

# *A primer on* **Intersectionality**

## *Table of Contents*

- ✚ *Intersectionality:  
Why a New Prism is Needed ... 2*
- ✚ *Capturing the New Mood in America ... 2*
- ✚ *Re-envisioning Group-Based Interventions ... 3*
  - 1. Intersectional Analysis ... 3*
  - 2. Intersectional Interventions ...4*
  - 3. Intersectional Advocacy ... 5*
- ✚ *“What Kind of Ally are You?” ... 7*



## **Intersectionality: Why a New Prism is Needed**



Social justice advocacy has entered a new era. Rising expectations brought about by the remarkable shift in the national political arena have heightened the need to rethink standard approaches to social justice advocacy. One of the most significant aspects of current social justice practice that warrants rethinking, is the dominance of a particular orientation that disaggregates social problems into discrete challenges facing specific groups. These groups are often defined in mutually exclusive ways, generating artificial distinctions and sometimes conflicting agendas.

This approach—sometimes called the single-axis analysis—corresponds to the silo-oriented structure of social justice mobilization and grant making. Interventions based on such models can frequently be ineffective and sometimes even lead to unnecessary exclusion and conflict within social justice movements. In cases where race, gender, sexual identity and class work together to limit access to social goods such as employment, fair immigration, healthcare, child care, or education, it is essential that social justice interventions be grounded in an understanding of how these factors operate together. Intersectionality can provide that grounding.

## **Capturing the New Mood in America**


Never in recent memory have so many Americans been so hopeful that significant social transformation is possible. This new sense of possibility fuels the need for thought and action leaders to fashion new and effective strategies to deliver equitable opportunity, security and well-being to those who have been historically marginalized and underserved. At this time of rising expectations, traditional civil rights issues such as violence against women, pay equity, and affirmative action are meeting up with newer issues such as gay marriage, immigration reform, mass incarceration, and environmental racism.

These new challenges have only heightened the need to find new modes to enable effective cooperation and problem-solving across constituencies. One thing is clear: none of the pressing social justice issues can be productively advanced through traditional frameworks by explaining these problems as the product of one axis of exclusion. Equally important, none of these social problems are exclusive to one set of people, separately defined. Contrary to the dominant framing of some of these issues, contemporary immigrants are not all Latino; prisoners are not all men; affirmative action beneficiaries are not all African American; and LGBTs are not all white and middle class. Recognizing that these constituencies are multiply-constituted means that interventions and programs designed to address group interests can no longer be framed in exclusionary terms. There are constituencies within constituencies that are not well-served by such categorical thinking.

## Re-envisioning Group-Based Interventions



Intersectionality is a concept that enables us to recognize the fact that perceived group membership can make people vulnerable to various forms of bias, yet because we are simultaneously members of many groups, our complex identities can shape the specific way we each experience that bias. For example, men and women can often experience racism differently, just as women of different races can experience sexism differently, and so on. As a result, an intersectional approach goes beyond conventional analysis in order to focus our attention on injuries that we otherwise might not recognize. The illustration below represents what it means to move beyond conventional forms of group and issue-based intervention. It demonstrates that the groups in question are not mutually exclusive, but are in fact multidimensional. Internally each group has multiple characteristics that must be considered in shaping advocacy and public policy. Whether those goals are equal opportunity, fair immigration policies, equitable pay, a just criminal justice system, or more inclusive visions of equal citizenship, the multidimensionality of these groups must be factored into the equation. These goals can be advanced by using an intersectional prism to 1) analyze social problems more fully; 2) shape more effective interventions; and 3) promote more inclusive coalitional advocacy.




