

**Fall 2016**  
**Social Diversity, Gender and the Law**  
**The University of Western Ontario**  
**POL4203/9758**

Professor: Caroline Dick  
Time: Tuesday 11:30-1:20 p.m.  
Classroom: SSC 4103

Office: SSC 4088  
Email: cdick4@uwo.ca  
Office Hours: Monday 12:10-1:10 p.m.  
Tuesday 1:30-2:30 p.m.

Prerequisite(s): POL2230E  
Antirequisite(s): None

**IMPORTANT NOTICE RE PREREQUISITES/ANTIREQUISITES**

You are responsible for ensuring that you have successfully completed all course prerequisites, and that you have **not** taken an antirequisite course. Lack of prerequisites may not be used as a basis for appeal. If you are found to be **ineligible** for a course, you may be removed from it at any time and you will receive no adjustment to your fees. **This decision cannot be appealed.** If you find that you do not have the course requisites, it is in your best interest to drop the course well before the end of the add/drop period. Your prompt attention to this matter will not only help protect your academic record, but will ensure that spaces become available for students who require the course in question for graduation.

**COURSE DESCRIPTION:**

From religious minorities and Aboriginal peoples to feminists and gays and lesbians, Canadian social groups contend that group-differentiated rights and group-sensitive legal and constitutional interpretations are a necessary condition of equality. While the Canadian state has responded with group-specific provisions in the *Charter* and Constitution, as well an official policy of multiculturalism, social groups continue to press for legal concessions and the expansion of their rights. This course will examine the relationship between Canadian social groups and the law to assess how social groups employ the legal system in pursuit of equality and how they challenge laws that fail to attend to social group differences. Additionally, this course will examine how the differences that cut across social groups complicate the legal accommodation of 'group' differences. By assessing the legal claims of a number of social groups, this course will examine legal responses to questions of social diversity, the limits of law in addressing group-based inequalities and the effects that legal responses to social diversity can have on the most vulnerable members of social groups (often women).

## **Course Materials**

Many of the readings are available electronically. Those that are not available electronically are marked with a ✱. All legal cases can be accessed using web links found in the weekly folders in the course web site.

The text of the *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms* can be found at: <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/const/page-15.html>

Legal decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada are available electronically at: <http://scc.lexum.org/decisia-scc-csc/scc-csc/en/nav.do>

Lower court decisions are available electronically through the Canadian Legal Information Institute at: <http://www.canlii.org/en/index.php>

## **Learning Objectives**

By the end of the course, students should be able to identify the principles of critical theory and their application to the cross-disciplinary area of law and politics. Students should also be able to engage actively with critical theory by assessing and resolving competing rights claims that are advanced by and within minority social groups.

## **Email**

The Professor will respond to email and will do her best to reply within 48 hours. Emails sent on the weekend will be answered on Monday. Please do not send email messages via OWL. Do note that university policy precludes Professors from responding to email messages that were not sent from a UWO email account. Note, also, that grades may not be discussed via email.

## **Web Site**

There is a web site set up for this course through OWL at <https://owl.uwo.ca>. The course syllabus, abbreviated case law materials and links to legal cases and turnitin.com will be posted on the web site as will important class announcements. Accordingly, students should check the web site regularly.

## **Turnitin**

All assignments are subject to submission for textual similarity review to the commercial plagiarism detection software under license to the University for the detection of plagiarism. All papers submitted for such checking will be included as source documents in the reference database for the purpose of detecting plagiarism of papers subsequently submitted to the system. Use of the service is subject to the licensing agreement, currently between The University of Western Ontario and Turnitin.com (<http://www.turnitin.com>).

Assignments can be submitted to turnitin.com through OWL. Note that assignments have not been submitted “on time” unless they have been submitted to turnitin.com *prior* to being submitted in hard copy form at seminar.

### **Extensions**

Extensions are not given. However, when there are genuine and unavoidable family or medical circumstances, students may seek academic accommodation, as detailed below. If you fail to hand in an assignment but are pursuing academic accommodation, please advise your Professor of this fact.

