Comm 5221: Media, race, and identity   Spring 2019

Prof. Gil Rodman (rodman@umn.edu)   office hours (Ford 284): TuTh 10-11a, 1:30-2:30p and by appointment
GTA Chistian Angelich (angel183@umn.edu)   office hours (Ford 298): TuTh 11:30a-1p and by appointment

Course description and objectives

Racial prejudice and institutional racism remain significant problems today. The US remains a nation deeply divided along racial faultlines, and race continues to matter tremendously when it comes to the distribution of education, jobs, housing, healthcare, justice, political power, and then some. One of the most significant arenas where racial politics manifest themselves is the mass media. We will spend the semester studying how this thing we call "race" both shapes and is shaped by a variety of media practices and policies. In particular, we will examine:

- the social construction of race and racial identity,
- the nature of racial identity formation and self-awareness,
- the public discourses around racial/ethnic assimilation and integration,
- the politics of media representation and invisibility,
- the history of interracial cultural borrowing and theft,
- the interplay between media and government institutions with respect to maintaining racial hierarchies,
- the vexed question of racial ambiguity and hybridity, and
- the variability of racial formations across different geopolitical contexts.

None of these questions have easy answers. If they did, racism would have disappeared centuries ago. As such, soundbite approaches to these issues (e.g., "can't we all just get along?") will not serve you well, and a crucial part of your task this semester will be to think _critically_ and _complexly_ about racism and media in contemporary society.

Readings

The following _required_ books are available at the University Bookstore in Coffman Union.
- Ta-Nehisi Coates, _Between the World and Me_
- Gilbert B. Rodman (ed.), _The Race and Media Reader_

Other required readings/videos will be made available via Canvas.

Students who choose to pursue a Capstone Project are _strongly_ encouraged to use the _recommended_ book (also available at the University Bookstore) to help conceive, plan, research, and write their final papers:
- Wayne C. Booth _et al._, _The Craft of Research_ [fourth edition]

Requiring you to buy a book for which I will receive royalties -- even tiny ones -- is an awkward thing to do. To avoid profiting from such sales, for every student on the roster as of 30 Jan, I will donate $5 (i.e., more than the royalties I'll actually receive) to a non-profit organization of the class' choosing. That organization should:
- fit the theme of the course clearly and directly
- _not_ be an organization that anyone in the class actively works/volunteers for

Canvas

If you're on the roster, you should already have access to the course Canvas site. Log in to the U's main Canvas page (https://canvas.umn.edu/) and select "COMM 5221" from either the Dashboard or the Courses menu. We will use Canvas for several things this semester:
- access to the official course documents and assignments
- access to our required non-book readings/videos
- a graded course blog where you will contribute posts and comments about the course material
- details about your course grade
- a repository for various media examples relevant to our required readings
- occasional business-related announcements about the course
- nominations for the non-profit organization described in "Readings" above

More information on Canvas can be found at:
- https://community.canvaslms.com/docs/DOC-10701 [text-based guide]
- https://community.canvaslms.com/videos/1124-canvas-overview-students [video tutorial]

[N.B.: There are Canvas smartphone apps (search for "Canvas Student") for both iOS and Android, though these are probably not the most efficient way to use Canvas on a regular basis.]

Graduate students

If you are a graduate student, the basic rules in this syllabus vary slightly for you:
- Unless we make an explicit agreement to the contrary, you are required to attend all regular class meetings and do all the assigned readings.
- We will hold extra meetings every 3-4 weeks (dates and times to be determined) to discuss additional graduate-level readings (also to be determined). These extra meetings and readings are both required.
- Your major written work for the course will be to research and write a paper that (a) fits the course theme, (b) is _at least 6250 words_ long and (c) is suitable for submission to a scholarly conference and/or journal. You must meet with me no later than _19 Feb_ to discuss your proposed paper topic, submit a formal topic proposal no later than _26 Feb_, and submit a final version of your paper by _4:00 pm on 13 May._
- You are _not_ required to complete any of the writing assignments described below.
- I assume that grad students are more invested in the course's core issues than in grades -- to the point where grades are potentially counterproductive. As such, successfully completing the graduate-level requirements above will earn you an A for the course. That said, if you are clearly slacking off, I reserve the right to go deeper into the alphabet when I submit final grades.

Undergraduates who believe they can handle the extra work of the graduate-level requirements are welcome to meet with me to discuss the possibility of taking the course with those rules. That meeting must happen no later than _5 Feb_, and you should come prepared to convince me that you can perform at graduate student level.

