ESP M 263
Indigenous, Feminist, and Postcolonial Approaches to Science, Technology, and Environment

(Spring 2011)
Kim TallBear, Assistant Professor
Th 2:00-5:00, 2505 Tolman Hall
Course Control #: 30171, Units 4
E-mail: kimberly.tallbear@berkeley.edu
Office hours: Tu 11:30-1:00, W 10:00-11:30, 122 Giannini

OBJECT COLLABORATOR SCIENTIST TRAD. KNOWER

Tibet (1938), Anthropometric investigations
UC-Berkeley/Pinoleville Pomo Nation Co-designed home (“Low fidelity” version)
Nanibaa’ Garrison, Diné (Navajo) Geneticist and Bioethicist
Young Man’s First Sheep Hunt Kluane First Nation

COURSE DESCRIPTION & OBJECTIVES

This seminar introduces students to a multidisciplinary set of cases and analyses spanning fields including indigenous studies, feminist and environmental geography, cultural anthropology, natural resource management, engineering, cultural studies, and science and technology studies (STS), including especially feminist and postcolonial science studies and animal studies. This course adds to ESPM’s emphasis area within the division of Society & Environment (S&E) of Science, Technology, and Environment (STE) by bringing to the fore three overlapping approaches to analyzing science and technology projects—feminist, postcolonial, and indigenous analyses.

Common to these approaches and to STS is the idea that the scientific and the social/political are always already inside one another. We will emphasize the idea of “naturecultures” as we encounter thinkers who view the world not in the more usual terms of nature vs. culture, environment vs. humans, or science vs. society, but rather as made up of humans, non-humans, and other-than-human persons who act upon one another in mutually constitutive ways. Grounding this course is the idea that dichotomous thinking about humans vs. nature has gone hand-in-hand with scientific practices that have privileged the views and realities of particularly “First World” men at the expense of the views and realities of
historically marginalized social actors including indigenous and other non-western humans, women, and LGBTI people and cultures. Troubling the nature/culture dichotomy—taking fuller account of the cultures that ground all science—is necessary if science and technology projects are to become more democratic and if they are to meet the needs of more of the worlds’ people and non-humans.

By focusing on non-Western and feminist approaches to science and technology, we can expand upon and refine the already critical insights of western and not-explicitly feminist STS scholarship. A goal of this seminar is also to bring a more diverse array of students to consider the roles of science and technology in larger feminist, indigenous, and postcolonial projects. This is a less than typical approach to doing science studies. There is room especially for greater encroachment by postcolonial and indigenous approaches within the broader field. And I see those as especially conducive to conversations with feminist scholars of science and technology. Thus a triad of approaches provides our framework this semester.

Finally, in our interrogation of science and technology projects we will turn our critical gaze back on ourselves and our own historically contingent research to analyze our methodological and theoretical choices. We will emphasize generous and productive analyses and critique with each other.

REQUIRED TEXTS, READINGS, AND AVAILABILITY


All titles with the exception of Friedlaender and Turnbull are in stock at the ASUC as of 1/19/11 with 8 copies available for each. Some however, only have all used or all new copies. Some have both new and used available. Friedlaender is print upon order so you want to make sure
you get your order for this book in right away. At ASUC, go to the textbook info desk and place a special order. Turnbull was out of stock with the ASUC bookstore supplier so they didn’t get it. It is sometimes difficult to find. However, I see 15 new and 8 used copies on Amazon.com as of 1/19/11 ($44-$46). Weir is currently available at the ASUC, but note that it’s not easy to find generally. There are only a couple of copies available as of 1/19.

In addition, they will be on two-hour reserve at the Koshland Bioscience & Natural Resources Library. See http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/BIOS/index.html for more information.

E-Reader & bSpace

Very occasionally you are assigned readings available on the internet. URLs are provided on this syllabus. Most of the assigned journal articles can be downloaded from our course bSpace site, accessible at https://bspace.berkeley.edu/portal). Our class site is under your “SP 11 ESPM 263 tab. Check “Resources” for readings. Please bring the readings to class in either print or electronic format. We will sometimes do in-class responses that require close reading of text.

