On Monday March 3, 2003 the Center for Race and Gender was honored to host a panel discussion concerning the work of the groundbreaking Chicano performance group Culture Clash featuring Professor Jorge Huerta of UC San Diego, Professor Alma Martinez of UC Santa Cruz, Annie Glenn, a doctoral student in the UC Irvine/UC San Diego Joint PhD Program in Theatre and Drama, and featuring the three members of Culture Clash: Ric Salinas, Herbert Siguenza and Richard Montoya.

The discussion provided listeners with an overview of Culture Clash’s history as well as their philosophy and their views on the current directions their work is taking, directions leading to a quite different place from which they started. Salinas, Siguenza and Montoya’s formation of Culture Clash in 1984 filled a unique role in American arts. Their work is political, but it is more than simply political theater – it is a redrawing of the map of traditional theater. Performing a heady mixture of vaudeville, satire, and what Annie Glenn refers to as “community based” theater, Culture Clash continues to produce hard-hitting work that is both commercial yet political, professional yet risky, sentimental yet scathing.

In 1992 their play “A Bowl of Beings” premiered on PBS’s Great Performances series. For Fox Broadcasting they set a milestone for Latinos with 30 episodes of “Culture Clash,” which aired in seven U.S. markets, the first ever Latino-themed half-hour sketch comedy for television executive produced and written by its stars. The group co-produced, co-wrote, and starred in an award-winning 1992 short film entitled Columbus on Trial directed by Lourdes Portillo. Theatre Communications Group published Culture Clash’s first book Life, Death, and Revolutionary Comedy, now in its second printing, which includes their plays “The Mission,” “A Bowl of Beings,” and “Radio Mambo”.

Culture Clash is known for their irreverent, often offensive, and always incisive satire designed to highlight social inequality, oppression, racism, class bias, the short-sightedness of the right, and the complacency of the left. At the
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Faculty Retreat

During our successful Dissertation Retreat in the Fall of 2002 it occurred to faculty in attendance as mentors that they rarely had opportunities for the kind of focused exchange that took place among the graduate students. Thus was born the idea for a research retreat specifically for faculty engaged in scholarly projects on race and gender.

The idea was realized on March 14-15, when the CRG held a “Faculty Research Retreat” at Green Gulch Farm, the SF Zen Center retreat in Sausalito. The explicit aim was to share projects that were in their early stages and that would benefit from feedback from others doing related research. Thus each participant was asked to submit a two weeks ahead of time an outline, draft or proposal for work-in-formation, rather than a finished product. Over the course of the retreat each project went through two rounds of discussion. Thus, participants had a chance to become engaged in another’s projects and receive constructive feedback on their own project.

The participants represented a range of disciplines and topics. Paola Bachetta (Women’s Studies, UCB) presented a draft of a paper entitled “Racism is not intellectual” Interracial Friendship, Multicultural Literature, and Moral Growth,” which focuses on emotion as a basis for epistemic knowledge and healing. She examines how both interracial friendship and multicultural literature, by opening up people to emotion, can under certain conditions lead to moral growth.

Paula Moya (English, Stanford) offered a draft of a paper entitled “Racism is not intellectual” Interracial Friendship, Multicultural Literature, and Moral Growth,” which focuses on emotion as a basis for epistemic knowledge and healing. She examines how both interracial friendship and multicultural literature, by opening up people to emotion, can under certain conditions lead to moral growth.

Reyna Ramirez (American Studies, UCSC) presented a draft of a paper entitled “Engendering Cultural Citizenship from a Native Perspective” which offers a criti-
At the same time attention to threats of terrorism and the war on Iraq have distracted us from on-going domestic issues of race and gender. However, some critical developments are underway that have enormous implications for the lives of men and women of color in the U.S. and for our struggles for economic, social, and political justice. A judicial appeal on University of Michigan’s affirmative action programs is slated to be heard by the U.S. Supreme Court. Emboldened by the anticipated overturning of Michigan’s admissions criteria that awards a few points for minority status (within a much larger set of criteria that mostly focus on test scores, grades, and quality of the high school) anti-affirmative action forces have begun attacking other types of programs, such as summer enrichment programs, that were established in the 1970s and 80s to address the continuing inequalities in primary and secondary education by providing special programs that attempt to lessen the preparation gap. In Texas and California — states where affirmative action has been barred either by legislation or popular initiative — the university system has adopted some version of a “race blind” admissions process that nonetheless tries to lessen the inequalities resulting from inequality of secondary schools by granting admission to the top tier of graduates of every public high school in the state (the top 10% in Texas and 4% in California). Studies of the impacts of the new policies reveal a drop in Black and Latino enrollments in the UC system. Glenn Loury, a belated convert to affirmative action, points out in a recent op-ed piece in the New York Times, that for the remedy to have the desired impact, there would have to be complete racial/ethnic segregation of schools. The reality is that even with substantial racial segregation of schools, student bodies are not 100% black or Latino or Asian. In a predominately black school, the top 4% of students may be disproportionately white or Asian. And this is exactly the case: Granting ethnicity to the top 4% in California means that Asian Americans are admitted in even greater proportions than they would be under either affirmative action or a purely test and grade driven admissions process.

