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**Introduction**

This course examines the politics and politicization of human differences, and the politics and politicization of “culture”. It explores how and why differences are established, and how and why those differences can result in controversy, conflict and violence. It asks: once we know the how and why, what do we do next? What constitutes an ethical judgement or action? Is the problem culture – or how culture is defined and invoked?

This course aims to sharpen students’ abilities to:

* present, defend and rebut an argument
* understand and argue issues from multiple perspectives
* understand the politics and consequences of a particular argument
* understand the connections between ethics, the law, official policies and every-day life
* advocate and lobby

**Assignments**

 **Percentage of Course Mark Due Date and Time**

Position Paper 1 15% 11.59pm 20th January

Compare and Contrast 20% 11.59pm 3rd February

Summaries (2x 5%) 10% 11.59pm 14th February

 11.59pm 13th March

Group Presentation 10% 27th February (in class)

Position Paper 2 20% 11.59pm 23rd March

Big Essay 25% To be Decided by the Class

**Total 100%**

Please submit your assignments to the relevant DropBox on LEARN. **Students must complete all assignments and essays in order to pass this course.**

Late assignments or essays will be accepted for **TWO** days following the due date and time at a penalty of **5% PER DAY**. Anything submitted after this will not be accepted **UNLESS** students can provide a formal doctor’s note according to the University’s regulations.

Unclaimed assignments will be retained for one month after term grades become official in Quest. After that time, they will be destroyed in compliance with UW’s [confidential shredding procedures](http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infostor/Confidential%20Shredding%20procedures%202008.htm).

Text matching software (Turnitin®) will be used to screen assignments in this course to verify documented use of all materials and sources. Students have the option not to have their assignment /s screened by Turnitin.

**Summaries**

Choose **ONE** of the readings from weeks 5-7, and **ONE** of the readings from weeks 8-10. Write out, using quotation marks and page numbers, **TWO** quotations that capture the reading’s main ideas. In a **MAXIMUM** of **ONE** page, explain what those quotations are saying, and how they build the author’s argument.

Set out your assignment as follows:

Cover page (your first and last names; course code and title; author’s full name; title of article or chapter in quotation marks and in normal font)

On your one page:

Quotation 1

“Blablabla” (p302)

What this quotation is saying.

Quotation 2

“Blablabla” (p310)

What this quotation is saying.

Building the Argument

These two quotations…

Rubric

choice of quotations 2 x 5 10

formatting of quotations 2 x 5 (half mark penalties for each error) 10

what is each quotation saying 2 x 5 10

how do the two quotations together build the author’s argument 10

style and format 10

-1 mark if cover page missing or incomplete; -1 mark if set format not followed

**Part 1 Framing the Debates**

Weeks 1-2 Blame Cultural Relativism…?



Abu-Lughod, L 2002 “Do Muslim Women Really need Saving? Anthropological Reﬂections on Cultural Relativism and its Others’, *American Anthropologist* 104

Aya, R 2004 “Reign of Error: or the Case against Cognitive Cultural Relativism”, *Irish Journal of Sociology* 13(1)

Brown, M 2008 “Cultural Relativism 2.0”, *Current Anthropology* 49 (3) <http://www.csun.edu/~ss24912/Brown2008CulturalRelativism.pdf>

Zechenter, E 1997 “In the Name of Culture: Cultural Relativism and the Abuse of the Individual”, *Journal of Anthropological Research* 53

**Position Paper 1**

Cultural relativism is unethical. Agree OR disagree.