*Intersectionality, a term coined by AAPF's Kimberle Crenshaw, has been offered as a prism from which to view a range of social problems to better ensure inclusiveness of remedies, and to identify opportunities for greater collaboration between and across social movements. Intersectionality has traveled globally, shaping social justice awareness and actions in Europe as well as in the Global South. Several national, regional and now UN documents acknowledge the concept and encourage the development of policies and practices to sustain more productive approaches to equity, opportunity, and basic human rights.*

### 1. Intersectional Analysis

Intersectionality is thus a critical lens for bringing awareness and capacity to the social justice industry in order to expand and deepen its interventions. Intersectionality was initially conceived as a way to present a simple reality that seemed to be hidden by conventional thinking about discrimination and exclusion. This simple reality is that disadvantage or exclusion can be based on the interaction of multiple factors rather than just one. Yet conventional approaches to social problems are often organized as though these risk factors are mutually exclusive and separable. As a consequence, many interventions and policies fail to capture the interactive effects of race, gender, sexuality, class, etc. and marginalize the needs of those who are multiply affected by them.

The exclusionary consequences of this problematic thinking were starkly presented in a case in which Black women challenged the exclusionary hiring practices of auto maker General Motors. In this historically race and gender segregated auto industry, women were only permitted to work in front office jobs and African Americans were limited to heavy industrial work.

The problem for African American women was even more acute: the front office jobs were only available to women who were white, and the industrial jobs were appropriate only for Blacks who were men. African American women argued that they had clearly been discriminated against on the basis of race and gender, but in *DeGraffenreid v. General Motors*, the court dismissed their case because neither white women nor African American men were similarly excluded. In essence, the trial court was not convinced that the Black female plaintiffs could prove that GM had engaged in gender discrimination since obviously not all women were excluded, nor could they prove race discrimination because not all African Americans were excluded. Clearly something had happened to these plaintiffs, but the existing understanding of discrimination blinded the court to this kind of discrimination. Race and gender discrimination was seen as group based and exclusive, not overlapping and multiply-constituted. As a consequence of this limited thinking, the discrimination that happened to these plaintiffs literally fell through the cracks.



It was in thinking about why such a “big miss” could have happened within a complex structure of antidiscrimination law that intersectionality was born. The specific effort was to locate and visualize this discrimination at a place where conventional thinking did not go, that is, where various forms of discrimination overlapped rather than ran parallel. Thus, one function of the intersectional prism is to draw attention to the overlap of various forms of exclusion or disadvantage.

## 2. Intersectional Interventions

The second and important dimension of intersectionality was reflected in the *DeGraffenreid* court’s inability to address the obvious injury suffered by the Black female plaintiffs. To highlight the metaphor again, it was as if antidiscrimination law was called to the scene of an accident, but because it was unclear whether the accident was caused exclusively by race or by gender, each ambulance sped away, leaving these plaintiffs lying in the intersection. This second dimension of intersectionality directs attention to the ways that social policy, advocacy and social movements are often ill-equipped to address the needs of constituents who struggle against more than one disadvantage or discrimination. When feminism focuses exclusively on gender, or antiracism on race, or LGBT on sexual identity, they often fail to comprehend that countless numbers of their constituents confront circumstances and challenges that reflect more than one barrier or obstacle.

Social movements typically follow analyses similar to the discussion in *DeGraffenreid*. They approach intersectional problems by claiming that the various issues should be taken up separately, preferably by separate institutions or organizations. Separating out or disaggregating such dynamics into distinct social problems, frequently distorts certain experiences or renders them completely invisible.

The failure to analyze and approach social problems from an intersectional lens can cause advocates and other actors to miss the boat on important issues. This sometimes leads to unfortunate or even tragic consequences. One example involves the special vulnerability of immigrant women whose lives are threatened by their abusive citizen spouses. Earlier immigration “reform” required spouses who immigrated to the US to marry American citizens to remain “properly married” for two years before they were eligible to receive permanent resident status. This requirement provided no exceptions for battered women who often faced the risk of serious injury and death on the one hand, or deportation on the other. Yet, advocates fighting for fairer immigration policies were generally uninformed about vulnerabilities relating to gender, while advocates for domestic violence survivors never considered that members of their constituency included immigrant women seeking permanent residence status.



Only the predictably tragic consequences of this double burden brought this problem into the light, but even then the solutions did little to increase the safety of the most vulnerable women.

Thinking and acting intersectionally from the start might have ensured that advocates for fair immigration policy and advocates for domestic violence survivors would have envisioned their common cause and seen their shared constituencies more clearly.

