b>[McCann and Kim]:</b> Carole R. McCann and Seung-Kyung Kim (ed.), <i>Feminist Theory Reader: Local and Global Perspectives</i> (New York: Routledge, 2003)</p> <p><b>[Tuana and Tong]:</b> Nancy Tuana and Rosemarie Tong (ed.), <i>Feminism and Philosophy: Essential Readings in Theory, Reinterpretation, and Application</i> (Boulder, Co. and Oxford, UK: Westview Press, 1995)</p> <p><b>[Narayan and Harding]:</b> Uma Narayan and Sandra Harding (ed.), <i>Decentering the Center: Philosophy for a Multicultural, Postcolonial, and Feminist World</i> (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000)</p> |
| დამხმარე ლიტერატურა და სხვა სასწავლო მასალა |  |
| დამატებითი ინფორმაცია/პირობები              |  |

სასწავლო კურსის შინაარსი

| N | თემა (ლექცია/სამუშაო ჯგუფი/პრაქტიკული, ლაბორატორიული სამუშაო და ა.შ.)   | სასწავლო მასალა   |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | <p><b>1. შესავალი. ჩაგვრა და სექსიზმი</b></p> <p>What is Sexism? What is Oppression? Is women’s subjugation universal? Or is it overwhelming, or widespread at least? How to account for it? And how such an accounts can be important for feminist politics? What are the implications of various purported explanations of the universality of women’s oppression for emancipatory projects?</p>  | <p><b>შესავალი (1-ლი შეხვედრა):</b></p> <p>Introduction to the course, discussion of the requirements.</p> <p>Please read before the first meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⌋ Joan W. Scott, “Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis”, <i>American Historical Review</i> 91, No. 5 (December 1986), pp. 1053-1075 (see especially pp. 1066-1075).</li> </ul>   |
| 2 | <p><b>კვირა I: ჩაგვრა, სექსიზმი, პატრიარქატი</b></p> <p>Oppression as an analytic category: as a systematic and structural characteristic of a society that affects an individual qua a member of certain social group; invisibility of oppression and asymmetrical character of its recognition. How the need to account for the unprivileged status of women as a group necessitates the recognition of another analytical category, sexism, which is also a systematic and structural characteristic of society, as invisible and difficult to recognize as oppression itself.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⌋ Ann Cudd and Leslie Jones (2003), “Sexism”, in Cudd and Andreasen, pp. 73-83</li> <li>⌋ Iris Marion Young (1998), “The Five Faces of Oppression”, in Cudd and Andreasen, pp. 91-104</li> <li>⌋ Marilyn Frye (1983), “Oppression”, in Cudd and Andreasen, pp. 84-90</li> <li>⌋ Carole Pateman, <i>The Sexual Contract</i> (Stanford University Press, 1988), pp. 1-18</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommended reading:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>⌋ Catharine MacKinnon, “Sexuality, Pornography, and Method: Pleasure under Patriarchy” (Tuana and Tong, pp. 134-161)</li> <li>⌋ Carole Pateman, <i>The Sexual Contract</i> (Stanford University</li> </ul> |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   |  | Press, 1988), pp. 19-153   |
| 3 | <p><b>კვირა II: ქალების მდგომარეობის ახსნა: ბიოლოგია თუ კულტურა?</b></p> <p>Some explanations of the ubiquitous character of women’s subordination: alternatives to biological determinism. What are the implications of Rubin’s explanation along the lines of structuralism and psychoanalyses? Where does Chodorow’s view of the origins of gender hierarchies leave us in respect of politics? Evolutionary explanations (the concept of parental investment): their appeal, their limitations and their relevance to political projects.</p>  | <p>) Gale Rubin (1975), “The Traffic in Women”, in Nicholson, pp. 27-62</p> <p>) Nancy Chodorow (1978), “The Psychodynamics of the Family”, in Nicholson, pp. 181-197</p> <p>) Independent research on paradigmatic explanations in evolutionary psychology.</p>   |
| 4 | <p><b>კვირა III: ქალების მდგომარეობის ახსნა: სუბიექტურობა და სხვად ყოფნა</b></p> <p>Simone de Beauvoir’s view of woman’s condition: authenticity, subjectivity, otherness. The question of origins of the condition of otherness. Beauvoir’s view of liberation. Kristeva’s concept of abjection: symbolic order with its subject-object pair versus its outside, the abject. Views of essential femininity. Irigaray on symbolic roots of women’s subjugation. Projects of affirmative womanhood. The difference of women as a resource for emancipatory politics. Gilligan’s views of specifically female moral understanding.</p> | <p>) Simone de Beauvoir (1949) , <i>The Second Sex</i>, “Introduction” and “Conclusion”, in Cudd and Andreasen, pp. 27-36, 383-391</p> <p>) Luce Irigaray, “This Sex Which is Not One” (1977), “The Power of Discourse and the Subordination of the Feminine” (1975), in Luce Irigaray, <i>This Sex Which is Not One</i>, trans. by C. Porter and C. Burke (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985), pp. 23-34, 68-85</p> <p><b>Recommended reading:</b></p> <p>) Mary Felstiner (1980), “Seeing The Second Sex Through the Second Wave”, <i>Feminist Studies</i>, Vol. 6, No. 2, 1980, pp. 247-276</p> <p>) Julia Kristeva (1980), “Approaching Abjection” from <i>The Powers of Horror</i>, in <i>The Portable Kristeva</i>, second edition (Columbia University Press, 2002), pp. 229-247</p> <p>) Hélène Cixous (1975), “The Laugh of the Medusa”, <i>Signs</i>, Vol. 1, No. 4, 1976, pp. 875-893</p> <p>) Andrea Nay (??), “The Voice of the Serpent: French Feminism and Philosophy of Language”, in Ann Garry and Marilyn Pearsall (ed.), <i>Women, Knowledge, and Reality</i> (Routledge, 1992), pp. 323-338</p> <p>) Carol Gilligan (1982),</p> |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
|   |  | <p>“Introduction”, “Women’s Place in Man’s Life Circle”, in Carol Gilligan, <i>In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women’s Development</i> (Harvard University Press, 6th edition, 1993), pp. 1-23</p>  |
| 5 | <p><b>კვირა IV: ქალად ყოფნა, როგორც ისტორიული სიტუაცია. სხეულეზრები სუბიექტურობა: დაბრუნება ბოვუართან</b></p> <p>How is woman’s gendered social existence connected to her physical existence as a sexed body? Is “becoming a woman” the result of one’s arbitrary/free choice? Or is one destined to become a woman just by one’s female biology? Is femaleness (sex in general) something preceding and independent of social identities?</p>  | <p>⌋ Judith Butler (1986), “Sex and Gender in Simone de Beauvoir’s Second Sex”, <i>Yale French Studies</i>, #72, 1986, pp. 35-49</p> <p>⌋ Judith Butler (1988), “Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory”, <i>Theatre Journal</i>, Vol. 40, No. 4 (Dec., 1988), pp. 519-531</p> <p>⌋ Sonia Kruks (1992), “Gender and Subjectivity: Simone de Beauvoir and Contemporary Feminism”, <i>Signs</i>, Vol. 18, No. 1, 1992, pp. 89-110</p> <p><b>Recommended reading:</b></p> <p>⌋ Iris Marion Young (1984), “Pregnant Embodiment: Subjectivity and Alienation”, part 1: 45-54, <i>Journal of Medicine and Philosophy</i>, Volume 9, Number 1, pp. 45-62, also in Tuana and Tong, pp. 407-419</p> |
| 6 | <p><b>კვირა V: ეჭვები სქესსა და გენდერს შორის განსხვავების მიმართ</b></p> <p>Building up on the insights gained in the previous week, further questioning of the assumed distinction between sex and gender will be undertaken. Two central questions to be addressed: 1) How is it theoretically possible to dismiss sex as the biological basis of gender? In other words, what kind of theoretical construction would make it plausible to think of biology/sex as socially constructed? 2) What are the implications of so dismissing sex as the biological basis of gender for feminist politics? In particular, how is the concept “women” delineated?</p> | <p>⌋ Christine Delphy (1993), “Rethinking Sex and Gender”, in McCann and Kim, pp. 57-67</p> <p>⌋ Linda Nicholson (1994), “Interpreting Gender”, <i>Signs</i>, Vol. 20, No. 1, 1994, pp. 79-105</p> <p><b>Recommended reading:</b></p> <p>⌋ Judith Butler (1993), “Introduction” to <i>Bodies That Matter</i>, in Judith Butler, <i>Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex</i> (Routledge, 1993), pp. 1-23</p> <p>⌋ Thomas Laqueur (1992), “Destiny Is Anatomy”, “New Science, One Flesh”, in <i>Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud</i> (Harvard University Press, 1992), pp. 25-113</p>   |
| 7 | <p><b>კვირა VI: ჰეტერონორმატიულობა და</b></p>  | <p>⌋ Monique Wittig (1981) “One is Not Born a Woman”, <i>Feminist Issues</i> 1,</p>  |