It may soon become difficult to conduct studies that document the actual impacts of admissions policies in California if the so-called “Racial Privacy Act” (renamed the Classification by Race, Ethnicity, and National Origin Act, or CRENO) is approved by the electorate. The initiative has garnered sufficient signatures to appear on the March, 2004 election ballot, and early polls indicate that passage is likely. This measure has been crafted by the deceptively named “The American Civil Rights Coalition.” The measure prohibits state entities from collecting information on race and ethnicity. Supporters claim that collection of such information is a violation of “privacy” rights and helps to foster racial divisiveness. Supporters also claim that only through “color blindness” can a true meritocracy be attained. However, as those involved in equal opportunity efforts know, the collection of racial/ethnic data is essential for tracking differential health status, monitoring hate crimes, documenting discrimination, and measuring civil rights progress. The law is cleverly written so as to create various exemptions to ward off the most obvious objections. For example, the initiative contains a provision allowing the police to use racial descriptors, but exempts them from having to provide racial data on searches, arrests, and charges. Thus, the measure allows police to engage in racial profiling without any accountability for doing so.

CRG programming for 2003-2004 will address some of the issues raised above. Two are already in the works: First, as a follow up to our Spring 2002 symposium on “Race, Gender and the War on Terrorism,” we plan to mount a symposium series for the 2003-2004 academic year called “Race, Gender, Religion Post-9/11,” which will feature activists and scholars. Paula Bachetta, a new member of the Women’s Studies Department, who has done extensive work on anti-Muslim movements in India, will be the main organ-izer. Second, the CRG is preparing to work with student groups and others to sponsor events to help build awareness of the provisions of the Racial Privacy initiative, the political interests of backers of the initiative, and the likely consequences if the initiative passes. We anticipate undertaking still other initiatives to address emerging race and gender issues.

Professor Evelyn Nakano Glenn
CRG Director

Students Organize Against CRENO

Every Tuesday night from 8 p.m. – 9 p.m. a group of organizers meet on the second floor of UC Berkeley’s Eshleman Hall, which houses most of the student groups on campus. The Berkeley organizers are part of a statewide student coalition made up of organizers from the UCSA (University of California Students Association) and CSAAC (The California State-wide Affirmative Action Coalition). These organizers are working together to fight the latest wave of neo-conservative legislation to wash over the citizens of California: UC Regent Ward Connerly’s Classification of Race, Ethnicity and National Origin Initiative.

The Classification of Race, Ethnicity and National Origin Initiative, also known as CRENO, is a voter resolution being marketed as a means to make California completely “race-blind” at various state government agencies. CRENO’s surface appearance obscures the harmful and negative consequences that will follow if voters fail to critically apprehend the rhetoric that is surrounding this resolution. Proposed by UC Regent Ward Connerly, who was one of the main backers of Proposition 209 which ended affirmative action in the UC system, CRENO, formerly known as the Racial Privacy Initiative, would make collection of any data on racial and ethnicity illegal for all state government agencies, including the University of California. CRENO’s supporters claim that the goal of the initiative is to ensure that all are judged on merits rather than so-called “extraneous factors” (to see what else people are saying in support of CRENO visit www.racialprivacy.org).

CRENO’s merits are, however, dubious at best, and the proposed legislation’s wording might very well confuse voters who do not fully understand the resulting damage that the resolution would cause. By banning all government agencies from collecting data on race and ethnicity, healthcare facilities would be unable to gather information on racial disparities in disease patterns, for example, whether Asian-American women in California are more likely to develop lung cancer than white women. Improving our educational system would be infinitely more difficult under CRENO as we would not know which racial groups are in need of differing educational resources and which groups may need support for academic achievement. Hate crime statistics – which inform us of particular groups that are being targeted – would also not be available. These are just some of the serious bans on information that would come out of CRENO. By putting Californians in an “information black hole,” people of this state would be unable to work on solving such aforementioned problems in an effective and informed way.