Intersectionality thus informs not only a fuller understanding of the sometimes overlapping forces that structure the lives of constituents, but also draws attention to the limited vision that grounds advocacy and intervention on their behalf. Where problems are intersectional

*Intersectionality not only provides a tool to render certain exclusions more visible, it also points in the direction of a reframed approach to social justice politics. Intersectionality is thus a critical lens for bringing awareness and capacity to the social justice industry in order to expand and deepen its interventions.*

### **3. Intersectional Advocacy**

The movement-building insights of intersectionality implicate the structure and occasional tensions between social justice movements. All too frequently, organizations and movements shape their rhetorical claims in ways that not only fail to address other dimensions of disadvantage, but sometimes reinforce them as well. There are now several classic cases where movements have been tragically pitted against one another in pursuing their legitimate ends. Historically, such examples include feminist anti-rape advocacy that sometimes foregrounded the stereotype of the Black rapist in appealing for legal reform; domestic violence advocacy that linked protection of women to the growth of incarceration; affirmative action advocacy that centralized gender over race; and gay marriage advocacy that linked the right to marry to nuclear, economically viable, two-parent families. What these examples have in common are the various ways—sometimes implicit and sometimes explicit—that key arguments or images used to advance one cause sometimes retard or work against other social justice interests.



These rhetorical problems exacerbate and are exacerbated by a host of “isms” that circulate within these constituencies. For example, sexism, homophobia, racism, and xenophobia exist within communities of color, immigrant communities, LGBT communities, and others. These dynamics sometimes serve as the scaffolding for rhetoric that undermines efforts to build progressive social justice coalitions. The challenges grow more ominous when one recognizes that none of these communities are exclusive. Like “friendly fire,” the rhetoric hurled back and forth between communities often strike members within.

Thus, to use one unfortunate example, in the aftermath of Proposition 8 campaign in California, the recriminations and tensions between Blacks and Latinos on one hand, and the LGBT community on the other were sometimes premised on the assumption that these constituencies were utterly distinct warring camps and that neither was part of the other. This disastrous outcome has been particularly tragic for those simultaneously




members of both communities. In the rallies, marches and civic debate following November elections in California, Black and Latino LGBTs suffered raced-based insults from other LGBTs and homophobic insults from other people of color. There were casualties of communities at war with themselves.

Clearly one significant factor that permits these destructive politics to prevail is the failure to imagine, elevate and incorporate the sensibilities of LGBTs who are Black and Latino in the agenda setting of both the LGBT and people of color communities.

*At the most basic level, intersectional awareness encourages advocates and policy makers to ask how their approaches address and engage constituent members who are in fact constituents of other social groups as well. How do debates across constituencies sound different when it is recognized that each community contains members of the other? What is the broadest articulation of a problem that would embrace more than the interests of the most advantaged?*



Movement politics and advocacy must be recalibrated to more fully incorporate constituencies at the margins and to move away from single issue organizing. These are challenging questions and often there is no one right answer. But it is clear that ignoring these issues will no longer do. Efforts must be expanded to make the practice of intersectional awareness routine so that the hard work of creating and sustaining non-exclusive social justice initiatives becomes second-nature to everyone.





## “What Kind of Ally are You?”

*\* Or, What is your Disaster Relief Kit?*

Speech Delivered by Kimberle  
Crenshaw  
V-Day 10<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Celebration  
The Superdome  
New Orleans, LA  
April 11, 2008

*You know, whenever I meet people from other countries, there are two things they want to talk about -- and one is Hurricane Katrina. Citizens of the world were shocked that our friends, our families, our fellow citizens and humans, would be called "refugees." Can there be any doubt that this slip of the tongue describes exactly who they were seen to be -- you know, maybe they are God's children, but not exactly our responsibility.*

*And it's not that the US was somehow exceptional in its miserable DISASTER RELIEF efforts. When we look at disaster relief all over the world, this American experience was tragically universal. Whether it was the Tsunami that killed thousands in Asia and Africa, the earthquake that wiped out 300,000 in Central Asia, Hurricane Mitch that devastated the lives of thousands in Central America, the DISASTER RELIEF failures were essentially the same: the poor, ethnically and racially marginalized, the women, the children, the old, the disabled, were all hardest hit by the disaster and least served by the relief. And why is this the case? Kofi Annan was asked during one of the crises whether the relief efforts were going to be "gender sensitive". He responded that since all people were effected the same, then the disaster relief would be the same. Not true of course.*