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
|   | <p><b>გენდერული იერარქიები</b><br/> How “natural” is heterosexuality for women? What is the role played by the heteronormativity, or, as many authors label it, the compulsory heterosexuality in establishing and reinforcing male domination? Two issues already discussed previously will be also addressed: on the one hand, the discussion of the theories of origins of women’s dominated status will be continued; on the other hand, the issue of differences between women will come to the foreground.</p>                                      | <p>no. 2 (Winter 1981), reprinted in <i>Straight Mind and Other Essays</i> (Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press, 1992), pp. 9-20. Also in Nicholson, pp. 265-271</p> <p>) Adrienne Rich (1980), “Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence”, <i>Signs</i>, Vol. 5, No. 4, 1980, pp. 631-660</p> <p><b>Recommended reading:</b></p> <p>) Catharine Mackinnon (1989), “Sexuality”, in Nicholson, pp. 158-180</p> <p>) R. Ruby Rich (1986), “Feminism and Sexuality in the 1980s”, <i>Feminist Studies</i>, 12, No 3, 1986, pp. 525-561</p> <p>) Elisabeth A. Lloyd (1993), “Pre-Theoretical Assumptions in Evolutionary Explanations of Female Sexuality”, in Cudd and Andreasen, pp. 119-128</p> |
| 8 | <p><b>კვირა VII: ფუკო სექსუალობის შესახებ</b><br/> Historicity of discourses of sexuality; sexuality and power.</p>   | <p>) Michel Foucault (1976), <i>The History of Sexuality Vol. 1: The Will to Knowledge</i> (Vintage Books, 1990), pp. 1-91, 135-59.</p> <p>) Michel Foucault (1977), “Power and Sex”, in <i>Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977-1984</i> (Ed. Lawrence Kritzman, Routledge, 1990), pp. 110-124</p>  |
| 9 | <p><b>კვირა VIII: სხეულის ფერი და ფერადი სხეულები: გენდერსა და რასაზე დამყარებული იერარქიული ღერძების ურთიერთკვეთა</b><br/> Do bodies have colors? Do just some bodies or all of them have a color? What is the significance of the color of a body? Does it have any significance for one’s womanhood? for one’s political solidarities and loyalties? for feminist emancipatory projects? Do all axes of difference have to be axes of power asymmetry? What does intersectionality mean and how does its acknowledgement affect feminist politics?</p> | <p>) The Combahee River Collective (1977), “A Black Feminist Statement”, in Nicholson, pp. 63-70</p> <p>) Frantz Fanon (1952), “The Fact of Blackness”, in <i>Black Skin, White Masks</i> (Paladin, 1970), pp. 77-99</p> <p>) Ruth Frankenberg (1993), “Introduction: Points of Origin, Points of Departure”, in <i>White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness</i> (University of Minnesota Press, 1993), pp. 1-22</p> <p><b>Recommended reading:</b></p> <p>) Norma Alarcon (??), “The Theoretical Subjects of The Bridge Called My Back and Anglo-American Feminism, in Nicholson,</p>  |