Grades

This course follows the University's published standards for A-F grading:
- A: "achievement that is outstanding relative to the level necessary to meet course requirements"
- B: "achievement that is significantly above the level necessary to meet course requirements"
- C: "achievement that meets the course requirements in every respect"
- D: "achievement that is worthy of credit even though it fails to meet fully the course requirements"
- F: "signifies that the work was . . . completed but at a level of achievement that is not worthy of credit."

Final course grades will be calculated using the following schedule:
- In-class participation (ICP): 25 points maximum
- Course blog: 25 points maximum
- Thought paper (TP): 10 points maximum
- Critical essays (CEs): 10 points each

N.B.: Regardless of your other grades, _the upper limit for course grade is your final ICP grade multiplied by 4_ (e.g., if your final ICP grade is 21, your maximum possible course grade is 84).

Point totals at the end of the semester will translate to letter grades as follows:

A	93+	B+	87-89	C+	77-79	D+	67-69
A-	90-92	B	83-86	C	73-76	D	60-66
		B-	80-82	C-	70-72	F	0-59

- There will be occasional opportunities to earn points via in-class quizzes and/or extra assignments. Such opportunities will be the exception, rather than the rule, and they will not be offered on an individual basis.
- "S/N" grades will only be given to students who have registered for the course on an S/N basis.
- "I" grades will only be given under _extraordinary_ circumstances (i.e., major life emergencies).

N.B.: The "Grades" feature on the Canvas site is not equipped to handle the sort of "pile it on" grading system this course uses. In particular, the numbers that it provides on the "Assignments" line are unhelpful and misleading. If I could adjust the way that Canvas calculates those numbers (or remove that line from the report), I would. Since that isn't possible, you should ignore that line completely. Otherwise, though, that report should allow you to keep track of your running grade point total on a regular basis.

Grade disputes
By University rule, GTAs do not have the authority to change grades that professors have assigned. I will only change grades that Christian has assigned if _all_ the following conditions apply:
- You must first make a good-faith effort to resolve the issue directly with him.
- You need to share a copy of the graded assignment with me.
- You must email me a clear, detailed explanation for why you believe you deserve a higher grade.

In the event of such disputes, I will regrade your work myself and the new grade -- regardless of whether it's higher, lower, or the same -- will be your final grade for that assignment.

In-class participation (ICP)

This is _not_ a lecture-based course. Our class meetings will be structured around discussions, so you'll need to:
- attend class regularly,
- do the required readings carefully,
- come to class prepared to discuss those readings in thoughtful ways,
- contribute to in our in-class discussions/exercises in a non-trivial fashion.

On any given day, I will do my best to make sure that everyone gets a chance to make meaningful contributions to our conversations. This may mean that I will call on you if you have been exceptionally quiet or, alternately, that I will ask you _not_ to speak for a while if you have been extra talkative and other students have not been heard from.

If you miss class (for any reason), you can't participate, and so you can't earn ICP points for that day. Significantly late arrivals and/or early departures will result in lower ICP scores for the days in questions.

For grading purposes, if you are "present in name only" (PINO) for one of our class meetings, you will _not_ earn ICP points that day. As the name implies, a PINO day happens when you are physically present, but you do not contribute to our discussion in a substantive fashion. This includes (but is not limited to) days when:
- you are present for less than half of a given class meeting,
- you have clearly not done the assigned reading, and/or
- you are primarily a passive spectator in our in-class activities.

Decisions about what counts as a PINO day will be based on my assessment of your in-class performance, and I will email you about any such decision within 24 hours of the class meeting in question.

We have 28 class meetings this semester, each of which allows you to earn up to 1 point toward your ICP grade. The maximum number of ICP points you can earn overall is 25.

Course blog

The blog is an online forum where you and your classmates will stake out clear positions on the _major_ issues raised by our required readings and in-class discussions, and offer persuasive arguments to support those positions. Posts/comments that (1) are primarily summaries of the readings/discussions, (2) focus on minor facets of the readings/discussions, (3) focus on topics outside of the course content, and/or (4) are largely simple statements of (dis)agreement will _not_ count towards your grade.

Blog contributions will be graded every course week: i.e., the seven-day period that begins each Tuesday at 2:30 pm. (N.B.: For grading purposes, the last course week of the semester begins at 2:30 pm on 2 May and ends at _4:00 pm on 13 May_.) For any given course week, there are two ways to earn points:
- You create a post of _at least 300 words_ of thoughtful commentary about the assigned readings and/or our in-class discussions/exercises. You can earn a maximum of 1 point each course week for such posts.
- You create a comment of _at least 300 words_ of thoughtful response to one of your classmates' posts or comments. You can earn a maximum of 1 point each course week for such comments.