*We know that women in the midst of natural disasters or conflict are vulnerable to a whole range of harms, including loss of life, harassment, violence, rape and other forms of sexual abuse. We know they have different needs, they have different responsibilities, and the effect of disasters often exacerbates their vulnerability to violence and harm. And we also know that it isn't just ALL WOMEN from region to region who are effected the most. It is SOME women, the women who are also the ones who are socially marginal, who are isolated, who are already burdened or viewed as less valued women. If you take just about any of these contexts and put a different face on these women -- a difference race, caste, or ethnicity -- I believe that the response would be different. Gender-neutral Disaster Relief efforts don't work, because the effects of disaster intersect with women's status, role, and context so that the disaster has secondary and tertiary effects.*

*In the same way that we know that disaster doesn't effect men and women in the same way, it also doesn't always effect people the same way across race or social class either. Yet when we run to the rescue and don't pay attention to race or caste or ethnicity, all the preexisting dynamics that marginalized some communities and made them vulnerable to receive the brunt of the disaster will render them less worthy of relief when the disaster strikes. In India for example, the Dalits, those who are at the bottom of the caste structure, were often entirely excluded from disaster relief efforts after the Tsunami. Some Dalit villages destroyed by the Tsunami received no rations or water because locals distributing the goods believed that Dalits didn't need or deserve relief. Some believed that the Dalits destitution pre-existed the disaster so there was no need to lift the burdens that befell them along with everyone else. Others believed that Dalits should play the same role in the relief camps that they play in the villages, that is, removing dead bodies, carrying baskets of human waste on their heads, doing the most degrading dehumanizing work for*

*mere rations or for no pay at all. The problem with disaster relief that is colorblind, caste-blind or gender blind is that it reinforces all of the ills, the privileges, the silences, the oppressions that preexisted the disaster, and often makes them worst.*

*Now believe it or not, I'm not here to talk about governments, or the UN, or any supernatural entities. I'm really here to talk about us, all of us RIGHT HERE. I'm here to ask us, "what kind of Disaster Relief are we trying to build here?" Or to put it another way, we are all trying to build a Global Movement to end a tragedy—something we call VIOLENCE. We want to intervene, put our bodies, our minds, our resources between this particular man-made disaster and its effects. What kind of tools are in OUR disaster relief kits? Are we as a movement prepared to do any better than our governments? We want to be allies in this effort, but exactly what kind of ally are we prepared to be? Are we "just about me," allies, or are we "taking it to the mat" allies? Well, maybe it really depends on whether we can see, hear and respond to those problems that happen in the INTERSECTIONS of disasters. It's not too hard for us to see and respond to the kinds of local disasters that occur on our watch, in our neighborhood, to people just like us, or on terrain in which we are familiar. But can we broaden our purview, our experience, our rhetoric, and our practice, to really get at the vulnerabilities that we don't share, and aren't so sure about?*

*You know, sometimes it seems as though with all these movements, the antiviolence and feminist movement, the antiracism movement, the LGBT movement, the antiwar movement, the human rights movement, and the anti-colonial movement, that we have got so many movements that nothing at all should ever fall through the cracks. All we have got to do is strengthen our own piece of the puzzle and we'd be all good. But is that really true? Do we pay attention when the issues that these movements address collide? And what do we do when they do?*

*I use the metaphor of intersectionality to call our attention to precisely these questions. Imagine each of our movements as providing security and relief along their own highway. Let's say the antiracism movement patrols and secures all of the traffic that rolls down the race highway. And that's a particularly deadly patch of road there. Lots of people get hit trying to navigate across the road of racism. The role of the antiracist advocates is to come to their rescue, to call attention and to administer, to try to prevent further harm, to make the situation right. In short, to provide Disaster Relief.*