|    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
|    |   | <p>pp. 288-299</p> <p>) Audre Lorde (1984), “Age, Race, Class and Sex: Women Redefining Difference”, in Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan (ed.), <i>Literary Theory: an Anthology</i> (Mass: Blackwell, 1998), pp. 854-860</p> <p>) Gloria Anzaldua (1987), “La Concientia de la Mestiza”, in McCann and Kim, pp. 179-187</p>  |
| 10 | <p><b>კვირა IX: კოლონიური დისკურსის დეკონსტრუქცია</b></p> <p>Is it possible to speak of women’s oppression in other cultures/societies? What are consequences of western feminists labeling “third world” women subjugated and “third world” practices patriarchal or oppressive? What does speaking for or about the “third world” imply? On the other hand, are the implications of refusing to speak for the “third world” very different? Who can speak, who is entitled to speak, and who is obliged to speak?</p> | <p>) Chandra Talpade Mohanty (1984), “Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses”, in <i>Boundary</i>, 2, Vol. 12, No. 3, 1984), pp. 333-358</p> <p>) Dipesh Chakrabarty (1992), “Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History: Who Speaks for “Indian” pasts?”, <i>Representations</i> 37 (1992), pp. 1-26</p> <p>) Uma Narayan (2000), “Essence of Culture and a Sense of History: A feminist Critique of Cultural Essentialism”, in Narayan and Harding, pp. 80-100</p> <p>) József Böröcz (2006), “Goodness is Elsewhere: The Rule of European Difference”, <i>Comparative Studies in Society and History</i> 48 (2006) 1, pp. 110-138</p> <p><b>Recommended reading:</b></p> <p>) Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (1988), “Can the Subaltern Speak?” in Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (ed.), <i>Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture</i> (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988), pp. 271-313</p> <p>) Uma Narayan, <i>Dislocating Cultures. Identities, Traditions, And Third World Feminism</i> (Routledge 1997), pp. 41-117, 195-209.</p> <p>) Linda Alcoff (2000), “What Should White People Do”, in Narayan and Harding, pp. 262-282</p> <p>) Chandra Talpade Mohanty (2002), “Under Western Eyes Revisited: Feminist Solidarity through Anticapitalist Struggles”, <i>Signs</i>, Vol. 28, No. 2, 2002, pp. 499-535</p> |



|           |  |   |
|-----------|--|---|
| <p>11</p> | <p><b>კვირა X-XI: ქალის კატეგორიის პრობლემურობა:</b><br/> <b>აუცილებელია თუ არა ეს კატეგორია ფემინისტური პოლიტიკისთვის?</b></p> <p>The problematic character of the category of women – a problem for feminist politics? How to construct such a category if needed? Back to the biology? Or common social conditioning and/or common experience? The idea of seriality.</p> <p>Continuing the issue of the category of women as a necessary basis for feminist politics. The idea of performativity of gender explored deeper. Assumptions of feminist/liberal/progressivist political discourse concerning the agency and subjectivity. How to understand agency in right-wing, “patriarchal”, “fundamentalist” movements? Agency – necessarily connected with social change and transformation?</p> | <p>J Linda Alcoff (1988), “Cultural Feminism Versus Post-Structuralism: The Identity Crisis in Feminist Theory”, <i>Signs</i>, Vol. 13, No. 3. 988, pp. 405-436, reprinted in Nicholson, pp. 330-355</p> <p>J Judith Butler (1990), “Subjects of Sex/Gender/Desire”, in <i>Gender Trouble</i> (Routledge, 2006), pp. 1-34</p> <p>J Wendy Brown (1993), “Wounded Attachments”, <i>Political Theory</i> Vol. 21, No. 3 (Aug., 1993), pp. 390-410</p> <p>J Marilyn Frye (1996), “The Necessity of Difference: Constructing a Positive Category of Women”, <i>Signs</i>, Vol. 21, No. 4, 1996, pp. 991-1010</p> <p>J Rogers Brubaker, Frederick Cooper (2000), “Beyond “Identity” ”, <i>Theory and Society</i> 29 (2000), pp. 1-47.</p> <p>J Saba Mahmood (2005), “The Subject of Freedom”, in <i>Politics of Piety, The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject</i> (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2005), pp. 1-39</p> <p><b>Recommended reading:</b></p> <p>J Julia Kristeva (1979), “Women’s Time”, <i>Signs</i>, Vol. 7, No. 1. (Autumn, 1981), pp. 13-35</p> <p>J Nancy Fraser (1992), “Structuralism or Pragmatics? On Discourse Theory and Feminist Politics”, in Nicholson, pp. 379-395</p> <p>J Iris Marion Young (1994) “Gender as Seriality. Thinking about Women as a Social Collective”, <i>Signs</i>, Vol. 19, No. 3, 1994, pp. 713-738</p> <p>J Adrienne Rich (2001), “Notes Toward a Politics of Location”, in McCann and Kim, pp. 447-459</p> <p>J Chandra Talpade Mohanty (1997), “Feminist Encounters: Locating the Politics of Experience”, in McCann and Kim, pp. 460-471</p> |
| <p>12</p> | <p><b>3. ფემინისტური ეპისტემოლოგიები</b></p>   | <p>J Nancy Hartsock (1983), “The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically</p>  |