### **Computer Problems**

Students are expected to back up their written work and lecture/tutorial notes. Furthermore, students will be responsible for finding replacement lecture/tutorial notes where they fail to back-up their files. Extensions are not granted for computer-related problems.

### **Academic Accommodation**

If a situation should arise where a student requires accommodation because of a medical or personal issue, the student should visit his or her faculty's Academic Counselling office so that an academic counsellor can make a recommendation for academic accommodation to the student's Professor(s).

This procedure means that you do not provide your instructor with any details of your situation. It is your responsibility to speak with a counsellor as soon as possible after an issue arises. Academic accommodation ONLY will be provided if you speak with an Academic Counsellor and provide them with documentation of your issue, and if the issue is brought to their attention in a timely fashion.

Academic Counselling **for the Faculty of Social Sciences** is located at SSC 2105

Telephone: 519 661-2011

Recorded information: 519 661-2052

Fax: 519 661-3384

Email: ssaco@uwo.ca

### **Medical Illness**

Please be aware that the policies regarding medical documentation have changed. The following is an excerpt from the Policy on Accommodation for Medical Illness.

### **Undergraduate Students**

#### **Documentation from Family Physicians and Walk-In Clinics**

A UWO Student Medical Certificate (SMC) is required where a student is seeking academic accommodation. This documentation should be obtained at the time of the initial consultation with the physician or walk-in clinic. An SMC can be downloaded here:

[https://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic\\_policies/appeals/medicalform\\_15JUN.pdf](https://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/appeals/medicalform_15JUN.pdf)

Hard copies are available from Academic Counselling in the Faculties.

### **Documentation from Student Health Services**

Students obtaining documentation from Student Health Services should sign a “release of information.” This form authorizes Student Health Services to provide information to the student’s home Faculty. Release of information forms are available from, and can be arranged through, the student’s home Faculty Academic Counselling service.

### **Documentation from Hospital Urgent Care Centres or Emergency Departments**

Students should request that an SMC be filled out. Students may bring this form with them, or request alternative Emergency Department documentation. Documentation should be secured at the time of the initial visit to the Emergency Department. Where it is not possible for a student to have an SMC completed by the attending physician, the student must request documentation sufficient to demonstrate that his/her ability to meet his/her academic responsibilities was seriously affected.

### **Learning Objectives**

By the end of the course, students should be able to identify the various in-group difference that divide social minority groups. Students should also be able to evaluate and rank competing rights claims that place group members at odds with one another.

### **Evaluation**

Seminar Assignment 20%

Participation 20%

Critical Analyses 30%

Essay Proposal 5% (Due November 15)

Research Essay 25% (Due December 6)

### **Seminar Assignment**

Commencing in week 3 of the course, each student will be responsible for leading the seminar. A sign-up sheet is posted on my office door.

There are two components to this assignment. First, students will make a brief presentation to the class in which they present the content of their critical analyses. Accordingly, the content and structure of your presentation should focus on a question or debate that cuts across the week’s readings. Presenters are not to summarize the readings, and presentations may not run for more than **10 minutes** (and may be shorter).

While presenters will limit their formal presentations to the content of their critical analyses, they will also address issues that were not taken up in their critical analyses by leading the class in discussion. Accordingly, the second component of the seminar assignment requires students to lead the class in discussion by posing questions that draw out themes and debates in the required readings and *engaging the class around those issues*. This provides presenters with a second opportunity to showcase their own critical observations. However, in addition to being assessed on their ability to identify relevant debates, themes, and issues, presenters will be evaluated on their ability to stimulate discussion among their classmates. Presenters are welcome to introduce news stories about current events that are relevant to the week’s readings if they would like to.

In most weeks, more than one student will be scheduled to present to the class. Students scheduled to present in the same seminar may choose to run the seminar jointly, though there is no requirement to do so. Nonetheless, where students scheduled for the same week choose not to work jointly, they must communicate with one another about the focus of their presentations and discussion questions in order to avoid undue repetition.

