The Challenge Ahead...
January 21, 2017 was truly an historic day for women everywhere. On that day just after the inauguration of an avowedly misogynistic (and racist) president, millions of women marched in cities and towns across the country, and indeed around the world. (In the Bay Area alone there were twelve marches.) I was privileged to participate in the Washington, D.C. March, and here are a few reflections on that event.

As we now know, the D.C. March turned out to be a stupendous success, drawing more than 500,000 activists. However until shortly before the march, there was uncertainty and some anxiety about whether the numbers would be large enough to make a splash. The organizers’ publicly stated their goal was to have 250,000 marchers.

The first inkling that the march was going to be a success was the congestion on the Metro train and the hordes at the stations. Jean, a friend of mine from Rhode Island, and I managed to make it to Independence Avenue. We became part of a huge wall-to-wall crowd stuck on Independence Avenue between 6th and 7th Streets. Luckily, large screens and loudspeakers had been set up on major intersections so that we could hear and see the speakers and entertainers. (Gloria Steinem in particular was amazing at age 80+.) We were also entertained by the numerous variations of the pink pussy hats worn by marchers and the original and witty signs carried by marchers. The mood of the crowd was celebratory. Despite being elbow to elbow, folks remained good-humored and courteous as they made way for people trying to get through the crowd, parents pushing strollers, and those with mobility limitations. However, there was pent-up energy and we broke into periodic chants of “Let us march,” as it became clear that the program on stage was going to go on and on.... which it did for more than three hours. Many of us started making our way back away from the direction of the Mall and strolling in random directions, but there was no actual march per se.
The folks on stage were diverse with white, Muslim, Black, and Latina women, gay, straight and transgender speakers. The marchers themselves seemed to be disproportionately white (90%?) and female (90%), and varied in terms of age. There seemed to be many multi-generational family groups, especially mothers and daughters.

Topping off the experience, my friend and I stayed for two extra days, and we were able to visit the African American History Museum and the American Indian Museum. The former chronicles the long history of African American enslavement and struggle for freedom and citizenship highlighting the multifarious ways in which the wealth of the U.S. was built on the slave trade and accumulated through slave labor. Organized chronologically starting with the Atlantic slave trade and plantation life, subsequent sections document the communities built by freedmen and women, African American political organizing, institution building, and cultural formations. Particularly moving for me was a section devoted to the murder of Emmet Till, in 1955, that helped spark the African American civil rights movement. The American Indian Museum displays the long shared history of displacement, genocide, and erasure of indigenous peoples by U.S. settler institutions. Displays on specific tribes document the survival and vitality of diverse American Indian cultures and the rise of Pan-Indian political movements. It is important to keep in mind that these museums were brought into being by many years of struggle, planning, fundraising, and moral suasion by African Americans and Native Americans, an important and inspiring thought for us to keep in mind at CRG.

As for the March, I believe virtually all of us, in DC and across the country had the same thought as we set out to march on January 21: “this can only be the first step.” And, in the ensuing days and weeks since then, as the rights of women and people of color have been increasingly challenged, many of us have sought ways to better organize ourselves, and to commit for the long haul. I just hope the energy and optimism that were so dramatically in evidence on “march day” can and will be sustained. I expect the Center for Race and Gender to play a strong and vital role in that process.

– Evelyn Nakano Glenn, Founding Director
The Insurgent Legacy of Evelyn Nakano Glenn

A fter 43 years of transformative scholarship, Center for Race and Gender Founding Director, Prof. Evelyn Nakano Glenn, retired from her faculty position last spring. With joint appointments in Gender and Women’s Studies and Ethnic Studies at the UC Berkeley, Prof Glenn’s research has been instrumental in the development of the method and frameworks for the analysis of race, class, gender and its intersections. A symposium to honor Prof. Glenn’s insurgent legacy and her influential impact was held on Thursday, November 3, 2016 at the Multicultural Community Center on campus.

During her career at UC Berkeley, Prof. Glenn has published widely impactful books, such as the critical volume, Unequal Freedom: How Race and Gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor. Prof. Glenn has also received many awards and recognitions including the UC Berkeley Chancellor’s Award for Advancing Institutional Excellence, the KQED Asian Pacific American Heritage Local Hero, the American Sociological Association Jessie Bernard Award in “recognition of outstanding scholarship that has enlarged the horizons of sociology to encompass the role of women in society.” At the symposium, Prof. Glenn was publicly honored by Assembly Member Tony Thurmond’s Office and District Director Mary Nicely with a formal resolution for her commitment to education justice, citizenship rights, intersectional research and labor justice.

Under Prof. Glenn’s leadership, the Center for Race and Gender has grown to focus on transdisciplinary methods and critical approaches to the study of race, gender, sexuality, empire and its intersections in personal, public, and domestic spheres. Her commitment to addressing the dynamic role of race and gender politics and contested evolutions of immigration, nation, and citizenship has greatly influenced the trajectory of the Center and its diverse research initiatives, working groups and student scholarship.