*And feminists, they have a patch of road too where all sorts of things happen to folks who live on that stretch of highway, folks who get hit by sexism, patriarchy, and its consequences: violence, discrimination, disempowerment. Their job is to rush to the scene, administer, protect, and prevent and to provide resources and help.*

*And there are other patches of road that other folks administer: LGBT has a patch; the antiwar folks have a patch. Whatever movement, there is a patch of road that they administer.*

*But imagine, just for a moment, what would happen if an accident occurs on that patch of road where they all converge and intersect. Imagine no one actually SAW the accident, but everybody heard it. Terrible sounds, screeching breaks, a big crash and then a body, lying in the intersection, unconscious. All of the Disaster Relief specialists jump in their ambulances and rush to the scene, and are flummoxed. What do we do? She's lying there, in the intersection. She's on everybody's road—the race road, the gender road, the LGBT road, but no one can tell which traffic hit her. So, they start to discuss it. Now nobody's doing anything yet, they just, well... are thinking about it.*

*So, Mr. Race man says, "hmm, well, can't really tell what happened here, but my guess, since*



*she is a woman, is that she probably got barreled over by the gender traffic. I'm going to leave her to you."*

*But Ms Feminist says, "well hold it a minute, if it was really gender, I think she'd probably be over here, closer to this spot here. I don't think I can handle this one but you know, she looks a little, well, BUTCH. Maybe she got hit by the homophobia traffic."*

*"Well," Mr. LGBT says "to be honest, my guess would be...not. We've covered a lot of accidents but not around these parts. My guess would be that it was probably poverty, or you know, maybe she was coming from the Global South, so it could be, you know, globalization or something like that. Let's ask the anti-imperialism folks if they recognize her"*

*"Well," Ms. Human Rights chimes in with a bright idea---"let's just try to revive her and ask."*

*So they all move in a little closer, bend down, and one lifts her head up just a little, and yells, "WHO HIT YOU? WE NEED TO KNOW? WAS IT RACISM? WAS IT PATRIARCHY? TELL ME, WAS IT HOMOPHOBIA? WE NEED TO KNOW WHO INSURED YOU AGAINST THIS INJURY? SE HABLA ESPANOL?"*

*And the woman struggles to come to, but can only say, "I don't know, but can someone just help me? Just help!"*



*And she passes out...again.*

*Unable now to figure out who is responsible, all of the Disaster Relief Specialists just pile back into their ambulances and speed away to the next accident, hopefully one fully with their purview, and definitely on their exclusive patch of road.*

*Just an apocryphal story? Sure. Exaggerated? Well looking around this place, looking at our movements, and looking directly into the mirror, you tell me.*

*What about this: In upstate New York, I was working with Latina domestic violence activists who were struggling to persuade their white colleagues to adopt more language sensitive interventions in their shelters. One particular case is haunting. A woman called the crisis hotline. She was desperate, the fear and anxiety in her voice betrayed the adrenaline coursing through her body. She'd run for her life, she told the hotline worker in Spanish. Her husband had tried to kill her before, and this time he vowed to finish the job. She had fled with her young son, and they needed a place to stay. The hotline worker called the local shelter.*

*"Good news," she told the woman, holding the phone, "there's room." But, the intake coordinator wanted to know -- "does she speak English?"*

*The hotline coordinator: "well I think, but I'll check." Back to the phone. She asks, but the woman is in so much fear, the coordinator can barely make out her Spanish, much less her English. She goes back to the intake coordinator. "I don't know, but she's desperate. Her husband is looking for her, it is after midnight, and she is out on the street alone with her son. She needs a place to stay now."*

*"Well we can't take her unless she can speak English. We have an empowerment program that all of our women must take. If she can't speak English, she can't participate in the program."*

*The hotline counselor was stunned, but kept trying. "Well, can't we have her son translate for her? This woman is in trouble. I don't know if she will survive the night."*

*Intake Coordinator: "Well, that's just our policy. If the son translates, he would further disempower the woman. She needs to be able to speak for herself."*