I will also use bspace to post the syllabus, assignment instruction sheets, grades, and class announcements, including unforeseen class cancellations and important changes to the syllabus. In the rare event of an unforeseen class cancellation and for your own convenience, you should check bspace a couple of hours before each class meeting.

For those of you new to bSpace you will need your Calnet ID and password to log in. Non-UC students will need a guest account to access bSpace. When you create the account with your email, your password will be emailed to you. Your email address is your username in bSpace. I have already put all guests onto my class roster. If you experience difficulties as a guest please e-mail me and I should be able to assist you by tweaking site permissions.

COURSE OUTLINE AND REQUIRED READINGS

Th) Jan 20: Course Overview & Introductions

Th) Jan 27: Researcher Subjectivities & Currencies (176 pgs.)

1969 song, “Here come the Anthros,” based on Deloria’s chapter, 


Discussion question: I am trying to provoke several conversations with this group of readings. How do these readings speak to each other? Please come to class with responses prepared (notes for your own reference are fine). I am especially interested in responses that intersect with questions you have about your own research. Note: I know this is a lot of reading. Haraway, Harding, Fortmann, and Deloria are essential, although you’ll get more Haraway and Harding in the form of their book. Their articles in the above list are foundational and will help you get through their later books. If you are unfamiliar with “situated knowledges” and “strong objectivity,” it is best to at least “case” the articles. The other readings are recommended. Read what you can—perhaps what seems most relevant to your own work and case the rest, i.e. intro, conclusion, main points. A few articles are quite short, however, and should be easy to read.

Th) Feb 3: Sciences from Below

Th) Feb 10: Genetic Science and Property (237 pgs.)


**Th) Feb 17: Genetics and Property (cont.)**


**Th) Feb 24: Indigenous & Western Knowledge (and Dialogue as Method) (161 pgs.)**


**Th) Mar 3: Indigenous Knowledge I**


**Th) Mar 10: Indigenous Knowledge II (256 pgs.)**


**Writing option 1: Long Paper Prospectus Due in Class**

**Th) Mar 24: SPRING BREAK NO CLASS**

**Th) Mar 31: Indigenous Knowledge IV: Indigenous “Knowledge” or Indigenous “Science”?**

Th) Apr 7: Nature-Cultures I: Companion Species

Th) April 14: Nature-Cultures II: Indigenous Nature-Cultures
Writing option 2: Op-ed Due in Class

http://www.culanth.org/?q=node/338
1) Eben Kirksey and Stefan Helmreich. “The Emergence of Multispecies Ethnography”
2) Eva Hayward. “Fingeryeyes: Impressions of Cup Corals”
4) Celia Lowe. “Viral Clouds: Becoming H5N1 in Indonesia.”

Th) Apr 28: Reading Quantum Physics through Feminist & Poststructuralist Theory

Th) May 6: (Reading, Review, Recitation Week)
In-class presentations & course evaluation

F) May 13: Options 1 & 2, Final Research Paper/Review Essay DUE in my office (122 Giannini) or mailbox (201 Giannini) by 4 p.m.

GRADING & ASSIGNMENTS (200 pts.)
Weekly response papers (1 single-spaced page) and class participation - 30% of grade (10 responses @ 6 pts. each, TOTAL 60 pts.)
In order to ground your reading practice and help prepare you for active participation in class, you will complete 10 weekly response papers based on each week’s reading(s). We have 13 course sessions for which you are assigned reading. In addition to leading one book discussion, you will be allowed to drop two reading responses. Response papers are to be written based both on your day’s reading and on class discussion for that day, exhibiting your synthesis of the ideas discussed, including your critique and analysis, any questions, and your thoughts on how the reading(s) of the day relate to broader class questions and topics. Summaries of the reading are not what I am looking for. As always, the more you can relate readings and questions
discussed to your own research, the more interesting these responses will be for you and for me. Your responses are DUE to me by email Sunday before the next class session.