These themes were celebrated through three panels aptly named, “Adventures in Intersectionality,” “Radicalizing Care & Labor Justice” and “Education Justice and Insurgent Citizenship” and featured wonderful presentations from a close-knit group of Evelyn’s current and former students, mentees, family and friends. Thank you to all our speakers and members of “the Evelyn Diaspora” for acknowledging the critical importance of Prof. Glenn in their own work as activist-scholars. Symposium moderators and presenters included Prof. Paola Bacchetta (Gender and Women’s Studies), Prof. Hatem Bazian (Ethnic Studies), Prof. Ula Taylor (African American Studies), Prof. Charis Thompson (Gender and Women’s Studies), Prof. Elaine Kim (Ethnic Studies), Prof. Juana Maria Rodriguez (Gender and Women’s Studies), Prof. Priya Kandaswamy (Mills College), Prof. Sara Clarke Kaplan (UC San Diego), Prof. Margaret Rhee (University of Oregon), Antonia Grace Glenn (Independent Filmmaker), Linda Burnham (National Domestic Workers Alliance), Prof. Annie Fukushima (University of Utah), Prof. Grace Chang (UC Santa Barbara), Prof. Nelson Maldanado-Torres (Rutgers University), Marco Flores (Ethnic Studies), Dr. Kevin Escudero (Brown University) and Prof. Rick Baldoz (Oberlin College).

- Desirée Valadares, CRG Graduate Student Researcher
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Distinguished Guest Lecture

No Mercy Here: Gender, Punishment and the Making of Jim Crow Modernity
Professor Sarah Haley

The Center for Race and Gender 2016-2017 Distinguished Guest Lecture was delivered by Prof. Sarah Haley, Assistant Professor of Gender Studies and African American Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles. Her groundbreaking book, No Mercy Here: Gender, Punishment, and the Making of Jim Crow Modernity (2016), explores how the history of captivity and punishment of black women during the Jim Crow Era shaped the emergence of modern incarceration, as well as black feminist resistance against public and private structures of punishment. During her introduction of Prof. Haley, Prof. Nikki Jones (African American Studies) described how No Mercy Here resonated deeply with students in her course, inspiring them to begin a new research initiative that engages the book’s themes. Below is an excerpt from Prof. Haley’s talk.

“In 1908 the chain gang was instituted to replace convict leasing, and the legislation codifying it also codified the racially specific definition of womanhood. Now, imprisoned laborers would surface 13,000 miles of county road in Georgia, making commercial and leisure transport possible. So now they would work for the state only on the roads rather than in a diverse array of industries. But the law that implemented the chain gang replacing convict leasing specified, “if the convict be female, the judge may, in his discretion sentence her to labor and confinement on the women’s prison on the state farm, in lieu of the chain gang sentence. So this exemption for Women – capital W, Women – was the condition for possibility for the creation of the chain gang. The notion that white women who were a vulnerable and protected class could be put to work publicly on this chain gang had to be eradicated for this system to be implemented. In all the records of chain gang laborers, only four exceptions to this rule existed. Only four white women convicted of misdemeanors were eligible to be put to work on the chain gang, were so put to work. And that compares with nearly 2,000 black women convicted of similar crimes who were forced to labor on the chain gang.

That same year in 1908, the state instituted a system of parole by which black women would be forced to work for at least a year as a domestic in white homes rather than be released when they had served their sentence. So this established a regime of domestic carceral servitude at the very same time that the state instituted a massive reform eliminating convict labor for private profit. It enshrined that very same system of private profit labor, replacing the corporation with the white family as the unit that would profit from imprisoned women’s labor. So be careful about the reforms that we sort of hail in this contemporary moment.

Against this landscape of structural violence, captivity and dispossession, black women on the inside and outside of prison walls produced a terrain of abolitionist cultural production that protested the intimate and carceral violence they faced, challenged legal norms, refused innocence as a category of humanization, and rejected normative femininity as an aspiration. The imagined a world beyond the prison.

As I end my talk I want to focus on examples of the blues as a black feminist critique of state and intimate violence. Although this was only one of many modes of carceral sabotage – including escape, work slowdowns, destroying prison infrastructure, arson, and feigning illness – that imprisoned women practiced. Women imprisoned in Mississippi in the 1930s were recorded by folklorist Herbert Halpert as part of the Works Progress Administration’s blues recordings. The recordings were re-released on the feminist imprint, Rosetta Records, in 1987.

No Mo Freedom
Sung by Eva White (1939)

Don’t the moon look pretty, shinin down through the willow tree.
I can see my baby, but my baby can’t see me.
I was standing, standing on the corner of North Farish and Church Street,
When that old big bad police man came up and arrested me.

When those jurors found me guilty, that old mean clerk he wrote it down.
I could tell by that, people, that I was Parchman bound.
No more freedom, no more good time, in this wide, wide world for me.
I’m beat for my freedom, and I’m sick as I can be.
But someday, yes, someday, someday I will go free.
I’m gon’ treat all you people just like you treated me.”