Cover page and reference section **(-1 mark if cover page missing; -1 mark if reference section missing)**

**MINIMUM** 1,300 words (excluding your cover page and reference section; automatic fail if under the minimum)

**MINIMUM** three readings from this unit (automatic fail if you are under the minimum)

**FOUR** main points – use headings **(-1 mark if there are no headings)**

Understanding and application of readings 20

Overarching argument/ hook 10

Quality of argument/ level of insight and analysis 20

Structure (organization of and flow between ideas) 10

Style (referencing; spelling; sentence structure, rhythm and flow; precision and flair with words) 10

Weeks 3-4 Civilizational Discourses



**https://apjjf.org/2015/13/27/Ellen-Sebring/4339.html**

Graeber D 2007 “There Never was a West” in *Possibilities: Essays on Hierarchy, Rebellion and Desire*, AK Press <https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/david-graeber-there-never-was-a-west>

Huntington, S 1993 “The Clash of Civilizations”, *Foreign Affairs* <http://www.bintjbeil.com/articles/en/d_huntington.html>

Irvine J T & Gal S 2000 “Language Ideology and Linguistic Differentiation” in Kroskrity P V (eds) *Regimes of Language: Ideologies, Polities and Identities*, Santa Fe: School of American Research Press <http://www.stanford.edu/~eckert/PDF/IrvineGal2000.pdf>

Tsing, A L 2004 “Introduction”, *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection,* Princeton: Princeton University Press

**Compare and Contrast**

Huntington and Graeber **OR** Huntington and Tsing **OR** Huntington and Irvine and Gal.

Cover page and reference section **(-1 mark for each missing item)**

**MINIMUM** 1,300 words (excl. cover page and reference section; automatic fail if you are under the minimum)

**FOUR** main points – use headings **(-1 mark if there are no headings)**

Understanding and application of readings 20

Overarching argument/ hook 10

Quality of argument/ level of insight and analysis 20

Structure (organization of and flow between ideas) 10

Style (referencing; spelling; sentence structure, rhythm and flow; precision and flair with words) 10

**Part 2 The Case Studies**

Weeks 5-7 Legislating Culture: Post-Apartheid South Africa

Albertyn C 2011 “‘The Stubborn Persistence of Patriarchy?’ Gender Equality and Cultural Diversity in South Africa” *Constitutional Court Review 2* <http://www.pulp.up.ac.za/pdf/2011_03/2011_03_f_sec2_1.pdf>

Mamdani M 1996 “Decentralised Despotism”, *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*, Kampala: Fountain Publishers

Nhlapo, T 2017 “Customary Law in Post-Apartheid South Africa: Constitutional Confrontations in Culture, Gender and ‘Living Law’”, *South African Journal on Human Rights* 33(1) <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02587203.2017.1303900>

Rautenbach C 2010 “Deep Legal Pluralism in South Africa: Judicial Accommodation of Non-State Law” *Journal of Legal Pluralism* No. 60 <http://commission-on-legal-pluralism.com/volumes/60/rautenbach-art.pdf>

Sibanda S 2010 “When is the Past not the Past? Reflections on Customary Law under South Africa’s Constitutional Dispensation” <http://www.wcl.american.edu/hrbrief/17/3sibanda.pdf>

**In-Class Group Presentation: The Power of Satire**

Design a satirical government or NGO campaign that EITHER bans culture OR makes it compulsory.

You choose which government or NGO.

5 min; 20 slides on auto-advance

Weeks 8-10 Cutting the Body



**http://www.jackyfleming.co.uk/cartoons/nggallery/cartoons/postcards**

Boddy, J 2008 “Legislating against Culture: Efforts to End Pharaonic Circumcision in the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan”, *The Finnish Anthropology Society* 33 (1)

Edmonds, A 2011 “‘Almost Invisible Scars’: Medical Tourism to Brazil”, *Signs*, 36 (2)

Jarrin, A 2015 “Towards a Biopolitics of Beauty: Eugenics, Aesthetic Hierarchies and Plastic Surgery in Brazil”, *Journal of Latin American Cultural Studies* 24(4)

Lock M & Scheper-Hughes N 1987 “A Prolegomenon to Future Work in Medical Anthropology”, *Medical Anthropology Quarterly* 1(1) <http://www.iupui.edu/~womrel/Rel%26HealingReadings/Scheper-Hughes_MindfulBody.pdf>

Lyons, H 2007 “Genital Cutting: The Past and Present of a Polythetic Category”, Africa Today, 53(4)

Pedwell, C 2007 “Theorizing ‘African’ Genital Cutting and ‘Western’ Body Modifications: A Critique of the Continuums and Analogue Approaches”, *Feminist Review* 86

Wade, L 2011 “Learning from Female ‘Genital Mutilation’: Lessons from Thirty Years of Academic Discourse”, *Ethnicities* 12(1)

**Position Paper 2**

Agree **OR** disagree with **ONE** of the following propositions:

1. Plastic surgery should be banned.

2. Genital cutting should be banned.

You must refer to **at least** **TWO** readings from this unit.