*At that point the woman in crisis said she had to go, she'd call back. The hotline crisis counselor begged her to hold on, or to call back. "We'll work something out." It took several more phone calls, and several back and forth discussions before the counselor finally found a shelter that would take the woman and her son. When she finally secured a place, the counselor waited for hours for the woman in crisis to call back. She never heard from the woman again. No one knows WHAT happened to this woman. This is disaster relief gone wrong. Very, very wrong.*

***So, while we sometimes dither and debate whether we can "take" an issue, or whether it fits our agenda, or whether we have the resources to deal with the accident, we miss the demands that we intervene. And when we do not relieve the disaster women face we simply contribute to it. We are not prepared for the call because we don't always anticipate the kind of woman or the kind of person we will be asked to serve and protect.***

*Rape crisis counselors in minority and immigrant communities, for example, complain that funding is often based on a model of a woman who has no other problems, a woman who might be more likely to be believed, or to press charges, rather than the women they typically serve, women who are homeless, jobless, who come in and say that they are hungry, or cold, or without shelter, and then tell them that they were raped. When crisis centers are funded on the model of "knowing your rights" or "court accompaniment" then these women are not served.*

*In the global arena, women are displaced all over the world due to violence and conflict, but often crisis interventions don't take into account the intersectional structure of their lives. In so far as the basic necessities of survival are concerned, women, because it is their job, must often travel long distances to collect firewood and water. It is in these long tracks that they are raped or even killed. When relief camps are set up without consulting these women or their concerns basic questions that should not determine life and death -- like 'how am I going to eat today?' -- are not considered because the intersectional specificities of their lives takes the back seat to their identity as simply "displaced persons."*

*And lest you think I'm being hard on the antiviolence movement, let me assure you that there are problems within the antiracist movement itself. When we talk about Black-on-Black violence in the African American community we seldom talk about the most common type of violence -- the violence that occurs in the home. It's as if the Black bodies that we care most about are gendered in a particular way. We talk about ending the violence that endangers our fathers, brothers and sons, but we are often far too silent about the violence that endangers and sometimes takes the lives of our daughters, sisters, and mothers. Antiracism's solidarity, it seems, is often drawn with a gender line.*

*So then I ask, what kind of ally are you?*

*Let me end with a story on a lighter note. By comparison to the disastrous scenarios described above it's trivial, but it amplifies my question. I was once invited, along with a Black male friend, to an exclusive private club. We were to be the first black guests. We had a pact—"we are not*

*taking no mess. No matter what, we're going in there strong and tall, proud Black people, unapologetic, in our power." So we went to the place, knocked on the elegant door using the big brass doorbell, and our host stepped out, embarrassed that he had forgotten an important detail. We weren't about to hear any excuses and we both stiffened our backs. 'Be strong,' we relayed to him with our body language. Be fierce. "Look man, you invited us here. Don't come telling us that we can't come in or some mess like that."*

*Our host said, "OH NO, that's not the problem. You can come in for SURE. It's just that I forgot to tell you that Kim can't come in. Well not through here. She's got to come in through the back door. Only men can come through the front door." "OH," my friend said. "That's different."*

*"That's different?" I said. What was so different about that? And what happened to our solidarity? The idea that we would stand fierce, stand strong, take no mess? What happened to our disaster intervention plan? I didn't think it came with a rider... 'I'm with you until we get what we want, unless I get what I want first. Then all bets are off.'*

*So as we come together here, standing shoulder to shoulder, what riders do we bring to the agreement? What's in the small print? What caveats do we have in our agreement to coalesce?*

*Are you a "me first" kind of ally, you can come along on the ride, but with a caveat that 'I gotta get there first?'*

*Are you a "be just like me" ally? 'I'll stand with you as long as you make yourself knowable to me in my terms. Let's talk about gender, about women, but don't complicate it with that other stuff. It takes me out of my comfort zone.'*

*Are you a Bette Davis Diva kind of ally: "If I can't get what I want, then NOBODY DOES. I've got it worst so it's MW or the Highway!"*

*Are you the nice liberal ally -- even though you're not directly effected you'll go along with the "We Are the World" approach until it gets too costly?*