– Alisa Bierria, Associate Director, CRG
In the midst of the Trump Administration moving forward on policies that is said to seriously endanger many targeted communities, infamous “alt-right” speaker, Milo Yiannopoulos, visited UC Berkeley this past February. His visit sparked student and faculty organizing, as well as a tumultuous convergence of neo-Nazis, Black Bloc members, police, and others the night of the scheduled visit. This event was widely covered by media, even getting a shout out by President Trump who tweeted a threat to de-fund our campus. In this issue, FaultLines shares a quick snapshot of how UC Berkeley students are connecting issues of research and organizing on and off campus in the context of this political climate. We interviewed CRG student research grantees, Lisa Hofmann-Kuroda and Istifaa Ahmed, both of whom are also organizers engaged in social justice research practices. Lisa Hofmann-Kuroda is a graduate student in East Asian Languages and Cultures, studying kinship enacted through colonial anthropology and science in 19th and 20th century Japan. Istifaa Ahmed is an undergraduate student in Ethnic Studies and Gender and Women’s Studies. Her project considers art that explores violence against black women within public space. This interview has been edited for length.

– Alisa Bierrria, Associate Director

CRG: Let’s start with a summary of examples of your campus organizing.

Lisa: I’ve been involved with the Graduate Student Union on campus, but much of my activism started last October when I heard that Milo was coming to UC Berkeley. At first, I heard that Milo was visiting different college campuses giving inflammatory talks that would target students for their gender identity, their racial identity. I heard that he’d gone to the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, where he outed a transgender woman student in front of a lot of people. He projected her name and face onto a screen and said demeaning sexual comments about her. He targeted her specifically because she was an activist on campus fighting for gender neutral bathrooms. I was concerned because I knew he was coming to UC Berkeley the following February and felt like we couldn’t let this happen here.

We circulated email scripts [so others could] email the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor, faculty, and others telling them our concerns. I wanted to make a strong case for harassment and that students deserve the right to learn in a safe environment where they’re not harassed, and I think what Milo does constitutes legal harassment. By January, it had reached enough faculty so that a small group of faculty did get together to write the administration. The administration wrote the faculty back and told them: we hear your concerns, we don’t necessarily support Milo’s views, but we do support free speech. It didn’t really go anywhere.

So we made an anti-Milo digital toolkit, which was a moment of real creativity between us, acknowledging that we needed a fresh approach than just writing letters. We included an introduction to who Milo was, background about the “alt-right,” email scripts for people who hadn’t emailed the administration yet, and syllabi people could use to talk about free speech and hate speech. We had petitions students could file with the Graduate Student Union. If people were graduate student workers, they could file petitions that said “I have reason to believe that I won’t feel safe on this campus on those days, so I have a legal right not to go to work.” Unfortunately, the digital toolkit was leaked to Breitbart, which is the publication that Milo works for and [Trump Senior Advisor] Steve Bannon used to run, and they published our [personal] information on the internet. Then we were getting hate mail and death threats. Breitbart also doxxed faculty members on campus and they were getting death threats as well. It creates a really unsafe environment for students. [Discussions about anti-Milo protests focused on] “violent protestors…”, but y’all didn’t see the three months of organizing. We took every possible non-violent route to get this cancelled. The administration told us they weren’t going to cancel it unless there was a riot, and there was a riot.

CRG: Two things stand out. One is that y’all used a diversity of organizing strategies. You used digital strategies, direct action, base building, and work stoppages. Two, you’re challenging definitions of important concepts like “free speech” and “censorship.”

Lisa: This political concept of “free speech” has been so twisted from its original intentions. When people say UC Berkeley is the home of the Free Speech Movement (1964-65), they don’t realize that, though Mario Savio was the white face of the movement, he was trained by

continued on next page
Black freedom riders. So the Free Speech Movement was happening in the context of the Civil Rights Movement. People forget that – isolate it and abstract it – and “free speech” becomes about saying whatever you want. But originally, it was about protecting students who wanted to speak out against the administration in power. At the time at UC Berkeley, Black students weren’t allowed at certain spaces on campus. People who were trying to ally themselves with these Black students were being punished. So free speech was about protecting those students’ freedom of speech. The Free Speech Movement was always within the context of a power dynamic. So if you take the analysis of race and power out of free speech, then it makes no sense. The concept becomes twisted to become its opposite. Now we’re using the Free Speech movement to protect those in power. Milo already has enormous amount of power, his views are represented by the President of the United States, he has a media empire, the reason people know about Milo is because he has so much access to speech. His speech is actually not in danger. So to use the concept of free speech to protect Milo is really absurd.

CRG: Istifaa, tell us more about your organizing.

Istifaa: Projects that I’m currently involved in are through the American Cultures Center and a project called UROC – Underrepresented Researchers of Color – a new and emerging research group. My platform for organizing and resistance is through research currently. You see the wariness and discomfort with students of color and research, which inspired me to investigate why that is the case. Western research has been dominated by white anthropologists entering Indigenous sites or marginalized communities to extract information for their own benefit, and then they make the information inaccessible to the communities from which they extracted the information. I believe that research should be a site for students of color, especially at Berkeley, a research institution.

The project that I’ve taken on through UROC and AC is this workshop called Demystifying the Research Process. I will be working with students to integrate research ethics into their entire research process. This workshop will equip and empower students to regard themselves as researchers, and validate their communities as sources of knowledge, expertise, and knowledge production.

CRG: Do you see a connection between organizing and scholarship on and off campus?