|    |  |   |
|----|--|---|
|    | <p><b>კვირა XIII: პოზიციის ეპისტემოლოგიის ადრეული ფორმულირებები</b></p> <p>How is knowledge about the society produced? What are ways of validating knowledge claims and how does social location of the knowledge-producer affect the knowledge produced?</p>   | <p>Feminist Historical Materialism”, in McCann and Kim, pp. 292-307</p> <p>) Dorothy Smith (1974), “Women’s Perspective as a Radical Critique of Sociology”, <i>Sociological Inquiry</i> 44, 1974, pp. 7-13. Also in Harding (ed.), <i>The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies</i> (Routledge, 2003), pp. 21-33</p> <p>) Donna Haraway (1989), “Situated Knowledge: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective”, in Haraway, <i>Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature</i> (Routledge, 1990), pp. 183-202; reprinted in McCann and Kim, pp. 391-403, or Harding (ed.), <i>The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies</i> (Routledge, 2003), pp. 81-102</p>  |
| 13 | <p><b>კვირა XIV: სხვების ნაცვლად საუბრის პრობლემა და გამოცდილების მნიშვნელობა ცოდნის პრეტენზიებში</b></p> <p>Who is entitled to produce knowledge? Does the first person have a privilege in respect of the truth of knowledge claims? Difficulties with “Experientialism” and the notion of “the infallibility of oppressed”.</p> | <p>) Linda Alcoff (1991), “The Problem of Speaking for Others”, <i>Cultural Critique</i>, No 20, 1991-92, pp. 5-32</p> <p>) Joan Wallach Scott (1991), “Experience”, in Butler and Scott, <i>Feminists Theorize the Political</i> (New York and London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 22-40</p> <p><b>Recommended reading:</b></p> <p>) Maria Lugones and Elizabeth Spelman (1998), “Have We Got a Theory for You! Feminist Theory, Cultural Imperialism and the Demand for ‘the Woman’s Voice’”, in Tuana and Tong, pp. 494-507</p> <p>) Alison Wylie (1992), “Reasoning about Ourselves: Feminist Methodology in the Social Sciences”, in <i>Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science</i>, ed. by Michael Martin and Lee C. McIntyre (The MIT Press, 1994), pp. 611-624</p> <p>) Donna Haraway (1989), “A Cyborg Manifesto”, in: <i>Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature</i> (Routledge, 1990), 149-181</p> |

|    |   |  |
|----|---|--|
| 14 | <p><b>კვირა XV: ფემინისტური მეცნიერების პერსპექტივები</b></p> <p>Feminist epistemology and philosophy of science: in what sense can and should feminist knowledge, science, or research be feminist? What is (should be) the relationship between knowledge projects and (feminist) political projects?</p> | <p>) Helen Longino (1987), “Can There Be a Feminist Science?”, in Cudd and Andreasen, pp. 210-217</p> <p>) Sandra Harding (1993), “Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What is Strong Objectivity”, in Cudd and Andreasen, pp. 218-236</p> <p><b>Recommended reading:</b></p> <p>) Uma Narayan (1989), “The Project of Feminist Epistemology: Perspectives from a Nonwestern Feminist”, in McCann and Kim, pp. 308-317</p> |
|----|---|--|

Center for Social Sciences,  
at Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University

## **FEMINIST PHILOSOPHY**

10 ECTS credits

One term (15 weeks)

AY 2010-2011; Spring semester

**TAMAR TSKHADADZE**

[tamunats@gmail.com](mailto:tamunats@gmail.com), 899516876

### **COURSE DESCRIPTION:**

**Overview:** The course will examine conceptual and normative issues in contemporary feminist theory. Issues to be discussed include the relation between sex and gender, power and knowledge-production, resistance, the interrelatedness of gender, race, class, and sexuality, woman versus women debate, relation between feminist theory and activism. Both western and non-western feminist discussions of these themes will be considered.