For grading purposes, only your own words count: e.g., 75 words from you plus 250 words quoted from elsewhere counts as 75 words, rather than 325. Similarly, if your contributions include large amounts of filler prose, only the substantive words will count toward your grade. Any given blog contribution must be substantially different from your other contributions to the blog: i.e., you don't earn additional points for rephrasing an argument you've already made in previous posts/comments. Posts/comments shorter than 300 words will _not_ earn points.

There are 16 course weeks in the semester, each of which allows you to earn up to 2 points toward your Course Blog grade. The maximum number of Course Blog points you can earn overall is 25.

Technical instructions
- Access the blog using the "Discussions" link in the lefthand menu of the course Canvas site.
- Create a new post using the "+Discussion" button in the upper righthand corner of the page.
- Comment on an existing thread using the "Reply" link beneath that thread's box.

- There are no reading-related deadlines for the blog: i.e., you can still earn points for "late" posts/comments on "old" readings, as long as you're adding something new to the conversation.
- Your comments should be respectful and constructive -- *especially* if you are disagreeing with something one of your classmates has written.

Thought paper

In a well-crafted and thoughtful essay of *at least 1000 words*, address *both* of the following questions:
- Pick one *mainstream* media text (e.g., a TV show, a Hollywood film, a major news story) from the past ten years that you feel is clearly a *beneficial* representation of contemporary racial politics and, in as *persuasive* a fashion as you can, explain *why* that representation is beneficial.
- Pick a second *mainstream* media text (e.g., a TV show, a Hollywood film, a major news story) from the past ten years that you feel is clearly a *harmful* representation of contemporary racial politics and, in as *persuasive* a fashion as you can, explain *why* that representation is harmful.

This assignment will be *ungraded*. Assuming you turn the paper in, you should receive full credit (10 points) for doing so -- though I reserve the right to assign lower grades (including zeros) to papers that fail to meet the assignment's requirements. This paper is due by *2:30 pm on 29 January*. No late papers will be accepted.

Tips
- This essay is not just a chance to state your opinions. Simply sharing an opinion doesn't require much thought, especially in the absence of a rationale for *why* you believe what you do. You should approach this essay as an opportunity to *change* your audience's opinion about the media texts in question.
- I won't be finicky about what counts as a "mainstream" media text. That said, if a text you're discussing is clearly something that's only "well known" to a very tiny segment of the population, then you've made a poor choice for this assignment.
- Think carefully about how your answers to the two pieces of this assignment relate to each other. If I can swap your two media texts with your two arguments and find your case to be just as persuasive, then your arguments aren't as strong as they should be.

Critical essays (CEs)

Any given CE must (1) be *at least 1000 words* long, (2) consist of a *persuasive argument* that doesn't duplicate your other written work for this course, and (3) engage in substantial fashion with our required readings.

There are four possible types of CEs:
- Replacement Reading (RR)
- Thought Paper Revision (TPR)
- Most Valuable Reading (MVR)
- Least Valuable Reading (LVR)

You are *not* obligated to submit CEs from all four categories. You are free to submit as many RRs as you like, but you can only submit one each for the other three options. Exactly how many CEs you should submit will vary but, as a rough guide, most students will need to submit *at least* 3 CEs in order to pass the course.

Each CE is worth a maximum of 10 points. CEs will earn points on a scale proportionate to the grading schedule on page 2 of this syllabus: e.g., a B- paper is worth 8 points, a B paper is worth 8.3 points, and so on. [N.B.: If you submit CEs that earn grades of D+ or below, only the first two such papers will earn points.] You can submit as many (or as few) CEs as you like. That said, the average student will need to submit 3-4 CEs in order to pass the course, and you will *not* be able to pass the course if you don't submit at least 1 CE.

Each option requires you to engage directly with our assigned readings. For this assignment, each assigned chapter from the reader and each of the assigned page ranges from the Coates book count as separate readings.

The final deadline for all CEs is *4:00 pm on 13 May*. That deadline is firm and non-negotiable. The only *potential* exceptions to this rule involve situations where you have a *documented* major life emergency of some sort.