Istifaa: It’s inseparable. All of the [organizing] I do informs my research and academic practices. Our staff at AC is supporting undocumented students who are working to make California a sanctuary space. My work with California Coalition for Women Prisoners (CCWP), a San Francisco-based grassroots organization unaffiliated with UC Berkeley, directly aids my research projects. We communicate with incarcerated women across California through letters and prison visits, and we provide them with emotional support and resources, such as medical resources. I spoke with 25-30 people in a women’s prison in Chowchilla, CA. If we’re understanding the prison industrial complex as an extension of slavery because we’re commodifying these bodies, it reminds me that these incarcerated women who are directly experiencing these struggles are the true abolitionists. We’re looking to them as the leaders of our movement. My research interest includes analyzing state-sanctioned racial and sexual violence created by the prison industrial complex against incarcerated women of color. My work would be substance-less if it weren’t for the organizing with these women I’m directly informed by.

CRG: You’re interested in working through different modalities. You’re supporting students of color to engage the research process, your own research project analyzes aesthetics and creative production contending with violence against Black women, and your community organizing is about following the leadership of incarcerated people in women’s prisons. Are there connections?

Istifaa: One example is that CCWP publishes a newsletter every season which consists of poetry, testimonies, and art work from the women themselves. It’s humbling to see their work published on this platform that’s circulated across the prisons within the nation. We see a sense of solidarity inside and outside of prisons. Also I have seen formerly incarcerated students often become stigmatized, but in fact [like many other incarcerated people] they’ve acquired so much legal knowledge and expertise behind bars.
Late December 2014, I apprehensively accepted an offer for a commonwealth-supported place in Western Sydney University’s PhD Program in Human Geography to become a visiting scholar in the CRG Islamophobia Research & Documentation Project. Overwhelmed by nerves, fear and self-doubt, I knew this commitment would be no less than an intense, demanding challenge. As I sit here on the beautiful UC Berkeley campus in California, I can safely say I could never have imagined writing a reflection of my PhD experience from such a position of privilege. A strong passion for researching racial inequality – namely Islamophobia, encouragement from mentors, and a rigorous application process resulted in receiving the prestigious Australian Government Endeavour Postgraduate Scholarship to fund a full-year of PhD fieldwork on Islamophobia in the Bay Area.

As a member of the Australian Muslim community subject to increasing levels of Islamophobia, my interest in capturing and documenting the impacts of this form of racism on Muslim youth is very much a personal one. My educational background in human geography inspired a consideration of how the public exclusion of Muslims from Sydney’s spaces expressed through protests against Mosque development or Islamic institutions was being interpreted by Muslims, and whether it shaped the way they perceived and engaged with various regions they had been excluded from. My 2014 research on the impacts of Islamophobia on the spatial mobility of Muslim youth in Sydney, found that experiences of Islamophobia not only impacted the way young Muslims perceived their neighbourhoods, but also limited the way they engaged in certain spaces.

My Bay Area case-study, supervised by Dr. Hatem Bazian (Ethnic Studies), who leads the Center for Race and Gender’s Islamophobia Research and Documentation Project, aims to similarly uncover the geography of Islamophobia in the Bay Area. As of April 2016, I have collected over 150 online surveys, and will spend the remaining three months of my visit conducting over 30 interviews with young Muslims on their diverse experiences of identity and belonging in the Bay Area. Upon collecting these narratives, I will undertake a relational comparison between the experiences of young Muslims in the Bay Area and Sydney to gain insight into the complexities of how Islamophobia is experienced, and the way it is both locally and globally produced and manifested.

The research process has been exciting, rewarding and challenging. Conducting research on such a sensitive topic, with a community under immense political pressure called for a more “participatory” research approach. Gaining trust and building rapport as an “insider-outsider” resulted in data collection delays, that was equally met with enriched local knowledge, stronger community networks, and building friendships along the way.

Throughout the research process, my time as a visiting scholar at CRG has facilitated access to endless resources, networks, and opportunities for research dissemination and professional development as an Early Career Researcher. Dr. Bazian’s local knowledge and well-established trust with the Bay Area Muslim community has been instrumental to my data collection and rapport-building in the early months of my visit.

Further, CRG has provided me with access to a community with like-minded individuals and groups who are striving towards the common goal of achieving racial justice. I’ve had the pleasure of sharing my research via a number of public-speaking engagements across the Bay Area, ranging from presenting my local findings at the CRG Thursday Forum Series, training UC Berkeley students on “racialization” at the local YWCA, speaking as a “Phenomenal Woman of Colour” at De Anza College in Cupertino, CA, and presenting my Sydney case-study at the Annual Islamophobia Conference, co-sponsored by CRG. My UC Berkeley affiliation has opened doors to a vast array of career development workshops ranging from resume consultancy, to training in digital research methods such as “demographic mapping” at D-Lab in Barrows Hall. Of all these benefits, the collegial, welcoming and supportive team environment at CRG has been the highlight of my visit, and made my research, opportunities and accomplishments possible.