CRENO would also hamper anti-tobacco and other prevention programs since certain racial groups are targeted in differ-
As part of its mandate to foster explorations of race, gender, and their intersections, the Center for Race and Gender sponsors several series of talks on campus throughout the academic year. These talks bring together scholars on campus and abroad, as well as community activists for fruitful, interdisciplinary and inter-institutional discussion. During the 2002 – 2003 academic year the CRG sponsored two series: the CRG Forum, and the Environmental Justice Discussion Group.

The CRG initiated the monthly Forums in an effort to provide opportunities for faculty and students to share emerging work on the race/gender nexus. At each meeting one or more faculty and/or graduate students gives brief presentations, followed by open discussion. This 2002 – 2003 academic year we had a fantastic series! In the fall we were honored to have acclaimed poet, scholar, and Cal Ethnic Studies faculty member Alfred Arteaga speak about “Habana Vieja: Love and Migration in Cuba.” In November two Ethnic Studies graduate students shared their research. Mimi Nguyen’s talk was entitled “Where’s the Riot Grrrls? Thinking Through Race, Voice, and Feminist Futures;” Victor Rios spoke about “From Knucklehead to Revolutionary: Urban Youth Culture and Social Transformation.”

The mix of faculty and graduate students is one of the things contributing to the dynamism of the Forums and we continued this in the Spring 2003 semester. In January Professor Nimachia Hernandez of Ethnic Studies gave a talk entitled “The Telling of Us: Blackfoot Gender Identity as Told in Story.” In February Professor Jose David Saldívar of Ethnic Studies and English presented part of his current research in a talk he called “In Search of the Mexican Elvis: Border Matters, Amercanity, and Critiques of the State.”

Our final Forum of the Spring saw Donna Maeda and David Hernandez presenting on “Remembering Plessy’s Race and Places: Haitian Diaspora, U.S. Colonialism, and Transnational Racial Regulations” and “Undue Process: Immigrant Detention Before 9/11” respectively. The CRG Forums will continue in the Fall 2003 semester so be sure to check our web site for the
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**Culture Clash**
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March CRG panel Richard Montoya elaborated thusly: “The great playwright August Wilson considered himself a ‘race man.’ Culture Clash is obsessed with race and with making people uncomfortable. We are ‘race men.’ Race is the most important subject, the most important tool, or clay, with which we work. “Anthems” [Culture Clash’s] most recently performed work about Washington D.C. immediately after 9/11] is not a consoling piece.” While in 1984 they were very much a comedy group, Professor Huerta began March’s panel discussion by making it clear to the audience that in his opinion Culture Clash has indeed moved from being the country’s premier comedy troupe, to being its premier Teatro Latino, politically motivated theater.

By making this distinction Huerta meant to reference the tonal shift in the group’s work and the subsequent impact Culture Clash has made on the nation’s consciousness in the last 10 – 15 years. Culture Clash’s work has shifted significantly from the comedy of their early years to a darker, more serious brand of humor. As Montoya explained it, “We went to Los Angeles twelve years ago and had some real crash and burn experiences with Hollywood. We then went back to theater at a time when L.A. was still recovering from Rodney King. The King riots and the general climate in the city really affected our work and I think that about eight years ago our focus shifted from the wholly Chicano to a much wider perspective. It was after this shift that we went to South Beach and were able to write something like ‘Radio Mambo.’ Then we weren’t doing just comedy anymore, and even though Chicanismo was not the center of our work, we were more sure of who we were, and who our subjects were, and each show still presents a Chicano world view.”

Montoya’s comment provides a kind of roadmap for the path the two-hour conversation took. Panelists discussed the shift in Culture Clash’s humor, the specificity of their work, how the trio functions together, whether or not they see themselves as “cross over artists,” and how they understand their work in relation to the world around them, specifically in the context of inter-ethnic conflict and concerns about gender and sexuality.