Replacement Reading (RR)
Find *one* reading (N.B.: for purposes of this CE, audios and videos count as "readings") to add to a future version of this syllabus that replaces *one* of our current readings. Your essay needs to make a persuasive argument for how/why your chosen reading significantly improves the course in comparison the one you would like to see

replaced. N.B.: this argument needs to be more substantial than simply explaining that you don't like the existing reading, or that your suggested reading covers topics that aren't present on the existing syllabus.

Any replacement reading you submit must:
- have a clear and direct connection to the course theme,
- be at least 1000 words long (for printed sources) or 5 minutes long (for audio/video sources),
- *not* be written/created by an author who's already on our syllabus, and
- *not* appear on syllabi from previous versions of this course (see http://www.gilrodman.com/syllabi)

Along with your essay, you *must* submit a clean, complete copy of your replacement reading. Ideally, you should submit a PDF copy. If your reading is freely available online (e.g., it's not behind a paywall), you can provide the URL. In some cases, however, you will need to provide a photocopy of your reading. Regardless of how you submit your readings, make sure that:
- they don't need to be trimmed (e.g., don't submit a full copy of a book for the sake of a single chapter)
- they are not missing pages
- they are not excessively underlined or marked up.

Some helpful advice for RRs:
- Think about your argument in relational terms. How does your new reading fit into the rest of the syllabus? What does it add to the course that is an improvement over the reading you want to replace? What holes are created in the syllabus by removing the reading you want to replace, and how does your chosen replacement reading fill (or make up for) those holes?
- A course with a theme as broad as this one will *never* be able to include all the major topics/issues that fit that theme. As such, any argument you make in favor of a new reading needs to do more than simply point out that there's nothing about topic A on the current syllabus, and that your chosen reading fixes that problem. In such cases, you will want/need to make a persuasive case for *why* topic A deserves to be on the syllabus in place of topic B (i.e., the topic of the reading you'd like to see replaced).
- New readings should match the size/scope of the readings you would like to replace. You'll have a hard time making a convincing argument that (for instance) a 1200-word personality profile from a celebrity gossip magazine will work well to replace a 5000-word historical analysis from an academic journal.

Thought Paper Revision (TPR)
Ideally, by the end of the semester, you'll have learned something that leads you to change at least one of the arguments from your Thought Paper. This option gives you the chance to demonstrate that shift in your thinking.

Pick *one* of the two halves of your Thought Paper. Revise (and expand) your original argument to make it stronger. Your revision needs to take at least two things into account:
- the feedback on your original Thought Paper
- the major argument made by at least one of our relevant required readings
Your revised argument *can* (but doesn't have to) involve a reversal of your original opinion, but it is *not* allowed to involve a change in the media text under analysis. The TPR option is *not* available to you if you didn't submit a Thought Paper in the first place.

Most Valuable Reading (MVR) / Least Valuable Reading (LVR)
[N.B.: Except for the difference between "most" and "least," the requirements for these two options are identical.]

Pick the *one* required reading that you found to be the *most/least* valuable, and write an essay that explains, in persuasive detail, why your chosen reading is the most/least important one in the course. You can only submit *one* MVR and *one* LVR, and each of those must select *only one* reading as the most/least valuable.

Some helpful advice for MVRs and LVRs:
- As with the RR option, think about your argument in relational terms: i.e., don't just discuss the particular strengths/weaknesses of a given reading, but make a case for how well it worked (or didn't) in the context of the course as a whole and/or in relation to the rest of the readings on the syllabus.
- Do *not* base your argument on questions of personal taste. The fact that you found a given reading to be easy, difficult, funny, boring, etc. doesn't necessarily affect how valuable it was to the course as a whole.
- This is not a popularity contest. The reading that generated the liveliest discussion isn't necessarily the most valuable, and the reading that prompted the least engagement isn't necessarily the least valuable.

- There is no single "right" answer that I look for when I grade CEs. The overall quality of the argument you make in any given CE matters more than the specific position you take. That said, some positions are much harder to defend successfully than others. Whatever position you take should be well supported by (a) the available facts and (b) a persuasive, well-constructed argument.
- Remember that your goal isn't simply to demonstrate that you have an opinion: it's to persuade your reader _why_ your position on the issue at hand is the best one (or, at the very least, a better one than most others). CEs that merely assert a position without arguing it will _not_ meet the requirements of this assignment, and the _highest_ grade they will earn is a D. That same grade ceiling also applies to CEs that focus on extended summary and/or paraphrasing of readings/sources, rather than on making an argument of your own.
- Focus on the _main_ argument(s) in the readings/sources in question. A CE built around a single paragraph from a 20-page article (for instance) will only work well if that paragraph is absolutely central to the article as a whole. If it's a side issue, or if the author's main argument still holds up without that paragraph, then it's not important enough for you to put it at the center of a CE.
- Do _not_ spend most of your CEs summarizing the reading(s) in question. Your CE grades depend on the quality of _your_ argument, rather than your ability to describe someone else's argument.