The course consists of three parts: Part 1 (weeks 1-4), which also serves as an introduction, concentrates on feminist theorizing of women's experience of oppression and feminist attempts to explain the origins of this ubiquity of this oppression; the question of political implications of various theoretical approaches will be also addressed. Part 2 (weeks 5-12), which constitutes the core of the course, focuses on feminist theorizing of various identities and differences, and on the problem of identity in feminist politics. Intersections and interrelations between the differential axes of sexuality, race, class, religion, ethnicity, etc, problems and prospects of non-imperialist, non-exclusive conceptions of women and feminism will be discussed. The concluding Part 3 (weeks 13-15) covers some issues in feminist epistemologies.

**Objectives:** The goal of the course is for each student to appreciate the diversity and complexity of feminist thought, to gain insight concerning the relation between women's experiences and feminist theorizing, to develop sensitivity to implications of various discourses and practices related to and/or affecting women's lives, to master conceptual and theoretical apparatus for analyzing and evaluating various theoretical viewpoints and political projects.

The texts assigned for reading are selected with two ends in view: to make the list as comprehensive as possible in respect of diversity both of viewpoints and issues, on the one hand, and to provide students with enough material for in-depth understanding of some selected issues.

**Outcomes:** After successful completion of the course, students will be acquainted with key concepts, issues and trends in feminist philosophy. They will have studied many foundational texts constituting the reference points in contemporary feminist debates. They will develop skills of critically reading texts, of interconnecting, comparing and adjudicating various positions and arguments, of creatively using the studied material for articulating and supporting their own viewpoints.

Intensive writing requirements will help students to develop their academic writing skills; while required presentations and participation in classroom discussions will enhance their skills of oral presentation.

## **COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND STUDENTS' ASSESSMENT:**

**1) Midterm paper (10%):** Students shall write 1 short paper (around 1600 words) on topic (one from each part of the course) that they select from the options offered by the instructor. A paper will embody a short outline of the theses and arguments presented in at least two required texts on the same issue, together with the student's response to them.

**2) Final paper (40%):** Students shall write a final paper (3000 to 4000 words) on a selected topic (to be agreed in advance with the instructor) drawing on both required and recommended readings. The paper will present an analyses and evaluation of different positions and arguments on the topic.

**3) Wikipedia article or a book review (20%):** Each student shall select a topic on feminism or gender studies on which she/he will write a wikipedia article to be posted on the web by the end of the term. Alternatively, a student shall select a monograph in feminist theory/gender studies published within last 5 years and write a review by the end of the term (the title to be reviewed should be agreed with the instructor in advance).

**4) Two presentations (10%, 5% each):** Each student will be scheduled to present (twice during the term) a short overview of the reading assignments to open the discussion and to set the questions to be addressed in the discussion (about 10 minutes). In their presentations, students are expected to outline clearly and succinctly the principal problem at issue, main lines of arguments presented in the texts, and to present their considered judgment respecting them.

**5) Participation in classroom discussions, response questions for reading assignments (20%):** Discussions will serve the in-depth understanding of selected arguments and problems from the week's lecture and reading material; the application of thus gained insights to the present situations and controversies in Georgia. Active participation (i.e. one earning a point) implies that a student, through engaging in discussion, expressing her/his own interpretations and evaluations, pointing out strengths and weaknesses of various arguments, demonstrates to have studied and reflected on all required assignments. In addition to oral contributions, students are required to submit very short (1/2 page) summaries of the key issues and response questions to the readings for the day at least for 15 meetings (out of 30) during the term.

## **IMPORTANT DATES:**

**March 16** – Topic for the Wikipedia article or the book title for review due

**March 30** – Midterm paper due

**April 15** –The first draft of the final paper due

**April 27** – Draft version of the Wikipedia article or the book review due

**May 6** – The final draft of the final paper with annotated bibliography due

**May 18** – The Final version of Wikipedia article to be uploaded or the book review to be submitted

**June 6** – Final paper due

## **BOOKS FOR THE COURSE:**

Most reading assignments come from the following anthologies referred to by editors in the syllabus:

**[Cudd and Andreasen]:** Ann E. Cudd and Robin O. Andreasen (ed.), *Feminist Theory, A Philosophical Anthology* (Blackwell Philosophy Anthologies) (Blackwell Publishing, 2004)

**[Nicholson]:** Linda Nicholson (ed.), *The Second Wave. A Reader in Feminist Theory* (New York and London: Routledge, 1997)

**[McCann and Kim]:** Carole R. McCann and Seung-Kyung Kim (ed.), *Feminist Theory Reader: Local and Global Perspectives* (New York: Routledge, 2003)

**[Tuana and Tong]:** Nancy Tuana and Rosemarie Tong (ed.), *Feminism and Philosophy: Essential Readings in Theory, Reinterpretation, and Application* (Boulder, Co. and Oxford, UK: Westview Press, 1995)

**[Narayan and Harding]:** Uma Narayan and Sandra Harding (ed.), *Decentering the Center: Philosophy for a Multicultural, Postcolonial, and Feminist World* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000)

Sources for reading assignments not included in the above anthologies are specified in the syllabus together with the titles of assigned articles.

## 1. INTRODUCTION. OPPRESSION AND SEXISM. THEORIES OF THE ORIGINS OF WOMEN'S SUBJUGATION.

What is Sexism? What is Oppression? Is women's subjugation universal? Or is it overwhelming, or widespread at least? How to account for it? And how such an accounts can be important for feminist politics? What are the implications of various purported explanations of the universality of women's oppression for emancipatory projects?