**MINIMUM** 1,400 words

**FOUR** main points – use headings

**Big Essay**

Find a recent news story from between 2010 and 2020 involving controversies about a “cultural practice”. Using that story as your case study and with reference to at least **FIVE** readings from the course, critically assess existing national OR international policies and/ or legislation towards that practice. Your essay can include recommendations for completely different or amended approaches. **TWO** of the five readings must come from weeks 5-7.

**MINIMUM** 2,000 words

**FIVE** main points – use headings

Embed the link to the news story in your text. Make the story central to your essay.

**Part 3**

Weeks 11-12 Review

**University Policies**

Academic Integrity: In order to maintain a culture of academic integrity, members of the University of Waterloo community are expected to promote honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility. www.uwaterloo.ca/academicintegrity/

Students who are unsure what constitutes an academic offence are requested to visit the on-line tutorial at http://www.lib.uwaterloo.ca/ait/

Research Ethics: Please also note that the ‘University of Waterloo requires all research conducted by its students, staff, and faculty which involves humans as participants to undergo prior ethics review and clearance through the Director, Office of Human Research and Animal Care (Office). The ethics review and clearance processes are intended to ensure that projects comply with the Office’s Guidelines for Research with Human Participants (Guidelines) as well as those of provincial and federal agencies, and that the safety, rights and welfare of participants are adequately protected. The Guidelines inform researchers about ethical issues and procedures which are of concern when conducting research with humans (e.g. confidentiality, risks and benefits, informed consent process, etc.). If the development of your research proposal consists of research that involves humans as participants, the please contact the course instructor for guidance and see <http://iris.uwaterloo.ca/ethics/>

Note for students with disabilities: The Office for Persons with Disabilities (OPD), located in Needles Hall, Room 1132, collaborates with all academic departments to arrange appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities without compromising the academic integrity of the curriculum. If you require academic accommodations to lessen the impact of your disability, please register with the OPD at the beginning of each academic term.

Religious Observances: Student needs to inform the instructor at the beginning of term if special accommodation needs to be made for religious observances that are not otherwise accounted for in the scheduling of classes and assignments.

**Grievance:**  A student who believes that a decision affecting some aspect of his/her university life has been unfair or unreasonable may have grounds for initiating a grievance. Read Policy 70 - Student Petitions and Grievances, Section 4, [www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy70.htm](http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy70.htm). When in doubt please contact your Undergraduate Advisor for details.

**Discipline:** A student is expected to know what constitutes academic integrity, to avoid committing academic offence, and to take responsibility for his/her actions. A student who is unsure whether an action constitutes an offense, or who needs help in learning how to avoid offenses (e.g., plagiarism, cheating) or about “rules” for group work/collaboration should seek guidance from the course professor, academic advisor, or the Undergraduate Associate Dean. For information on categories of offences and types of penalties, students should refer to Policy 71, Student Discipline, [www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy71.htm](http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy71.htm). For typical penalties, check Guidelines for Assessment of Penalties, [www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/guidelines/penaltyguidelines.htm](http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/guidelines/penaltyguidelines.htm)

**Appeals:** A decision made or penalty imposed under Policy 70 - Student Petitions and Grievances (other than a petition) or Policy 71 – (Student Discipline) may be appealed if there is a ground. A student who believes he/she has a ground for an appeal should refer to Policy 72 (Student Appeals) [www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy72.htm](http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy72.htm)