

FOOD: 2205.001

Theoretical Perspectives in Food Culture (v.12)

Krishnendu Ray

Mon: 4:55pm-6:35pm; Place: Waverley 566A

Spring 2013

Theme 1: Approaches/Departures

- Week 1: Raymond Williams. (1985). *Keywords* (pp. 11-29 + entries for Anthropology, Criticism, Culture, Empirical, History, Organic, Positivist, Romantic, Science, Taste, Theory, Tradition) (Oxford University Press).
- Week 2: David Sutton. (2001). *Remembrance of Repasts. An Anthropology of Food and Memory*. Oxford: Berg (Read the whole book).
- Week 3: Michel de Certeau, Luce Giard and Pierre Mayol. (1998). *The Practice of Everyday Life. Volume 2: Living & Cooking*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press (pp. xiii-xxxiii, 151-213).
AND
Mirko Zardini. Ed. (2005). *Sense of the City. An Alternative Approach to Urbanism*. Montreal: Lars Muller Publishers (pp. 1-75, 322-333).
- Week 4: Rick Dolphijn. (2004). *Foodscares. Towards a Deleuzian Ethics of Consumption*. Delft: Eburon Publishers.
AND
David Harvey. (2007). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Week 5: Stephen Mennell. (1996). *All Manners of Food. Eating and Taste in England and France from the Middle Ages to the Present*. University of Illinois Press (pp. 1-165)

Theme 2: The Flow of Theory on Commodities/Culture/Modernity/Sign

- Week 6: Don Slater. (1999). *Consumer Culture and Modernity* (pp. 1-173) (Polity)
AND
Stanley Lieberman. (2000). *A Matter of Taste. How Names, Fashions, and Culture Change*. New Haven: Yale University Press (pp. xi-142)
- Week 7: Theodore Adorno. (1991). *The Culture Industry* (pp. 1-60, 98-131, 158-177, 187-197) (Routledge). [Note: This particular edition is important = Edited and with an Introduction by J. M. Bernstein, 2001]
AND
Roland Barthes. (1990). *Mythologies* (pp. 7-25, 36-42, 50-64, 74-93) (Farrar, Strauss & Giroux)

Digging Deeper: Longer Traditions

Theme 3: Sign/Discourse/Deconstruction

- Week 8: Timothy Clark. (2002). *Martin Heidegger. Routledge Critical Thinkers*. (pp. 1-

95, 121-153) (London: Routledge).

AND

Sara Mills. (2003). *Michel Foucault*. (London: Routledge).

AND

Nicholas Royle. (2003). *Jacques Derrida* (London: Routledge).

AND

Jacques Derrida, (1991). “‘Eating Well,’ or the Calculation of the Subject” in *Who Comes After the Subject*, ed. Eduardo Cadava, Peter Connor and Jean-Luc Nancy (pp. 96-119) (London: Routledge).

Theme 4: Bodies/Senses: Foundations?

Week 9: Carolyn Korsmeyer. (1999). *Making Sense of Taste* (pp. 1-145) (Cornell University Press)

AND

Allen Weiss. (2002). *Feast & Folly. Cuisine, Intoxication and the Politics of the Sublime*. (Albany, NY: SUNY Press) (pp. 1-58, 85-123).

Week 10: Marcel Mauss, “Techniques of the Body,” Judith Butler, “Bodies that Matter,” etc. in Margaret Lock and Judith Farquhar. Eds. (2007). *Beyond the Body Proper* (Duke University Press) (pp. 1-29, 50-111; 133-184)

AND

Jane Bennett (2010). *Vibrant Matter. A Political Ecology of Things*. Duke University Press (pp. vii-19, 39-51).

Week 11: Paul Connerton. (1989). *How Societies Remember* (104 pages) (Cambridge University Press)

AND

Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett. (1998). *Destination Culture. Tourism, Museums, and Heritage*. Berkeley, CA: UCP (pp. 1-78, 131-176, 257-281).

Week 12: Pierre Bourdieu. (1984). *Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste* (1-225) (Harvard University Press)

AND

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/14/books/review/Greift.html?pagewanted=1&r=1&emc=eta1>

AND

Tony Bennett et. al. (2009). *Culture, Class, Distinction*. New York: Routledge (pp. 1-71; 234-259)

Theme 5: Private/Public/Domestic

Week 13: Judith Walsh. (2004). *Domesticity in Colonial India. What Women Learned When Men Gave them Advice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (pp. 1-49, 63-112, 141-165).

AND

Craig Calhoun. (1992). “Introduction: Habermas and the Public Sphere” (pp. 1-50) and Nancy Fraser. (1992). “Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy,” (pp. 109-142) in *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, ed. Craig Calhoun. Cambridge: CUP.