Capstone project (optional)

In order to fulfill the Capstone Project requirement in connection with this course, you must write a well-researched, argumentative essay of 2500+ words on a topic that fits the course's main theme. Because this project results in a separate grade and earns you an extra credit hour, it involves work _above and beyond_ the course requirements.

There are several _mandatory_ deadlines built into the project that should (1) prevent you from procrastinating too much, (2) allow us time to give you constructive feedback, and (3) give you time to act on that feedback:

5 Feb	Register for Comm 3995W-006
12 Feb	Meet with me to discuss your project
19 Feb	Topic proposal / 10-item bibliography
5 Mar	Thesis paragraph draft
26 Mar	Rough draft
13 May	Final paper and verification pages

Except for 13 May (when the deadline is 4:00 pm), all the deadlines above are at 2:30 pm. They are also all "drop dead" deadlines: i.e., failing to meet _any_ of them (which includes failing to meet their minimum requirements) means that you are no longer eligible to fulfill your Capstone Project requirement in this class. Further details about the Capstone Project are available on a separate handout.

Paperless (mostly) assignments

With two exceptions, _everything_ you'll submit for a grade this semester _must_ be submitted digitally. Contributions to the course blog can (obviously) only happen online. All other written assignments should be submitted _via email_ to rodman@umn.edu. All other assignments must be submitted as attachments in one of the following file formats:

- LibreOffice/OpenOffice (.odt)
- Microsoft Word (.doc or .docx)
- Rich Text Format (.rtf).

Assignments submitted in other formats (including PDFs and paper) will _not_ be accepted.

Exception #1 involves the copy of any reading you submit in connection to an "Replacement Reading" CE:

- Readings that only exist online should be submitted by including their URLs in your annotations.
- Readings that are readily available as PDFs should be submitted as PDFs.
- All other readings should be submitted as clean, complete photocopies.

Exception #2 involves Capstone Project verification pages, which _must_ be submitted in hard copy format.

Academic dishonesty

The following is a _partial_ list of examples of academic dishonesty:

- plagiarism in any of its forms
- copying assignments (in whole or in part) produced by other students

- "double-dipping" (i.e., using the same work to earn more than one grade -- including attempts to reuse work that you have submitted for a grade in some other course)
- having someone else research and/or write substantial portions of any graded assignment for you
- deleting and/or re-editing blog posts/comments after they've been placed on the course Canvas site
- knowingly assisting someone else in their efforts to engage in any of the above practices

The _minimum_ penalty for academic dishonesty is a _zero_ for the assignment in question. Put bluntly, the risks are high (plagiarism is usually easy to identify), the penalties are higher (e.g., expulsion from the U), and the potential benefits are usually trivial (e.g., you "earn" enough points to turn a C into a C+).

Some helpful resources to avoid academic dishonesty include:
- https://communitystandards.umn.edu/avoid-violations/avoiding-scholastic-dishonesty
- https://www.gilrodman.com/2015/03/01/how-to-plagiarize-well-tips-for-my-undergraduates-rerun-sunday/

Miscellaneous
- Our discussions will cover topics that are likely to evoke strong differences of opinion. I don't expect our class meetings to produce unanimous agreement about those topics, but I do expect our discussions to be characterized by mutual respect and collegiality. Strong opinions are acceptable; verbal bullying and personal attacks, on the other hand, will _not_ be tolerated under any circumstances.
- Significant disruptions of the normal flow of course-related business -- e.g., using cell phones in class, excessive side chatter, premature leave-taking behavior -- may result in grade penalties.
- You may make audio and/or video recordings of class meetings for your personal use, provided you do so without disrupting the ordinary flow of the class. The purchase and/or sale of either written notes or recordings of class meetings is strictly prohibited.
- I will make every reasonable effort to accommodate students' needs relating to religious holidays and/or documented disabilities. By University policy, you must provide written notice (for religious holidays) and/or official documentation (for disabilities) with enough lead time for accommodations to be arranged.
- University policy prohibits sexual harassment as defined in the January 2018 policy statement (see https://policy.umn.edu/hr/sexharassassault). In my role as a University employee, I am required to share information that I learn about possible sexual misconduct with the campus Title IX office that addresses these concerns. Questions or concerns about sexual harassment should be directed to the Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action (274 McNamara).