### **Participation**

Course participation constitutes a weekly assignment. Participation grades will be assigned for each week's class and will be based on the quality of the contribution made to the seminar discussion in accordance with the guidelines below. More specifically, the grades assigned will reflect *whether a student's contribution to class discussions demonstrates a familiarity with, and understanding of, the week's readings*. Students who attend seminar, but do not contribute orally to the seminar discussion, will be *assigned a grade of zero* for the week. *Students who do not attend at least 9 seminars between weeks 2 and 12 will not pass the course or receive a course credit*. Students who find participating in class discussions challenging are encouraged to come to class with prepared discussion questions to pose to the class.

### **Participation Grading Guide**

Grade		Discussion	Reading
85-100	Always	<u>Excellent</u> : leads debate; offers analysis and comments; always has ideas on theme of reading; takes care not to dominate; asks questions	Clearly has done and prepared questions on virtually all readings; intelligently uses this understanding and these questions in discussion
75-84	Almost always	<u>Very Good</u> : thoughtful comments and questions for the most part; willing, able and frequent contributor	Has done most readings; provides competent analysis of reading when prompted by others
65-74	Frequent	<u>Good</u> : has basic grasp of key concepts and occasional ideas on the main theme of the reading; arguments are sporadic and at times incomplete or poorly supported; unwilling to ask questions	Displays familiarity with most readings, but tends not to analyze them or to relate them to the course material
50-64	Occasional	<u>Somewhat Poor</u> : remarks in class marred by	Actual knowledge of material is outweighed by improvised

		misunderstandings of key concepts; seldom contributes effectively to discussion of the main theme; often digresses in unhelpful ways; sporadic	comments and remarks
0-49	Rare	<u>Poor</u> : rarely speaks; parrots text or comments of others	Little or no apparent familiarity with assigned material

### Critical Analyses

Undergraduate students will write either 2 or 3 critical analyses of the weekly readings at two (or three) different seminars. Where an undergraduate student chooses to submit 3 critical analyses, only the two highest marks received will count towards his or her grade. Graduate Students will write 3 critical analyses of the weekly readings at three different seminars.

Students may choose the seminars in which to submit their critical analyses, subject to two conditions. First, *students must hand in at least one critical analysis during weeks 2 through 6* of the course. Second, *students must submit a critical analysis for the week in which they are scheduled to lead the seminar.*

Students who fail to submit their first assignment by week 6 will be assigned a grade of zero, and that grade will be included in the student's grade calculation for the critical literature review course component. Students may still complete 2 additional CLR assignments, but the grade of zero assigned to CLR 1 will be averaged with the grades received on any other CLRs that the student completes.

Each analysis must be **no more than 5 pages** in length and will examine **at least two** of the week's readings. **Students may not exceed the 5 page limit (double-spaced, using standard margins and 12 point font).** Staying within the page limit is a part of the assignment.

Critical analyses must be handed in *before* the class in which the readings in question are to be discussed. Critical analyses must include footnotes, endnotes or parenthetical citation and a bibliography organized according to the Chicago style. Analyses must be submitted in hard copy form **with a turnitin receipt attached**. Email submissions will not be accepted. Note that late penalties do not apply to critical analyses and that *no extensions will be granted.*

The purpose of the analysis is for students to identify **one** central question, **written in question form**, that points to a difference of opinion or difference in approach among the authors and to critically reflect on this aspect of the literature. To this end, only a *small portion* of an analysis should be devoted to summarizing or outlining the authors' arguments respecting the central question identified. Instead, students should 1) identify one question (**posed in question form**) to be discussed in the analysis; 2) provide a very brief (comparative) outline of the principal arguments (and/or approaches) of the **authors in relation to the specific question identified;**

and 3) most importantly, offer a critical assessment of the authors answers to the common question identified.