### Introduction (1<sup>st</sup> meeting):

Introduction to the course, discussion of the requirements.

Please read before the first meeting:

- ) Joan W. Scott, "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis", *American Historical Review* 91, No. 5 (December 1986), pp. 1053-1075 (see especially pp. 1066-1075).

### Week I: Oppression, Sexism, Patriarchy

Oppression as an analytic category: as a systematic and structural characteristic of a society that affects an individual qua a member of certain social group; invisibility of oppression and asymmetrical character of its recognition. How the need to account for the unprivileged status of women as a group necessitates the recognition of another analytical category, sexism, which is also a systematic and structural characteristic of society, as invisible and difficult to recognize as oppression itself.

- ) Ann Cudd and Leslie Jones (2003), "Sexism", in Cudd and Andreasen, pp. 73-83
- ) Iris Marion Young (1998), "The Five Faces of Oppression", in Cudd and Andreasen, pp. 91-104
- ) Marilyn Frye (1983), "Oppression", in Cudd and Andreasen, pp. 84-90
- ) Carole Pateman, *The Sexual Contract* (Stanford University Press, 1988), pp. 1-18

### Recommended reading:

- ) Catharine MacKinnon, "Sexuality, Pornography, and Method: Pleasure under Patriarchy" (Tuana and Tong, pp. 134-161)
- ) Carole Pateman, *The Sexual Contract* (Stanford University Press, 1988), pp. 19-153

### Week II: Explaining Woman's Condition: Biology vs. Culture

Some explanations of the ubiquitous character of women's subordination: alternatives to biological determinism. What are the implications of Rubin's explanation along the lines of structuralism and psychoanalyses? Where does Chodorow's view of the origins of gender hierarchies leave us in respect of politics? Evolutionary explanations (the concept of parental investment): their appeal, their limitations and their relevance to political projects.

- ) Gale Rubin (1975), "The Traffic in Women", in Nicholson, pp. 27-62
- ) Nancy Chodorow (1978), "The Psychodynamics of the Family", in Nicholson, pp. 181-197
- ) Independent research on paradigmatic explanations in evolutionary psychology.

### **Week III: Explaining Woman's Condition: Subjectivity and Otherness. Difference instead of Otherness**

Simone de Beauvoir's view of woman's condition: authenticity, subjectivity, otherness. The question of origins of the condition of otherness. Beauvoir's view of liberation. Kristeva's concept of abjection: symbolic order with its subject-object pair versus its outside, the abject. Views of essential femininity. Irigaray on symbolic roots of women's subjugation. Projects of affirmative womanhood. The difference of women as a resource for emancipatory politics. Gilligan's views of specifically female moral understanding.

- J Simone de Beauvoir (1949), *The Second Sex*, "Introduction" and "Conclusion", in Cudd and Andreasen, pp. 27-36, 383-391
- J Luce Irigaray, "This Sex Which is Not One" (1977), "The Power of Discourse and the Subordination of the Feminine" (1975), in Luce Irigaray, *This Sex Which is Not One*, trans. by C. Porter and C. Burke (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1985), pp. 23-34, 68-85

#### **Recommended reading:**

- J Mary Felstiner (1980), "Seeing The Second Sex Through the Second Wave", *Feminist Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 2, 1980, pp. 247-276
- J Julia Kristeva (1980), "Approaching Abjection" from *The Powers of Horror*, in *The Portable Kristeva*, second edition (Columbia University Press, 2002), pp. 229-247
- J Hélène Cixous (1975), "The Laugh of the Medusa", *Signs*, Vol. 1, No. 4, 1976, pp. 875-893
- J Andrea Nay (???), "The Voice of the Serpent: French Feminism and Philosophy of Language", in Ann Garry and Marilyn Pearsall (ed.), *Women, Knowledge, and Reality* (Routledge, 1992), pp. 323-338
- J Carol Gilligan (1982), "Introduction", "Women's Place in Man's Life Circle", in Carol Gilligan, *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development* (Harvard University Press, 6th edition, 1993), pp. 1-23

### **Week IV: Womanhood as a Historical Situation. Embodied Subjectivity: Rereading Beauvoir**

How is woman's gendered social existence connected to her physical existence as a sexed body? Is "becoming a woman" the result of one's arbitrary/free choice? Or is one destined to become a woman just by one's female biology? Is femaleness (sex in general) something preceding and independent of social identities?

- J Judith Butler (1986), "Sex and Gender in Simone de Beauvoir's *Second Sex*", *Yale French Studies*, #72, 1986, pp. 35-49
- J Judith Butler (1988), "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution: An Essay in Phenomenology and Feminist Theory", *Theatre Journal*, Vol. 40, No. 4 (Dec., 1988), pp. 519-531
- J Sonia Kruks (1992), "Gender and Subjectivity: Simone de Beauvoir and Contemporary Feminism", *Signs*, Vol. 18, No. 1, 1992, pp. 89-110

#### **Recommended reading:**

- J Iris Marion Young (1984), "Pregnant Embodiment: Subjectivity and Alienation", part 1: 45-54, *Journal of Medicine and Philosophy*, Volume 9, Number 1, pp. 45-62, also in Tuana and Tong, pp. 407-419



## 2. THE DIFFERENCE OF WOMEN AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN WOMEN. INTERSECTIONALITY.

### Week V: Challenging Sex/Gender Opposition

Building up on the insights gained in the previous week, further questioning of the assumed distinction between sex and gender will be undertaken. Two central questions to be addressed: 1) How is it theoretically possible to dismiss sex as the biological basis of gender? In other words, what kind of theoretical construction would make it plausible to think of biology/sex as socially constructed? 2) What are the implications of so dismissing sex as the biological basis of gender for feminist politics? In particular, how is the concept “women” delineated?