Reading/assignment schedule
[Readings should be completed prior to the dates listed. Readings with asterisks (***) can be found via Canvas.]

22 Jan	no reading
24 Jan	***this syllabus
	****"How to Do Well in This Course"
	***Lamott, "Shitty First Drafts"
	American Anthropological Association, "Statement on 'Race'" (*RMR* ch. 1)
	Tatum, "Defining Racism" (*RMR* ch. 3)
	McIntosh, "White Privilege" (*RMR* ch. 4)
29 Jan	**Thought paper deadline**
	***Hall, "Histories of Difference"
	Hall, "The Whites of Their Eyes" (*RMR* ch. 5)
31 Jan	Omi & Winant, "Racial Formation" (*RMR* ch. 2)
5 Feb	**Capstone Project deadline #1 (register for Comm 3995W-006)**
	***Coates, "Notes From the Fifth Year / Fear of a Black President"
	***Coates, "The First White President"
7 Feb	***Lipsitz, "Bill Moore's Body"
	Lipsitz, "*Lean on Me*" (*RMR* ch. 7)
12 Feb	**Capstone Project deadline #2 (meeting)**
	Ontiveros, "No Golden Age" (*RMR* ch. 6)
	Newman, "The Forgotten Fifteen Million" (*RMR* ch. 9)

14 Feb	hooks, "Representing Whiteness in the Black Imagination" (*RMR* ch. 8)
	Jhally & Lewis, "White Responses" (*RMR* ch. 10)
19 Feb	**Capstone Project deadline #3 (topic proposal/bibliography)**
	Graduate Student Project deadline #1 (meeting)
	Jafa, "My Black Death" (*RMR* ch. 13)
	***Pham, "Racial Plagiarism and Fashion"
21 Feb	McLeod, "Copyright, Authorship and African-American Culture" (*RMR* ch. 12)
26 Feb	**Graduate Student Project deadline #2 (topic proposal)**
	Rose, "Fear of a Black Planet" (*RMR* ch. 11)
28 Feb	Rodman, "Race . . . and Other Four Letter Words" (*RMR* ch. 14)
	***Hayes & Rodman, "Thirteen Ways of Looking at a Black Film"
5 Mar	**Capstone Project deadline #4 (thesis paragraph draft)**
	Shimakawa, "Mind Yourself" (*RMR* ch. 15)
	***Cadogan, "Black and Blue"
7 Mar	Bird, "Imagining Indians" (*RMR* ch. 16)
12 Mar	Chvany, "Do We Look Like Ferengi Capitalists to You" (*RMR* ch. 17)
	***Ang, "On Not Speaking Chinese"
14 Mar	***Littler, "#Damonsplaining and the Unbearable Whiteness of 'Merit'"
19 Mar	**NO CLASS -- SPRING BREAK**
21 Mar	**NO CLASS -- SPRING BREAK**
26 Mar	**Capstone Project deadline #5 (rough draft)**
	Dyer, "The Light of the World" (*RMR* ch. 18)
28 Mar	Gray, "Jazz Tradition, Institutional Formation, and Cultural Practice" (*RMR* ch. 19)
2 Apr	Dyson, "Unnatural Disasters" (*RMR* ch. 22)
	Lipsitz, "The Hip Hop Hearings" (*RMR* ch. 23)
4 Apr	Stabile, "Criminalizing Black Culture" (*RMR* ch. 24)
9 Apr	Williams, "The Distribution of Distress," (*RMR* ch. 27)
	***Harrison, "When Feminism Dovetails With White Supremacy"
11 Apr	Hall, "Old and New Identities, Old and New Ethnicities" (*RMR* ch. 25)
16 Apr	Sharma, "Taxi Cab Publics and the Production of *Brown Space* After 9/11" (*RMR* ch. 29)
	***Rivera, "The Brown Threat"
18 Apr	Anzaldúa, "How to Tame a Wild Tongue" (*RMR* ch. 28)
	Piper, "Passing for White, Passing for Black" (RMR ch. 31)
23 Apr	Awkward, "Burying Don Imus" (*RMR* ch. 34)
25 Apr	Coates, *Between the World and Me*, pp. 1-71
30 Apr	Coates, *Between the World and Me*, pp. 72-152
2 May	Bell, "Racial Realism -- After We're Gone" (*RMR* ch. 32)
13 May	**Final deadline for CEs, blog posts/comments, and Capstone Projects**
(4:00 pm)	