**This is not an argumentative essay in which students marshal evidence from the readings in order to advance a thesis or enter a policy debate.** Instead, students are asked to compare, contrast and critically assess *how* different scholars study a common question. In this respect, students should think of the assignment as a comparative *critical* literature review. Students should focus on the *relationship* between the readings by comparing and contrasting how the authors study, approach and answer *a common question*. What are the ramifications of one author's work for another author's work? Does one author build upon the work of another? Would one author's work benefit from the insights of another's work? Does one reading reveal a fundamental flaw in another? Can we piece together a more complete answer to the question by combining the answers of several authors? These are the kinds of questions that students should be asking themselves when completing their assignments. Accordingly, the nature of the critique that students provide should be *comparative*. The idea is to use one reading to find weaknesses or strengths in others. It is the *interplay between the readings* and how they stand *in relation to each other* that is the focus of the assignment.

### **Research Essay and Proposal**

Undergraduate students will write a 3000 word research paper to be submitted at the beginning of the last seminar of the term. Graduate students will write a 4000 word paper with the same due date. Students are free to formulate any topic that they see as relevant to the course in consultation with the Professor.

Students must seek approval of their research paper topic in **week 10** of the term by submitting a **brief** written proposal at the start of class. The essay proposal will 1) outline the suggested topic for study; 2) provide either a guiding research question or thesis statement; and 3) include an annotated, working bibliography, which identifies the central thrust of each book or article listed and its relevance to the stated research topic. Essay proposals should be a **maximum** of 2-3 pages and can be shorter. Of course, students are welcome to discuss their essay topics with the instructor in advance of submitting the written proposal. **Essay proposals need not be submitted to turnitin.**

Essays are due at the start of the final seminar (ie. before class commences). Essays must include footnotes, endnotes, or parenthetical citation and a bibliography organized according to the Chicago style. As a general guide, undergraduate papers should include a bibliography with *no fewer than* 8 academic sources. Graduate students' papers should include a bibliography with *no fewer than* 10 academic sources. While it is acceptable to incorporate some class readings into the essay, as this is a research paper, class readings should not constitute a large percentage of the student bibliography.

Essays must be double spaced, submitted in hard copy form **with a turnitin receipt attached**. Email submissions will not be accepted. Extensions will be granted where recommended by

Academic Counselling. A 2% penalty per day will be assessed to late assignments without extensions.

### **Academic Offences (Graduate Students)**

Scholastic offences are taken seriously and students are directed to read the appropriate policy, specifically, the definition of what constitutes a Scholastic Offence, at the following web site: [https://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic\\_policies/appeals/scholoff.pdf](https://www.uwo.ca/univsec/pdf/academic_policies/appeals/scholoff.pdf)

## **Seminar Schedule**

### **Week 1. September 13**

#### **Introduction to the Course**

### **Week 2. September 20**

#### **Social Group Differences: Assimilation or Accommodation and the Difference Dilemma**

\*Young, Iris Marion. "Social Movements and the Politics of Difference." In *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, **156-75 only**. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1990.

\*Minow, Martha. *Making All the Difference: Inclusion, Exclusion, and American Law*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990. (**19-23 and 49-53 only**).

\*Barry, Brian. *Culture and Equality: An Egalitarian Critique of Multiculturalism*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2001. (**63-76 and 90-8 only**).

### **Week 3. September 27**

#### **Anti-essentialism and Intersectionality**

Grillo, Trina. "Anti-Essentialism and Intersectionality: Tools to Dismantle the Master's House." *Berkeley Women's Law Journal* 10 (1995): 16-30. (**16-22 only**).

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory, and Antiracist Politics." *The University of Chicago Legal Forum* (1989): 139-67. (**139-43 only**).

Crisp, Catherine. "White and Lesbian: Intersections of Privilege and Oppression." *Journal of Lesbian Studies* 18 (2014): 106-117. (**106-110 only**).

\*Razack, Sherene H. "Gendered Racial Violence and Specialized Justice: The Murder of Pamela George." In *Race, Space, and the Law: Unmapping a White Settler Society*, ed. Sherene H. Razack, 121-156. Toronto: Between the Lines, 2002. (**123-8; 136-45; 150-56 only**).