) Christine Delphy (1993), “Rethinking Sex and Gender”, in McCann and Kim, pp. 57-67

) Linda Nicholson (1994), “Interpreting Gender”, *Signs*, Vol. 20, No. 1, 1994, pp. 79-105

#### Recommended reading:

) Judith Butler (1993), “Introduction” to *Bodies That Matter*, in Judith Butler, *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex* (Routledge, 1993), pp. 1-23

) Thomas Laqueur (1992), “Destiny Is Anatomy”, “New Science, One Flesh”, in *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Harvard University Press, 1992), pp. 25-113

### Week VI: Heteronormativity and Gender Hierarchies

How “natural” is heterosexuality for women? What is the role played by the heteronormativity, or, as many authors label it, the compulsory heterosexuality in establishing and reinforcing male domination? Two issues already discussed previously will be also addressed: on the one hand, the discussion of the theories of origins of women’s dominated status will be continued; on the other hand, the issue of differences between women will come to the foreground.

) Monique Wittig (1981) “One is Not Born a Woman”, *Feminist Issues* 1, no. 2 (Winter 1981), reprinted in *Straight Mind and Other Essays* (Boston, Massachusetts: Beacon Press, 1992), pp. 9-20. Also in Nicholson, pp. 265-271

) Adrienne Rich (1980), “Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence”, *Signs*, Vol. 5, No. 4, 1980, pp. 631-660

#### Recommended reading:

) Catharine Mackinnon (1989), “Sexuality”, in Nicholson, pp. 158-180

) R. Ruby Rich (1986), “Feminism and Sexuality in the 1980s”, *Feminist Studies*, 12, No 3, 1986, pp. 525-561

) Elisabeth A. Lloyd (1993), “Pre-Theoretical Assumptions in Evolutionary Explanations of Female Sexuality”, in Cudd and Andreasen, pp. 119-128

### Week VII: Foucault on Sexuality

Historicity of discourses of sexuality; sexuality and power.

) Michel Foucault (1976), *The History of Sexuality Vol. 1: The Will to Knowledge* (Vintage Books, 1990), pp. 1-91, 135-59.

) Michel Foucault (1977), “Power and Sex”, in *Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings, 1977-1984* (Ed. Lawrence Kritzman, Routledge, 1990), pp. 110-124

## Week VIII: A Color of Body and Bodies of Color

Do bodies have colors? Do just some bodies or all of them have a color? What is the significance of the color of a body? Does it have any significance for one's womanhood? for one's political solidarities and loyalties? for feminist emancipatory projects? Do all axes of difference have to be axes of power asymmetry? What does intersectionality mean and how does its acknowledgement affect feminist politics?

- J The Combahee River Collective (1977), "A Black Feminist Statement", in Nicholson, pp. 63-70
- J Frantz Fanon (1952), "The Fact of Blackness", in *Black Skin, White Masks* (Paladin, 1970), pp. 77-99
- J Ruth Frankenberg (1993), "Introduction: Points of Origin, Points of Departure", in *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness* (University of Minnesota Press, 1993), pp. 1-22

### Recommended reading:

- J Norma Alarcon (???), "The Theoretical Subjects of The Bridge Called My Back and Anglo-American Feminism, in Nicholson, pp. 288-299
- J Audre Lorde (1984), "Age, Race, Class and Sex: Women Redefining Difference", in Julie Rivkin and Michael Ryan (ed.), *Literary Theory: an Anthology* (Mass: Blackwell, 1998), pp. 854-860
- J Gloria Anzaldúa (1987), "La Conciencia de la Mestiza", in McCann and Kim, pp. 179-187

## Week IX: Deconstructing Colonial Discourse

Is it possible to speak of women's oppression in other cultures/societies? What are consequences of western feminists labeling "third world" women subjugated and "third world" practices patriarchal or oppressive? What does speaking for or about the "third world" imply? On the other hand, are the implications of refusing to speak for the "third world" very different? Who can speak, who is entitled to speak, and who is obliged to speak?

- J Chandra Talpade Mohanty (1984), "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses", in *Boundary 2*, Vol. 12, No. 3, 1984, pp. 333-358
- J Dipesh Chakrabarty (1992), "Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History: Who Speaks for "Indian" Pasts?", *Representations* 37 (1992), pp. 1-26
- J Uma Narayan (2000), "Essence of Culture and a Sense of History: A feminist Critique of Cultural Essentialism", in Narayan and Harding, pp. 80-100
- J József Böröcz (2006), "Goodness is Elsewhere: The Rule of European Difference", *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 48 (2006) 1, pp. 110-138

### Recommended reading:

- J Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (1988), "Can the Subaltern Speak?" in Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (ed.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988), pp. 271-313
- J Uma Narayan, *Dislocating Cultures. Identities, Traditions, And Third World Feminism* (Routledge 1997), pp. 41-117, 195-209.
- J Linda Alcoff (2000), "What Should White People Do", in Narayan and Harding, pp. 262-282
- J Chandra Talpade Mohanty (2002), "Under Western Eyes Revisited: Feminist Solidarity through Anticapitalist Struggles", *Signs*, Vol. 28, No. 2, 2002, pp. 499-535

## **Weeks X-XI: Feminist Politics with or without a Category of Women? Womanhood, Agency and Subjectivity.**

The problematic character of the category of women – a problem for feminist politics? How to construct such a category if needed? Back to the biology? Or common social conditioning and/or common experience? The idea of seriality.