I look forward to the remainder of my appointment as a visiting scholar at CRG that will be filled with endless opportunities for social, professional and intellectual growth.
The Fall 2016 CRG Thursday Forum Series featured a range of speakers at various stages of their careers who shared emerging research on race, gender, and their intersections. Forum presentations this semester represented a broad landscape of ideas, topics, and disciplinary approaches, and provided an opportunity for students, fellows and faculty to share scholarly work for community feedback. Visit the CRG blog to listen to audio from the forums: crg.berkeley.edu/podcasts

The series began with “Racial Formation in Palestine-Israel: Gender, Diaspora and Occupation,” led by Dr. Smadar Lavie from the Beatrice Bain Research Group and PhD candidate, Evyn Lê Espiritu, from the Rhetoric Department. Dr. Lavie’s presentation, “Gaza 2014 and the Mizrahi Predicament: Neoliberalism, Informal Activism and Ultra-nationalism in Palestine-Israel” examined intra-Jewish racial and gendered dynamics in the State of Israel through ethnographic data and archival research. Her presentation explored the relationships between neoliberal financial reform and intra-Jewish racism as they relate to Israeli ultra-nationalism and the Israel-Palestine conflict. Lê Espiritu’s doctoral research, “Cold War Entanglements: Vietnam and Palestine from 1967 to 1975” examined how the Socialist Republic of Vietnam established diplomatic relations with the State of Israel by contextualizing an earlier moment of transnational solidarity between Vietnam and Palestine from 1967, the year of the June Six Day War. Her research drew extensively from newspaper articles, archival research conducted at the Institute of Palestine Studies (IPS) in Ramallah, personal interviews with current Vietnamese and Palestinian diplomats, and secondary literature to trace not only circuits of empire, but also circuits of transnational solidarity.

In the second forum of the semester, graduate students Daryl Maude (East Asian Languages & Cultures) and Lisa Hofmann-Kuroda (East Asian Languages & Cultures) studied intimacy, orientalism and global power through the medium of photography. Maude’s presentation entitled, “Through Okinawan Eyes: Race and Blackness in the Photography of Ishikawa Mao” contextualized cultural production in Okinawa against a broader geopolitical background of the Cold War. Maude argued that Ishikawa’s photography from the 1970s revealed critical racial, sexual, and gendered dynamics through portraits of African American service-men and their Okinawan and Japanese lovers, girlfriends and wives. Hofmann-Kuroda explored the connection between late-19th century Orientalist ethnography and travelogues in her presentation, “The Ghost in the (Oriental) Machine: Lafcadio Hearn’s Haunted Tales of Old Japan.” Drawing on Francis Galton’s technique of “composite photography” to predict an ideal racial type, Hofmann-Kuroda unravelled theories of kinship, evolution and eugenics as they travelled between overlapping spaces of empire in 19th century Victorian England and Meiji Japan. Discussion was moderated by recent graduate, Dr. Arikos Ikehara (Comparative Ethnic Studies) who challenged Maude and Hofmann-Kuroda to encode the different power dynamics of personal gendered and racialized relations in their respective visual archives.

Graduate students Kavitha Iyengar and Mina Barahimi, from the Jurisprudence and Social Policy program, presented their work in a forum entitled, “Lynch Law, Migration Control and the Regulation of Racial Meaning.” Iyengar’s presentation drew on a vast archive that included newspaper articles, publishing houses and literature on the construction of race and gender that surrounded lynching to examine Ida Wells’s writing as a response to the institutional and conceptual infrastructure of the rule of lynch law. Her research invited the audience to consider the institutional role that newspapers played in the racial terrorism of post-Reconstruction America. Barahimi’s presentation revealed how the discretion of U.S. Border Patrol officers shapes the practice of voluntary return, a summary (i.e. no due process) expulsion procedure implemented in the U.S.-Mexico border region against undocumented Mexican immigrants. Her research used a qualitative case study (San Diego, California) to frame voluntary
return in the context of U.S. immigration law enforcement and to illustrate its influence in constructing perceptions of Mexican immigrants as transient, temporary, and ultimately unsuitable for membership in the U.S. polity.

The fourth forum of the semester, “Islamophobia and the Body Politics of Public Space,” highlighted the research of two PhD candidates and Visiting Student Researchers at CRG’s Islamophobia Research and Documentation Project (IRDP): Rhonda Itaoui (Western Sydney University) and Fatima Khemilat (Instituts d’études politiques, France). Itaoui’s presentation, “Geographies of Islamophobia in Sydney and the San Francisco Bay Area: Mapping the Spatial Imaginaries of Young Muslim Residents,” used a systematic and empirical approach to examine mental maps, surveys and focus groups. Khemilat’s research draws on intersectional analyses of gender, racialization and gentrification to explore the rise of sexist and racist limitations targeted against veiled Muslim women in France in her presentation, “The Exclusion of Visible Muslims from French Public Spaces.” Both projects reveal the stigmatization of Islam within dominant Western cultures and Itaoui and Khemilat’s study of the spatial distribution of Islamophobia extend the geographical focus of IRDP to an Australian and French context.

In “Remapping Homelands: Cultural Production Across Borders,” Prof. Catherine Ceniza Choy (Ethnic Studies) and Prof. Minoo Moallem (Gender and Women’s Studies) provided the audience a glimpse into their ongoing research projects. In “No Longer Silent: Asian International Adoption and Cultural Production,” Prof. Ceniza Choy examined the central role South Korea plays in the history of international and transracial adoption. She explored the phenomenon of international adoptees returning to live and work in Korea and studies the significance of their artistic production (visual art and literature) in highlighting the contemporary state of international adoption. Prof. Moallem’s presentation “The Intangible Stories of War Carpets” drew on her book manuscript entitled Persian Carpets: The Nation as a Transnational Commodity to discuss the ways in which consumerism binds together citizen-subjects in the Global North with those who are being placed into the anonymous spaces of war zones, remote villages, refugee camps and borderlands.