With regards to the shift in their humor, Ric Salinas noted, “Rasucache [low-brow humor] is good, but it’s got to be good rasucache!” Herbert Siguenza concurred. “Comedy is still the basis of our work,” he said, “but now every joke has something to say. We are satirists now — our comedy has a message.” To illustrate, Salinas cited the character of Shamu in “Culture Clash in Bordertown” which had its world premier at San Diego Repertory’s Lyceum Theater in 1998. We meet Shamu, one of many characters in the pastiche work about San Diego, at Sea World, his place of employment. Like many residents of the city, Shamu is concerned about Mexican immigration and job scarcity. He speaks at length about “wetback” whales taking jobs from hard-working “American” whales. A talking whale with a sophisticated, if misinformed, political consciousness is clearly absurd, yet the very absurdity of the situation forms the foundation of the pointed satire of the entire piece.

“Culture Clash in Bordertown” is an example of what Annie Glenn refers to as Culture Clash’s “community based” theater. These are site specific, commissioned pieces. Their first such work was “Radio Mambo: Culture Clash Invades Miami.” As Montoya explained at the panel these pieces are intricate compositions involving a complex set of processes. In 1995 when Culture Clash was first commis-
latest details.

So too will continue our Environmental Justice Discussion Group. A synthesis seems to be possible among the growing number of Berkeley researchers who are studying racial, economic and environmental justice in America. This discussion series creates an opportunity for the presentation and exchange of ideas, and for the development of convergent possibilities that will support grant proposals, course and research development, conferences, and institutional reform. The series focused this fall explicitly on the reparations movement, racial equality in metropolitan development, the racialization of labor opportunities, the whiteness of America’s “commons,” and the use of prisons and immigration rules as a means to secure racialized, cheap, controlled labor for public purposes. Such topics have been approached separately in the past. The challenge of the series is to see whether more powerful themes emerge from attention to these topics as one.

This year we had a mix of academics and community-based researches at the EJ Group. In the fall Professor Charles Henry, Professor Angela Harris, Professor Steve Pitts, and Professor Jeff Romm framed discussions with aspects of their research. The spring saw an extension to the world outside the University with speakers such as: Michel Gelobter, Executive Director of Redefining Progress, Member of the National Environmental Justice Advisory Committee and former head of environmental justice for the City of New York; Luke Cole, Director of the Center on Race, Poverty, and the Environment; as well as Professor Pamela Tau Lee of the School of Public Health, Diana Wu and Scott Williams.

In the upcoming 2003 – 2004 academic year the CRG will continue to sponsor both the Forum and the Environmental Justice Discussion Group. In addition we will be inaugurating our “Race, Gender and Religion After 9/11” series. Check the “Events” page on our website for details. We hope you can join us for some or all of these important and exciting conversations! Please consult our website for exact dates and times.

- Marissa López
  Ph. D. Candidate, English

Charles Henry
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the Civil Liberties Act in 1988 that redressed the internment of Japanese Americans. Professor Henry devoted part of his presentation to the strategies that Japanese Americans pursued to pass this act and he assessed the applicability of legal strategies or mass mobilization for reparations.

Professor Henry fielded questions at the end of his presentation. It was during this time that a question on the relationship between reparations efforts and environmental justice was asked. Professor Henry speculated that the separation of reparations from demands for land could account for the absence of strong ties between both issues.

The Environmental Justice Discussion Group will continue with biweekly discussions in the Fall of 2003.

- Clem Lai
  Ph. D. Candidate, Ethnic Studies

- Marissa López
  Ph. D. Candidate, English
Professor Leanne Hinton is the chair of the Linguistics Department at Cal, and she is also director of the Survey of California and Other Indian Languages, a research unit focusing on the documentation of Native American languages. Her research fields include sociolinguistics, language change, and language and music, with a major focus on the preservation and restoration of Native American languages. Professor Hinton’s work is fascinating, but equally fascinating is the interesting and varied path she took to her career in academic linguistics – a path that winds around the world and through many communities, contributing both to her academic ethics and the partnerships that have made her work possible. Professor Hinton strives, as so many of us do, to bring her life’s passions to her work and she has succeeded remarkably.

Professor Hinton grew up in La Jolla, CA. Although La Jolla is now an over-developed expanse of gorgeous homes, boutique shopping, and UC San Diego, while Professor Hinton was growing up it was a sleepy community on the edge of town. She describes her childhood as living in the country, but with a beach. Though Professor Hinton never learned to surf, she did have a passion for the beach. Though the two did not speak the same language they managed nonetheless to communicate. It was this experience of communicating without language that opened Hinton up to the wonder and fascination of the many different, and similar, ways of life in the world.

