

Detailed Contents

Introduction	1
1 What's Wrong with Aristotle?	9
The power of legal rhetoric	9
The troubling roots of traditional legal rhetoric	10
Classical thought patterns: Aristotle and Plato	11
What's wrong with Aristotle?	13
Classical thought, rational thought, and White supremacy	15
Classical thought and White supremacy in U.S. law	17
Aristocratic and Aristotelian legal methods: categorizing from Olympus	20
Legal formalism: a classical style of legal reasoning	21
Problematizing the classical roots of traditional legal rhetoric	23
Traditional legal rhetoric is based on aristocratic and patriarchal norms	23
Traditional legal reasoning ruthlessly divides things, oftentimes unfairly	25
Traditional legal reasoning incorrectly occupies a privileged epistemological space	26
Future directions: "the last shall be first, and the first last" (Matthew 20:16)	28
Why we need to get rid of traditional rhetoric even though it has produced some good legal outcomes	29
Why we need to get rid of traditional rhetoric even though the classical norms relate more to the political than the rhetorical	31

2	<p>Problematizing Aristotle: Renovating and Remodeling Traditional Legal Rhetoric 36</p> <p>Introduction: legal education's role in maintaining oppressive feedback loops 36</p> <p>Legal education's preservation of White patriarchy is a feature, not a bug 39</p> <p>Indoctrination versus education in teaching law students legal reasoning and analysis 45</p> <p>Interrupting traditional legal rhetoric 56</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Boldness 57</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Empathy 57</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Shame 60</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Invisibilization 61</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Exasperation 61</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Flattery 62</p> <p>Conclusion 62</p>
3	<p>Shifting the Focus from the West 66</p> <p>Contested terrain: challenging foundational narratives 66</p> <p>Building the legal framework for White cultural hegemony 70</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">A compelling but unsuccessful challenge to the racialized <i>nomos</i>: <i>Jamison v. McClendon</i> 75</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Crafting justice based on the lived legal experiences of people of color: <i>Washington v. San Kim Sum</i> 85</p> <p>Conclusion: the need to critically engage with legal genres and analytic paradigms and to infuse legal reasoning with inclusive frameworks 91</p>
4	<p>Multicultural Rhetorics 96</p> <p>The making of multicultural legal reasoning and analytic paradigms 96</p> <p>Types of multicultural rhetoric 98</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Indigenous rhetorics 98</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Background 98</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Indigenous rhetorical strategies 106</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">African Diasporic rhetoric 107</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Background 107</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">African Diasporic rhetorical strategies 111</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Guidance for <i>Maat</i> as it functions in the <i>nommo</i> 111</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Asian Diasporic rhetoric 115</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Background: Chinese and South Asian rhetorics 115</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Asian Diasporic rhetorics 117</p>

	Asian Diasporic rhetorical strategies	119
	Latine rhetoric	121
	Background	121
	Latine rhetorical strategies	124
5	Reproducing the Canon, Reproducing Inequity (Traditional Rhetoric)	129
	<i>United States v. Bhagat Singh Thind</i> , 43 S. Ct. 338 (United States Supreme Court 1923)	129
	<i>Haynes v. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.</i> , 8 F.3d 1222 (7th Cir. 1993)	134
	<i>Grand Upright Music Limited v. Warner Bros. Records, Inc.</i> , 780 F. Supp. 182 (S.D.N.Y. 1991)	142
	<i>Luke Records, Inc. v. Navarro</i> , 960 F.2d 134 (11th Cir. 1992)	146
	<i>Baxter v. Bracey</i> , 751 Fed. Appx. 869 (6th Cir. 2018)	150
	<i>Sequoyah et al v. Tennessee Valley Authority</i> , 620 F.2d 1159 (1980)	155
6	Interrupting the Canon	163
	<i>Gideon v. Wainwright</i> , 373 U.S. 335 (1963)	163
	Summary of <i>Gideon v. Wainwright</i>	163
	Excerpt from Petitioner's Brief in <i>Gideon v. Wainwright</i>	164
	Traditional legal rhetoric in <i>Gideon v. Wainwright</i>	178
	Interrupters in <i>Gideon v. Wainwright</i>	179
	Empathy as an interrupter	179
	Invisibilization as an interrupter	180
	Boldness as an interrupter	181
	Flattery as an interrupter	182
	<i>Loving v. Virginia</i> , 188 U.S. 1 (1967)	184
	Summary of <i>Loving v. Virginia</i> , 188 U.S. 1 (1967)	184
	Excerpt from Petitioner's Brief, <i>Loving v. Virginia</i>	186
	Traditional legal rhetoric in <i>Loving v. Virginia</i>	199
	Interrupters in <i>Loving v. Virginia</i>	200
	Boldness as an interrupter	200
	Shame as an interrupter	201
	Exasperation as an interrupter	202
	Conclusion	203
7	Disrupting the Canon: Multicultural Rhetorical Strategies in Action	205
	Rethinking how we "do" law	205
	Multicultural rhetoric in action	208
	Multicultural rhetorical strategies in various legal genres	208
	The Complaint	208
	The Memo	225

DETAILED CONTENTS

The Trial Brief	232
The Appellate Brief	245
The Judicial Opinion	266
References	277
Index	294