\*Williams, Toni. "Intersectionality Analysis in the Sentencing of Aboriginal Women in Canada. What Difference Does it Make?" In *Intersectionality and Beyond: Law, Power and the Politics of Location*, ed. Emily Graham, Davina Cooper, Jane Krishnadas and Didi Herman, 79-104. New York: Routledge-Cavendish, 2009.

#### **Week 4. October 4**

##### **Women: The Utility of Rights**

MacKinnon, Catharine A. "Feminism, Marxism, Method, and the State: Toward Feminist Jurisprudence." *Signs* 8, no. 4 (1983): 635-58.

\*Schneider, Elizabeth M. "The Dialectic of Rights and Politics: Perspectives from the Women's Movement." In *Feminist Legal Theory: Foundations*, ed. D. Kelly Weisberg, 507-26. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1993.

\*Williams, Patricia J. "Alchemical Notes: Reconstructing Ideals from Deconstructed Rights." In *Feminist Legal Theory: Foundations*, ed. D. Kelly Weisberg, 496-506. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1993.

#### **Week 5. October 11**

##### **Socioeconomic Class**

\*Langston, Donna. "Tired of Playing Monopoly?" In *Race, Class and Gender: An Anthology*, 3d ed., ed. Margaret Andersen and Patricia Hill Collins, 126-36. Belmont, California: International Thomson Wadsworth, 1998.

\*Brodsky, Gwen. "The Subversion of Human Rights by Governments in Canada." In *Poverty: Rights, Social Citizenship, and Legal Activism*, ed. Margot Young, Susan B. Boyd, Gwen Brodsky and Shelagh Day, 355-72. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2007.

Brodsky, Gwen, and Shelagh Day. "Beyond the Social and Economic Rights Debate: Substantive Equality Speaks to Poverty." *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 14 (2002): 184-219.

*Gosselin v. Quebec (Attorney General)*, [2002] 4 S.C.R. 429 (S.C.C.).

\*\*abbreviated version available in course web site.

#### **Week 6. October 18 (\*\*LAST CHANCE TO HAND IN CA1\*\*)**

##### **Gays and Lesbians: Rights Claiming**

Majury, Diana. "Refashioning the Unfashionable: Claiming Lesbian Identities in the Legal Context." *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 7 (1994): 286-317.

Robson, Ruthann. "Lesbian Jurisprudence?" *Law and Inequality* 8 (1989-1990): 443-468. **(443-51 and 464-68 only)**.

Hartman, Julie E. "Another Kind of Chilly Climate": The Effects of Lesbian Separation on Bisexual Women's Identity and Community." *Journal of Bisexuality* 5, no. 4 (2005): 63-76.

Rehaag, Sean. "Patrolling the Borders of Sexual Orientation: Bisexual Refugee Claims in Canada." *McGill Law Journal* 53 (2008): 59-102. **(59-80; 84-90 only)**

### **Week 7. October 25**

#### **Transgendered and Transsexual Individuals**

Jeffreys, Sheila. "Transgender Activism: A Lesbian Feminist Perspective." *Journal of Lesbian Studies* 1, no.3/4 (1997): 55-74. **(55-9; 63-4; 66-7 only)**

\*Wilchins, Riki. "Deconstructing Trans." In *GenderQueer: Voices from Beyond the Sexual Binary*, ed. Joan Nestle, Clare Howell, and Riki Wilchins, 55-63. New York: Alyson Books, 2002.

\*Minter, Shannon Price. "Do Transsexuals Dream of Gay Rights? Getting Real about Transgender Inclusion." In *Transgender Rights*, ed. Paisely Currah, Richard M. Juang and Shannon Price Minter, 141-170. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2006. **(141-44; 147-50; 153-59 only)**

\*Spade, Dean. "Trans Law and Politics on a Neoliberal Landscape." In *Normal Life: Administrative Violence, Critical Trans Politics, and the Limits of Law*. Brooklyn, New York: South End Press, 2011.