Many years after the experience at Punta Banda, Baja Hinton went on to study anthropology at Cal. As an undergraduate in the 1960s she was interested in ethnomusicology, specifically folk music around the world. In 1964 Hinton was working with Alan Dundes (now an internationally renowned folklorist and highly respected, admired, and beloved Professor of Social Cultural Anthropology at Cal, then a first-year assistant professor) She told him she was interested in gaining fieldwork experience. Hinton wanted to go somewhere close to California, the endeavor needed to be relatively inexpensive, and finally, she had to leave herself enough time to work and earn money for the coming school year.

Together professor and student settled on Hinton working with the Havasupai tribe who live in a tributary of the Grand Canyon. Hinton was to spend part of the summer working with the tribe and studying their music. The project was a terrific one but getting to the Havasupai was a real challenge. Hinton describes the journey, understated, as a “rough one.” She was working with a classmate and both of them were fairly green, relatively inexperienced campers. The village was an eight-mile hike from the road and Hinton laughingly tells of her and her colleague almost getting sunstroke. They persevered, however, and Hinton gained access to much music, coming away from the project with several recordings and a life-long friendship that would flourish into an academic partnership with the Havasupai. Although her research at the time was primarily in ethnomusicology, Hinton says that what really interested her about the songs was the difference between the sung and the spoken language.

After earning her degree in 1966 Hinton went to graduate school in anthropology at the University of Illinois Champagne-Urbana where she spent one year before leaving, and it wasn’t just the snow that posed a problem to the California native! Hinton began to feel that graduate work in anthropology wasn’t exactly what she wanted to do, but then, she wasn’t exactly sure what she wanted to do either. She left school and spent five years traveling around the world engaged in a variety of interesting projects. For one, she made, while working with a marine biologist in Chile, what is still the best-known recording of a sperm whale.

During her break from the academic world the University of California campus at San Diego was steadily growing. Hinton’s father met Margaret Langdon, a linguist who worked with the same family of languages (the Yuman, which stretches from San Diego to Northern Arizona) that the Havasupai spoke, and with which Hinton had worked as an undergraduate. Langdon needed some help doing fieldwork studying the DigueOo language and Hinton’s father put the two women in contact. Hinton began co-authoring papers with Langdon and from there it was a clear path to graduate school in linguistics at UC San Diego under Professor Langdon.

Upon completion of her doctorate Professor Hinton’s major area of expertise was in language and music.
Her research addressed questions of the boundaries between language and music, the role language plays in music, the semantic meaning of music, the cognitive interaction between language and music, and the function of music from a linguistic point of view. She was interested primarily in folk and ethnic music. The passage of the Bilingual Education Act in the early 1970s was a galvanizing experience for Hinton personally and professionally.

Upon passage of the act the Havasupai and other tribes started building programs to maintain their languages, to keep them alive and help them to gain status as spoken, rather than dying, languages. Hinton began working with tribes on such maintenance and revitalization projects. She helped develop a writing system for the Havasupai as well as educational texts, and children’s books.

Hinton says that it is this work that has been some of her most fulfilling. With these initial projects she was able to be a true renaissance woman and exercise her many talents, combining her artistic side with her love of applied linguistics. She drew the illustrations for her books, developed language acquisition programs and worked collaboratively with the Havasupai and their neighbors.

This work did bring up ethical questions for Professor Hinton. When working with minority groups, she says, there is always a tension of exploitation. When she first worked with the Havasupai as an undergraduate some in the community suspected she wanted to make the recordings in order to sell them. Having gained their trust earlier, however, Hinton was able to work productively with the Havasupai. Hinton grants that her work with them has afforded her professional advancement and recognition, but at the same time, the Havasupai have a living language, and without her early recordings many of their songs would be lost.

Since 1978 Professor Hinton has been writing a column focusing on language revitalization and renewal for the journal News from Native California. News is for California Indians and their friends. The column helped establish a network of people interested in native languages and their maintenance. Through this network Professor Hinton was able to gather enough material for her 1994 collection Flutes of Fire: Essays on California Indian Languages. This network also became the starting point for the establishment of Advocates for Indigenous Californian Language Survival (Advocates for short). The Advocates consists of Professor Hinton and seven California natives who run a number of programs on language revitalization. One of the most interesting of these projects is their “Master/Apprentice Language Learning Program.” This is a program which trains native language speakers for one-on-one language instruction, an immersion-style approach that puts a non-speaker together with a speaker for language transmission in a natural manner. It is, according to Hinton, a “common-sense approach to language learning.”