AND

Sara Suleri. (1991). *Meatless Days*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Theme 6: Flows and Boundaries

Week 14: Arjun Appadurai. (1996). *Modernity at Large* (pp. 1-85, 139-199)
AND
Arjun Appadurai. (1986). *Social Life of Things* (pp. ix – 91)
AND
Parama Roy, (2010). *Alimentary Tracts. Appetites, Aversions, and the Postcolonial* (Durham: Duke University Press). (pp.?)
AND
(a historian's critique of literary studies' methodology)
<http://www.common-place.org/vol-11/no-03/reviews/albala.shtml>

Course Requirements:

Four papers: 4 pages (single-spaced) each; looks at a food-related topic (ideally develop a couple of projects you have been thinking about, have enough empirical material on, or are willing to invest in) through the prism of a theorist (or two) = 80% of the final grade

Due on weeks 4, 8, 12, 14.

Participation: 20% of the final grade

OR

By agreement with the instructor one 16-page (single spaced) paper submitted as (a) a topic and outline (b) first draft and (c) second draft and (d) final version = 80% of the grade

Due on weeks 4, 8, 12, 14.

Participation: 20% of the final grade

GRADING RUBRIC¹

A: Outstanding

Students who earn an A for class participation are consistently present and prepared for class, synthesize course materials, contribute insightfully and analytically, listen well to others, and generally move the discussion forward and are actively engaged each class. For written work, an "A" applies to outstanding student writing. A grade of "A" indicates not simply a command of material and excellent presentation (spelling, grammar, organization, writing style, etc.), but also sustained intellectual engagement with the material. This engagement takes such forms as shedding original light on the material, investigating patterns and connections, posing questions, and raising issues.

An "A" paper is excellent in nearly all respects:

- It is well argued and well organized (with a clear argument)
- It is well developed with content that is specific, interesting, appropriate and convincing

¹ Modified from the original developed by Fabienne Doucet

- It has logical transitions that contribute to a fluent style of writing
- It has few, if any, mechanical, grammatical, spelling, or diction errors
- It demonstrates command of a mature, unpretentious diction

B: Good

Students who earn a B for class participation generally contribute consistently and thoughtfully and listen well to other but may be less consistent in their participation and/or their presence in class and may be less likely to move discussion forward with their contributions. On written assignments, a “B” is given to work of high quality that reflects a command of the material and a strong presentation but lacks sustained intellectual engagement with the material.

A “B” paper shares most characteristics of an “A” paper, but

- It may have some minor weaknesses in its argumentation
- It may have some minor lapses in organization and development
- It may contain some sentence structures that are awkward or ineffective
- It may have minor mechanical, grammatical, or diction problems
- It may be less distinguished in its use of language

C: Adequate

Students who earn a C for class participation do not contribute regularly and may be absent from class regularly and/or their contributions to class discussion are often tangential and unclear and they do not listen well to others. Written work receiving a “C” is of fair overall quality but exhibits a lack of intellectual engagement as well as either deficiencies in the student’s command of the material or problems with presentation.

A “C” paper is generally competent; it is the average performance. Compared to a “B” paper, it may have a weaker thesis and less effective development.

- It may have serious shortcomings in its argumentation
- It may contain some lapses in organization
- It may have poor or awkward transitions
- It may have less varied sentence structures that tend toward monotony
- It may have more mechanical, grammatical, and diction problems

D: Unsatisfactory

Students who earn a D for class participation have spotty attendance, come to class unprepared, and make comments that are off-topic. On written work, the grade of “D” indicates significant problems with the student’s work, such as a shallow understanding of the material or poor writing.

- It presents no clear thesis
- It displays major organizational problems
- It lacks adequate support for its thesis
- It includes irrelevant details
- It includes confusing transitions or lacks transitions altogether
- It fails to fulfill the assignment
- It contains ungrammatical or poorly constructed sentences and/or demonstrates problems with spelling, punctuation, diction or syntax, which impedes understanding

F: Failed

Students who earn an F for class participation also have spotty attendance, come to class unprepared, fail to participate, demonstrate lack of engagement, and might create a hostile environment in the classroom. On written work, an “F” is given when a student fails to demonstrate an adequate understanding of the material, fails to address the exact topic of a question or assignment, fails to follow the directions in an assignment, or fails to hand in an assignment.

NOTE: Pluses (e.g., B+) indicate that the paper is especially strong on some, but not all, of the criteria for that letter grade. Minuses (e.g., C-) indicate that the paper is missing some, but not all, of the criteria for that letter grade.