The final forum of the semester featured talks by Christoph Hanssmann (Sociology, UC San Francisco) and Prof. James Doucet-Battle (Sociology, UC Santa Cruz) centering on “Bio-Recognition: Speculating Race, Gender and Health.” Hanssmann’s ethnographic research focused on transgender health activism in Buenos Aires and New York to understand how such health-based claims can “answer sideways” to issues of racialized criminalization, economic marginalization, and sexualized violence. In his presentation, Hanssmann compared trans-health activist movements in Argentina and the U.S. to related health activist movements (for example, campaigns for environmental health, sterilization prevention, and abortion access) to explore the connections between social movements mobilizing epidemiologic vernaculars. Prof. Battle’s presentation, “Bioethical Matriarchy: Race, Gender, and the Gift in Genomic Research,” explores the 2013 sequencing of the epigenome and genome from Henrietta Lack’s HeLa cell line that illuminated the bioethical intersections of genomics, race, and gender. Drawing from field, media, biomedical archival research, Prof. Battle studied the ways African-descent and matriarchal status reproduce the social order, reflecting racialized and gendered histories of kinship, desire, and status inequality. A special thank you to our moderator Prof. Charis Thompson (Gender & Women’s Studies) for engaging our audience and presenters in a lively discussion that broached themes of reparative and restorative justice, consent and inclusion through the lens of bioethical, intellectual property.

Text and photos by Desirée Valadares, CRG Graduate Student Researcher, except as noted.
“Missing in History”: An Interview with Prof. Khatharya Um on Critical Migration and Refugee Studies

Prof. Khatharya Um is an Associate Professor in the Department of Ethnic Studies in the area of Asian American and Asian Diaspora Studies. Prof. Um recently published two major volumes advancing the political discourse on migration and refugee studies in Southeast Asia, and exploring themes such as war, exile, belonging, and genocide. Prof. Um’s research not only intervenes in the telling of complex histories of conflict, it offers crucial insight into ongoing debates about migration, accountability and justice.

– Desirée Valadares, CRG Graduate Student Researcher

CRG: How did your edited volume, Southeast Asian Migration: People on the Move in Search of Work, Refuge and Belonging (2015) come about?

Prof. Khatharya Um: The idea for this volume came out of an international conference on migration. It was evident that despite the importance of Southeast Asia as both a migrant sending and receiving region, relatively few studies exist that address the complexity of Southeast Asian migration within and beyond the Asia-Pacific region.

The contributors are scholars from Asia, America, and Europe, and from different disciplines, many of whom have done pioneering work on these topics. Some are not simply scholars and researchers but also advocates and refugees themselves. The insights that they infuse into their scholarship are enriched by cultural and linguistic access and deep ethnography that make them invaluable.

CRG: How do trends/themes in Southeast Asian migration and refugee studies compare with global migration?

KU: As the volume reveals, Southeast Asian migration is compelled by many and different factors that include economic, political, environmental and other catalysts. It shares many features and concerns with economic migration from other parts of the world, and it also includes conflict-engendered displacement similar to what we witness in the Middle East, Europe, Latin America, and Africa. There is voluntary as well as forced migration and human trafficking both within and beyond the region.

CRG: This edited volume contains a range of interdisciplinary voices and methodologies. Do you think there is a particular field of study or method that lends itself to migration and refugee studies?

KU: Despite recent shifts in the field, migration studies remain overly preoccupied with policies, state actors, and global forces. However, migration is not reducible to legislation and statistics, nor is it just about economic motivation. It is also about rebuilding lives, community, a sense of home and belonging. Arts, religion, psychology, for example, can add much to the discourse on migration. An interdisciplinary approach allows us to capture migrants’ multifaceted and textured experiences. The more exciting works are those that critically push against disciplinary boundaries and prevailing assumptions. Critical Refugee Studies, for one, is an exciting emergent field.

CRG: How did your interest in refugee and migration studies develop?

KU: I am a refugee. I did not just choose the field; I live that experience. I have dedicated much of my academic and advocacy life to refugee works, but the multi-campus Critical Refugee Studies initiative that I co-lead is spurred by the resurgent interest in and current hypervisibility of refugees. Rather than adopting an ahistoricized, problem-oriented approach, we re-conceptualize the refugee as a site of critical interrogation of the nexus between imperial formations, militarization, and dislocation. The scholars involved have pioneered works that are foundational to CRS and brought refugees to the center of the ethnic studies concerns. Most are refugee scholars and not just scholars on refugees. This is a much-needed intervention. We aim to expand this intellectual community through grants, and faculty, graduate and undergraduate student engagement in the many activities that we are planning over the next four years on different collaborating campuses. It is an exciting moment for people working on what is decidedly one of the most critical issues of the 21st century.

CRG: Your book From the Land of Shadows (2015) is about the Cambodian genocide and the making of the Cambodian diaspora. Can you speak more about it?

KU: From the Land of Shadows is about the pathology of power and its ravaging effects on individuals and social system. Specifically, it is about state-sponsored violence against its own people – the kind that is perpetuated in many parts of the world today, and that exposes the limitations of international laws.