In the summer of 2002 Professor Hinton helped to organize a conference with Matt Vera and Nancy Steele called “How to Keep Your Language Alive” which focused on helping tribes develop practical programs for language maintenance and revitalization. In 2004 Professor Hinton will help host the “Breath of Life” conference on the UC Berkeley campus. “Breath of Life” is a national conference on stabilizing indigenous languages. 2004 will mark the first year it’s been held at Berkeley and conference organizers are expecting approximately 500 attendees.

“Everybody wants to feel they’re doing something useful,” Professor Hinton said during the interview for this article. It seems clear that Professor Hinton’s students as well as the many native language activists she has worked with throughout her career would agree that her work has been more than useful. It has been necessary and vital, and hopefully Professor Hinton will continue in the field of language revitalization for a long while.

Marissa López
Ph.D. Candidate, English

Hinton’s illustration as featured in her Havasupai language textbook

Students against CRENO
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ent ways, efforts to end racial profiling, civil rights protection groups, and school accountability in closing the gap on achievement for minority groups.

CRENO’s passage would be a devastating blow to a variety of programs and social action groups in California. That is why students in the University of California system are acting so aggressively to stop it. Currently organizers are implementing a mix of educational and outreach programs. Most recent polls show that only 10% of the state’s voters have even heard of the initiative. This presents a large, but not insurmountable obstacle, to organizers who must focus the bulk of their efforts on getting the word out about the negative effects CRENO would have.

Organizers are working on a legislative as well as educational plan. They are targeting the University of California Regents to take a stand against CRENO. The Regents are expected to take the issue up in their May meeting and organizers are hoping to mobilize and hold a rally outside to bring attention to the issue. At the meeting, the statewide faculty senate should be presenting a report on the harm CRENO will have on the educational community. Organizers are hopeful the Regents will oppose Connerly and vote against CRENO.

A recent Field Poll on CRENO showed that it is polling at 48% yes to 33% no, with only 10% having heard of it. This is excellent news for anti-CRENO organizers. It means that the initiative can be defeated by a strong educational campaign. Usually, initiative sponsors hope to get a 60% - 70% approval rating in the beginning, because initiatives tend to lose support as the election draws nearer. For example, Proposition 209, which passed in 1996 by 54%, was polling at 60-65% one year before the election.

Organizers are confident that CRENO can be beaten with an effective education and outreach campaign. If you are interested in getting involved organizing against CRENO please send an email to tgpee@uclink.berkeley.edu to be put on the listserv. While the students have yet to set up a website the Coalition for an Informed California (the statewide coalition of various groups such as the NAACP and MALDEF organizing against CRENO) does at www.informedcalifornia.org.

Mo Kashmire and Ritu Bhattacharji
Call for Submissions, DEADLINE 12/01/2003

Con/vergences: Critical Interventions in the Politics of Race and Gender Roundtable

UC Berkeley, February 6 – 7, 2004

The Center for Race and Gender invites submissions from UC Berkeley students of short papers (1000 words) in response to the following question: What are the political implications of the move towards transnationalism and postnationalism in race and gender studies?

Three to four papers will be selected for presentation in a roundtable discussion as part of the Center for Race and Gender’s first annual conference. The roundtable, which will consist of student presenters and faculty commentators, will cap two days of conversation about cutting edge research in race and gender.

Con/vergences: Critical Interventions in the Politics of Race and Gender will highlight innovative and creative research integrating race and gender and exploring the political and intellectual implications of recent trends in race and gender studies. The conference will present six panels comprised of eminent scholars from the UC community and beyond. The panels include: Race, Gender, and the Nation State; Race and Masculinities; Nationalism and Gender in Native American Studies; Sexualizing the Racial Body; Transnational Political Economies; and Reconstructing History and Resistance.

Selected student papers will be included in the collected proceedings of the conference, which the CRG plans to publish. Although only three to four papers will be selected for presentation the CRG plans to include as many submissions as possible in future CRG publications including our website and newsletter.

DEADLINE for submissions: 12/01/2003

Submit to: centerrg@uclink.berkeley.edu

Please direct questions to: centerrg@uclink.berkeley.edu

Faculty Retreat
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Professor E. Mamafist CRG Visiting Fellow