Continuing the issue of the category of women as a necessary basis for feminist politics. The idea of performativity of gender explored deeper. Assumptions of feminist/liberal/progressivist political discourse concerning the agency and subjectivity. How to understand agency in right-wing, “patriarchal”, “fundamentalist” movements? Agency – necessarily connected with social change and transformation?

- J Linda Alcoff (1988), “Cultural Feminism Versus Post-Structuralism: The Identity Crisis in Feminist Theory”, *Signs*, Vol. 13, No. 3. 988, pp. 405-436, reprinted in Nicholson, pp. 330-355
- J Judith Butler (1990), “Subjects of Sex/Gender/Desire”, in *Gender Trouble* (Routledge, 2006), pp. 1-34
- J Wendy Brown (1993), “Wounded Attachments”, *Political Theory* Vol. 21, No. 3 (Aug., 1993), pp. 390-410
- J Marilyn Frye (1996), “The Necessity of Difference: Constructing a Positive Category of Women”, *Signs*, Vol. 21, No. 4, 1996, pp. 991-1010
- J Rogers Brubaker, Frederick Cooper (2000), “Beyond “Identity” ”, *Theory and Society* 29 (2000), pp. 1-47.
- J Saba Mahmood (2005), “The Subject of Freedom”, in *Politics of Piety, The Islamic Revival and the Feminist Subject* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2005), pp. 1-39

### **Recommended reading:**

- J Julia Kristeva (1979), “Women’s Time”, *Signs*, Vol. 7, No. 1. (Autumn, 1981), pp. 13-35
- J Nancy Fraser (1992), “Structuralism or Pragmatics? On Discourse Theory and Feminist Politics”, in Nicholson, pp. 379-395
- J Iris Marion Young (1994) “Gender as Seriality. Thinking about Women as a Social Collective”, *Signs*, Vol. 19, No. 3, 1994, pp. 713-738
- J Adrienne Rich (2001), “Notes Toward a Politics of Location”, in McCann and Kim, pp. 447-459
- J Chandra Talpade Mohanty (1997), “Feminist Encounters: Locating the Politics of Experience”, in McCann and Kim, pp. 460-471

## **3. FEMINIST EPISTEMOLOGIES**

### **Week XIII: Early Formulations of Standpoint Epistemology**

How is knowledge about the society produced? What are ways of validating knowledge claims and how does social location of the knowledge-producer affect the knowledge produced?

- J Nancy Hartsock (1983), “The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism”, in McCann and Kim, pp. 292-307
- J Dorothy Smith (1974), “Women’s Perspective as a Radical Critique of Sociology”, *Sociological Inquiry* 44, 1974, pp. 7-13. Also in Harding (ed.), *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (Routledge, 2003), pp. 21-33

- J Donna Haraway (1989), "Situated Knowledge: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective", in Haraway, *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (Routledge, 1990), pp. 183-202; reprinted in McCann and Kim, pp. 391-403, or Harding (ed.), *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (Routledge, 2003), pp. 81-102

#### **Week XIV: The Problem of Speaking for Others and the Status of Experience.**

Who is entitled to produce knowledge? Does the first person have a privilege in respect of the truth of knowledge claims? Difficulties with "Experientialism" and the notion of "the infallibility of oppressed".

- J Linda Alcoff (1991), "The Problem of Speaking for Others", *Cultural Critique*, No 20, 1991-92, pp. 5-32
- J Joan Wallach Scott (1991), "Experience", in Butler and Scott, *Feminists Theorize the Political* (New York and London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 22-40

#### **Recommended reading:**

- J Maria Lugones and Elizabeth Spelman (1998), "Have We Got a Theory for You! Feminist Theory, Cultural Imperialism and the Demand for 'the Woman's Voice'", in Tuana and Tong, pp. 494-507
- J Alison Wylie (1992), "Reasoning about Ourselves: Feminist Methodology in the Social Sciences", in *Readings in the Philosophy of Social Science*, ed. by Michael Martin and Lee C. McIntyre (The MIT Press, 1994), pp. 611-624
- J Donna Haraway (1989), "A Cyborg Manifesto", in: *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (Routledge, 1990), 149-181

#### **Week XV: Perspectives of Feminist Science**

Feminist epistemology and philosophy of science: in what sense can and should feminist knowledge, science, or research be feminist? What is (should be) the relationship between knowledge projects and (feminist) political projects?

- J Helen Longino (1987), "Can There Be a Feminist Science?", in Cudd and Andreasen, pp. 210-217
- J Sandra Harding (1993), "Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What is Strong Objectivity?", in Cudd and Andreasen, pp. 218-236

#### **Recommended reading:**

- J Uma Narayan (1989), "The Project of Feminist Epistemology: Perspectives from a Nonwestern Feminist", in McCann and Kim, pp. 308-317