The war that we come to know as the “Vietnam War,” which was not confined to Vietnam, may have ended in 1975 for the US, but for Cambodians, it was the beginning of a spiraling descent into one of the nation’s darkest eras. Within hours of their seizure of power, the Cambodian
communists, also known as the Khmer Rouge, began the historically unprecedented process of emptying all urban centers. All residents were sent to the countryside and put to work in labor camps, and all aspects of life were collectivized, including forced marriages that were organized and imposed by the state. The country was consumed by state violence. In less than four years, almost a quarter of the population perished from hard labor, forced starvation, executions, and “disappearances.” Another half a million Cambodians became stateless, with over 100,000 finding refuge in America. A whole generation virtually disappeared, leaving the country’s post-genocide population comprised mostly of women and children. In the US, one in four Cambodian refugee women was a widow. In a country of oral traditions, physical death also means cultural rupture for when people die, they take with them the rich cultural memory that can never be retrieved.

**CRG:** Could you discuss some of the other themes in the book, particularly absence and silence?

**KU:** Absence is a theme that threads through the book – the absence engendered by mass disappearances, of Cambodia and Cambodians in US history books, in the academy, and popular consciousness in the West. Cambodian studies remain a colonized space. So much of the country’s history is written by non-Cambodians. We are, to borrow from Helen Zia, the “missing in history.”

The book is also about silence – the conditions that produce and perpetuate silence, and the multiple sites and registers of silence – the silence of humanity as it watched, unmoved, the crimes committed against itself and in its name in Cambodia, the silence of generational death, the silence of words, evacuated of meaning by the magnitude of the experience, the silence in the homes that hovers across generations.

Part of the silencing that contributed to the tragedy was the dismissing of refugee testimonies about mass atrocities as self-serving and unreliable. The book is based on substantive interviews and the lived experiences of survivor families because it is important for me to foreground Cambodian voices and presence in it. I also made a deliberate effort to end critical chapters in the book with a Cambodian voice, for we Cambodians are rarely seen in, and rarely allowed to speak to, our own history.

The book also moves beyond the question of what produces mass violence that is the focus of most genocide studies, to looking at the impact on, and responses of, individuals and social systems to historical traumas. Genocide wounds the nation physically and metaphysically, and tears asunder the normative fabric that gives coherence and cohesion to the social order. Forced migration and the physical, psychical, and spiritual disconnect from land, history, and identity that it entails renders this historical trauma even more acute for diasporas. What we often fail to see is what I call the heroism of quotidian life – that is the ability to recover the sense of communalism and sociality after social death, to emerge from under the rubbles to carry on – to live with dignity and compassion – as a refusal to submit.

This historical haunting provokes critical questions about healing, which is tied to the question of justice and accountability. Over $200 million and over three decades later, only three convictions for crimes against humanity have been handed to Khmer Rouge senior officials. Many of the Khmer Rouge leaders and many of the survivors had already died. What kind of possibility does that permit or preclude for the delivery of justice and what kind of justice, and for whom? We often speak of justice, reconciliation and healing as if they are mutually reinforcing. In fact they can be conflictual, for the search for justice has been argued to thwart reconciliation, and what is needed for justice – like the exposed remains of the killing fields – can preclude healing. If justice delivered through juridical processes can only be imperfect, where then does accountability lie, and who will be there to demand it?

**CRG:** What is the larger significance of the book?

**KU:** When we turn on the news these days, we see images of bombed out cities, refugees crammed into unseaworthy boats, and faces of desperation. They were not unlike what we saw four decades ago with the refugee crisis in Southeast Asia.

What we don’t hear enough is the why. Refugees are not ahistorical apparitions. They are the human and enduring legacies of war, conquest, and occupation, the debris of empire. We often think that conflicts are over once the images stop appearing on our TV screens but violence has its own temporality. The legacies of conflict persist long after its declared ending. It is not just about the bombs that rain over cities but that also remain in the fields and orchards for generations to come. Though extreme, the Cambodian tragedy is not an aberration. Mass atrocities, death camps, statelessness, and refugees tragically are features of modernity. The global responsibility is not only to stop mass atrocities but also not to create conditions for them to erupt in the first place.
GRADUATE GRANT RECIPIENTS

Natalee Kehaulani Bauer
Graduate School of Education; Social & Cultural Studies
(En)Gendering Whiteness: A Historical Analysis of White Womanhood, Colonial Anxieties, and “Tender Violence” in US Schools

Alexandra Havrylyshyn
Jurisprudence and Social Policy
Property as Power: How Enslaved Women and Girls Gained Access to Justice in Antebellum Louisiana

Lisa Hofmann-Kuroda
East Asian Languages and Cultures
The Tree of Life: The Politics of Kinship in Meiji Japan and Victorian Britain

Sarah Jessica Johnson
English
Maroons and Marronage: A Literary Study with Objects

Amani Morrison
African American Studies
Domestic Architecture and Spatial Performance in Great Migration Chicago

Jennifer Smith
Ethnic Studies
Ordering Space and Spatializing Order: Land and Race in Edward Curtis’s photographs of the 1899 Harriman Alaska Expedition