**Reading presentation & discussion prompt- 10% (1 @ 20 pts.)**
Each of you will be assigned to present one week’s reading (the books only) with some weeks requiring two presenters. You will respond in particular to analyses and theories presented in the day’s texts. You must also pose one or two key questions for the class to discuss. Your presentation and discussion prompt might take approximately 20 minutes.

**Collaborative presentations:** In addition to the weeks that require two-part presentations, you may also elect to pair up with someone and present in conversation two different day’s readings. In this case, your presentation might take approximately 30 minutes. Each in your pair will take responsibility for about half the reading on each of two days, and you’ll need to get together beforehand to integrate your insights. This option may require more work. Collaboration always does. But it also provides the advantage of potentially more sophisticated analyses on your parts. Two heads are almost always better than one. In addition, collaborative, in-dialogue scholarship is supposed to be a hallmark of both feminist and indigenous methods. If you elect this option, real collaboration is expected—meaning you must be in conversation in your responses. And you and your partner will need to commit to stick together for two class sessions.

**Writing Option 1: Research paper (approx. 6000 words or 20 double-spaced pages plus citations, 80 pts.) & 15 min. presentation (40 pts.)- 60% (TOTAL 120 pts.)**
If you choose this option you will write a research paper based on your own work but incorporating in a meaningful way one or more of the main texts from this course. This option involves three parts. First, you will submit a 2-page description of your proposed topic including a preliminary list of 8-10 sources, indicating that you’ve done some early thinking on your topic. This will be due March 17 in class. I will return it to you in a timely manner with my feedback and suggestions. Second, you must write the research paper, which will be due Friday, May 13 by 4 p.m. in my box in 207 Giannini. Third, you will present a shorter version of your paper in the form of a conference-length talk (15 minutes timed, approx. 3000 words) during our final day of class, May 6. We will allow 5-10 minutes for student feedback. Not much, I know, but this is usual conference format. Visual aids are required. I’ll have a projector and Powerpoint available and can access other technologies with sufficient notice. This may be an especially attractive option for more advanced students looking to incorporate insights from this class into your dissertation writing or who are also preparing a conference talk this semester.

**Writing Option 2: Op-ed (40 pts.) and Book Review Essay (80 pts.) - 60% (TOTAL 120 pts.)**
If you choose this option you will write two shorter papers. (I have written both types of pieces and can provide examples for your review.) First, you will write an op-ed, targeting a periodical such as the San Francisco Chronicle, the New York Times, or another venue that has a national or international audience, and which accepts unsolicited op-ed pieces. Both venues have online submission guidelines. In consultation with me, choose your venue (with explicit submission
guidelines) and your topic. The topic should be something within your realm of expertise and also relate to the topic of this class. Op-ed pieces are typically 500-1000 words, but note that writing something coherent and sophisticated in so few words is not easy. You do not have recourse to scholarly citations. You may cite only one source as part of the text. Yet as scholars you will be expected to make a rigorous case for your position. You must do that through artful writing and concise but substantive argument. You must actually submit your op-ed to the publisher. Look at the op-eds of other thinkers for insight on how to write a good editorial piece. We can talk about this more in class. Due April 14 in class.

Second, you will write a review essay on one of the books read this semester. By review essay, I do not mean the very short book reviews (1000 words or less) commonly written in scholarly journals. A “review essay” is a longer treatment of a book that not only critically analyzes the contributions of the book, but also situates the book within broader arguments and contexts, both scholarly and beyond the academy. Given the nature of this class, I expect that each of you can address both academic and beyond academic issues and audiences in your review essay. This paper should be approximately 3500 words or fifteen double-spaced pages with citations. You will cite sources beyond the book you are reviewing. This paper will draw on equal parts research (perhaps research you’ve already done) and textual analysis. Note: In order to complete this assignment successfully you should choose a book to which you had a strong reaction (positive and/or negative) and which you can analyze in relation to your own research and experiences. You are encouraged to consult with me in office hours about your idea for this piece. Due Friday, May 13 by 4 p.m. in my box in 207 Giannini.
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