### **Week 8. November 1**

#### **Judicial Impartiality and Contextualized Judging**

*R. v. S.(R.D.)*, [1997] 3 S.C.R. 484 (S.C.C.)

\*link available in course web site.

\* Martin, Robert Ivan. "Philosopher Kings and Queens." In *The Most Dangerous Branch: How the Supreme Court of Canada Has Undermined Our Law and Our Democracy*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003. **(77-80 and bottom of 90-94 only)**

Backhouse, Constance. "Bias in Canadian Law: A Lopsided Precipice." *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 10 (1998): 170-83.

Burey, April. "No Dichotomies: Reflections on Equality for African Canadians in *R. v. R.D.S.*" *Dalhousie Law Journal* 21, no. 1 (1998): 199-218.

Ipp, David. "Judicial Impartiality and Judicial Neutrality: Is there a Difference?" *Australian Bar Review* 119 (2000): 212-222.

**Week 9. November 8**  
**Ethnocultural Groups (Cultural Autonomy v. Gender Equality)**

\*Kymlicka, Will. "Freedom and Culture." In *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995. (75-95 only).

\*Okin, Susan Moller. "Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?" In *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* ed. Joshua Cohen, Matthew Howard and Martha C. Nussbaum, 9-24. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Lawrence, Sonia N. "Cultural (in)Sensitivity: The Dangers of a Simplistic Approach to Culture in the Courtroom." *Canadian Women of Journal and the Law* 13, no. 1 (2001): 107-36.

*The Queen v. GJ*, [2005] NTCCA 20 (Court of Criminal Appeal of the Northern Territory). (paras. 2-5 and 9-38 only).

\*link available in course web site (Australian case).

**Week 10. November 15** (\*\*ESSAY PROPOSAL DUE\*\*)  
**Cultural Defences at Law**

Coleman, Dorianne Lambelet. "Individualizing Justice Through Multiculturalism: The Liberals' Dilemma." *Columbia Law Review* 96, no. 5 (1996): 1093-1167. (1093-1150 and 1155-1166 only).

Volpp, Leti. "Blaming Culture for Bad Behavior." *Yale Journal of Law and the Humanities*. 12 (2000): 89-116. (89-99 and 104-106 only)

*R. v. Thibert*, [1996] 1 S.C.R. 37.

\*link available in course web site.

*R. v. Tran*, [2008] 9 W.W.R. 431 (Alta. C.A.). (Paragraphs 20-33 and 50-70 only).

\*link available in course web site.

**Week 11. November 22**  
**Indigenous Peoples and Gender**

Turpel, Mary Ellen. "Aboriginal Peoples and the Canadian Charter: Interpretive Monopolies, Cultural Differences." *Canadian Human Rights Yearbook* 6 (1989-1990): 3-45.

Ladner, Kiera. "Colonialism Isn't the Only Obstacle: Indigenous Peoples and Multilevel Governance in Canada." Paper delivered at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, Ottawa, Ontario, 27-29 May 2009.

\*link available in course web site.

Dick, Caroline. "The Politics of Intragroup Difference: First Nations' Women and the *Sawridge* Dispute." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 39, no. 1 (March 2006): 97-116.

## **Week 12. November 29**

### **Religious Minorities: Faith-Based Personal Law**

Blenkhorn, Lindsey E. "Islamic Marriage Contracts in American Courts: Interpreting *Mahr* Agreements as Prenuptials and their Effect on Muslim Women." *Southern California Law Review* 76 (2002-2003): 189-234. **(189-202 and 218-234 only)**.

\*Bakht, Natasha. "Family Arbitration Using Sharia Law: Examining Ontario's Arbitration Act and its Impact on Women." *Muslim World Journal of Human Rights* 1, no. 1 (2004):1-24.

\*Razack, Sherene. "The Muslims Are Coming: The 'Sharia Debate' in Canada." In *Casting Out: The Eviction of Muslims from Western Law and Politics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2008. **(145-57 and 169-72 only)**.

## **Week 13. December 6 (\*\*RESEARCH ESSAY DUE\*\*)**

### **Course Wrap Up**