Aaron Gregory Young
City & Regional Planning
The Landscape of Urban Restitution in South Africa

Joanne Tien
Education

UNDERGRADUATE GRANT RECIPIENTS

Julia Malakiman
Peace & Conflict Studies
Islamophobia Rising: The Nicois en Nour Mosque and 2016 Terrorist Attack in Nice, France

Istifaa Ahmed
Ethnic Studies; Gender & Women’s Studies
mY [blOOd] bOdY

Alexander Vazquez
English
See the Body: Performance in City of Night

Joanne Tien
Education

For more information about these student research projects, please see: crg.berkeley.edu/grantwinners

Spring Application deadlines
Undergraduate Student Grants:
Monday, March 6, 2017 by 3:00 p.m.
http://crg.berkeley.edu/content/undergraduate-deadline

Graduate Student Grants:
Monday, April 10, 2017, by 3:00 p.m.
http://crg.berkeley.edu/content/grad-grant-deadline
Upcoming Events - Spring 2017

Details at: crg.berkeley.edu

March 9
CRG Thursday Forum
States of Apology: The Culture of Commemoration
Amanda Su, English
Kristen Sun, Ethnic Studies
Desiree Valadares, Architecture
4:00 pm - 5:30 pm, 691 Barrows Hall

March 9
Book launch discussion
Palestine...it is something colonial
Dr. Hatem Bazian, Near Eastern and Asian American and Asian Diaspora Studies; Islamophobia Research and Documentation Project
6:30 pm - 9:00 pm, Ethnic Studies Library

March 14, * Tuesday
CRG Forum
Islamophobia Across the Atlantic: Trump, Europe’s Far Right, and the Place of Civil Society
Dr. Farid Hafez, Islamophobia Research & Documentation Project
5:00 pm - 7:00 pm, Hearst Field Annex, A1

March 16
CRG Thursday Forum
Disappearing Acts: Domestic Violence & Black Legal Subjects
Margo Mahan, Sociology
Alisa Bierria, Center for Race & Gender
4:00 pm - 5:30 pm, 691 Barrows Hall

March 23
CRG Thursday Forum
Bodies as Borders: A Spotlight on Undergraduate Research
Bonnie Cherry, Interdisciplinary Studies
Alexander Vazquez, English
Istifaa Ahmed, Ethnic Studies
4:00 pm - 5:30 pm, 691 Barrows Hall

April 11
Advancing Human Rights in a Rightward World: Challenges for International Institutions and Civil Society
Opening remarks by Dr. Paul Alivisatos, Vice Chancellor for Research and Samsung Distinguished Professor of Nanoscience and Nanotechnology
Moderated by Laurel Fletcher, Clinical Professor of Law and Director of the International Human Rights Law Clinic, School of Law
Introductions by Prof. Angana Chatterji, Visiting Research Anthropologist and Co-chair, Project on Political Conflict, Gender and People’s Rights, Center for Race and Gender
5:00 pm - 7:00 pm
Goldberg Room, Boalt Hall, Berkeley School of Law

April 20
CRG Thursday Forum
Visual Vocabularies & Queer Citizipships
Andrew Gayed, York University
Marco Flores, Ethnic Studies
Alan Carlos Pelaez Lopez, Comparative Ethnic Studies
4:00 pm - 5:30 pm, 691 Barrows Hall

April 21-23
Islamophobia and the End of Liberalism?
8th Annual Islamophobia Conference
Location: UC Berkeley, Details TBA

April 27
CRG Thursday Forum
Investments in Vulnerability: The Limits of Charity & Protection
Dr. Juliann Anesi, Gender and Women’s Studies
Dr. Lee Ann Wang, Berkeley School of Law
4:00 pm - 5:30 pm, 691 Barrows Hall

April 28
“Forgetting Vietnam” film screening
Prof. Trinh Minh-Ha, Gender and Women’s Studies
5:00 pm - 7:00 pm, Multicultural Community Center, MLK, Jr. Student Union

Please check for updates on these events: crg.berkeley.edu
SPARKING TRANSFORMATIVE RESEARCH!

The Center for Race and Gender is an interdisciplinary research center that is a core hub for critical research on race, gender, and their intersections. Your generous contribution will sustain groundbreaking research, strategic community connections, and the development of social justice projects of local and international scope.

To donate online, please visit: give.berkeley.edu/crg OR use the form below to make a contribution by check.

Thank you for contributing to the CRG!
Your donation will support transformative research at UC Berkeley.

I would like to donate:
☐ $500 (Director’s Circle)
☐ $100 (CRG Sustainer)
☐ $50 (Sponsor)
☐ $25 (Friend)
☐ (Other) please specify $_______

Please make checks payable to the “UC Berkeley Foundation” and write the fund number “FU1312000” in the memo line.

Please send checks to:
The Center for Race and Gender
UC Berkeley
638 Barrows Hall #1074
Berkeley, CA 94720-1074

NAME: _____________________________________________________________

ADDRESS: ____________________________________________________________________________

CITY: __________________________ STATE: __________ ZIP: __________________________

PHONE: __________________________ EMAIL: __________________________

Please check here to indicate if you are a  ☐ UCB Student  ☐ UCB Faculty  ☐ UCB Staff  ☐ UCB Alumni  ☐ Friend