*Or are you a Dependent Ally: Whether or not you'll stand up for issue DEPENDS on whose watching. In the march or at the rally you're hard to the core, but at the cocktail party or in boardroom your resolve to speak that truth to power suddenly evaporates.*

*Are you a "yes I'll get to you after we save the gorillas, the whales, and innocent puppies" ally like the ones in the Congo who negotiated with soldiers there not to kill the gorillas but forgot to mention the women.*

*These are all allies with riders, with caveats, with limits. I am here to say we don't need these kinds of allies. We need allies firmly planted in the intersections, the ones who will say, "I don't care what traffic hit her. She's in the middle of the road, let's get her help and let's prevent this from happening again." Intersectionality requires you to be a different kind of ally, one that will go to the mat, one that will give you a ride not only to your destination but all the way to her destination, one that will seek power not to exercise it for your own ends, but for the ends of women and disempowered people all over the world.*

*What kind of allies are we to each other? What kind of allies CAN WE BE to each other? Let us ask ourselves every day, "what do we have to think about, to do, to be reliable, real allies?" That's our challenge in the aftermath of Katrina -- that we leave no bodies lying in the intersection.*

## *African American Policy Forum Co-Founders:*



**Kimberle Crenshaw, Executive Director:** Kimberle Crenshaw, Executive Director: Crenshaw is a Professor of Law at UCLA and at Columbia Law School. She writes in the area of Civil Rights, Black feminist legal theory, race, and racism and the law. Her articles have appeared in such journals as the Harvard Law Review, National Black Law Journal and Stanford Law Review. She is the founding coordinator of the Critical Race Theory Workshop, and the co-editor of a volume, *Critical Race Theory: Key Documents That Shaped the Movement*. Prof. Crenshaw has lectured nationally and internationally on race matters, addressing audiences throughout Europe, Africa and South America. In 1996 she co-founded the African American Policy Forum (AAPF). Prof. Crenshaw earned her J.D. at Harvard; L.L.M. at University of Wisconsin and B.A. at Cornell University. In 2008, she became both a Fletcher Fellow and a fellow at Stanford's Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences.



**Luke Harris, Program Director:** Luke Harris, Program Director: Harris teaches American Politics and Constitutional Law at Vassar College. He co-founded the African American Policy Forum (AAPF) as part of an ongoing effort to promote women's rights in the context of struggles for racial justice. Prof. Harris earned a B.A. at Saint Joseph's University, a J.D. and an LL.M at Yale Law School, and a Ph.D. in Politics at Princeton. An expert in the field of Critical Race Theory, he was the co-writer and chief consultant for Kathe Sandler's 1993 award-winning documentary film, *A Question of Color*. More recently, his ground breaking essay, "Affirmative Action as Equalizing Opportunity: Challenging the Myth of Preferential Treatment," co-authored with Uma Narayan, was republished in Hugh LaFollette's, *Ethics in Practice*, in 2006. In 2009, he will serve as a Visiting Fellow at Stanford's Center for Comparative Studies in Race and Ethnicity.

### ***Our Board Members:***

George Lipsitz,, Chandra Bhatnagar, Devon Carbado, Tim Wise,  
M. Thandabantu Iverson, Janine Jackson, Beverly Guy-Sheftall

## **African American Policy Forum and Intersectionality**

The Policy Forum is a leading social justice clearing house providing information pertaining to social inclusion. Our key working concepts are that exclusion is often structural as opposed to intentional or individual, and that vulnerabilities are often overlapping as opposed to singular and discreet. Thus, our policy interventions, workshops, and other activities seek to highlight these dimensions of the social problems that our partners and constituents wish to address. For more information on our workshops, products and expertise, please visit [www.AAPF.org](http://www.AAPF.org).

© African American Policy Forum All Rights Reserved. For additional copies, please, contact:

Columbia Law School w 435 West 116th Street w 827 Green w Box E-7  
Mail Code 4089 w New York, NY 10027 w 212.854.8041

Prof. Kimberle Crenshaw w 405 Hilgard Avenue w UCLA School of Law  
Los Angeles, CA 90024 w 310.825.1503  
(Primary Mailing Address) [cmorsch@aapf.org](mailto:cmorsch@aapf.org) (email)