


2015

Teaching Progress: A critique of the grand narrative of human rights as pedagogy for marginalized students

Robyn Linde
Rhode Island College, rlinde@ric.edu

Mikaila M. L. Arthur
Rhode Island College, marthur@ric.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.ric.edu/facultypublications>

 Part of the [Politics and Social Change Commons](#), [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#), and the [Sociology of Culture Commons](#)

Citation

Linde, R., & Arthur, M. M. L. (2015). Teaching progress: A critique of the grand narrative of human rights as pedagogy for marginalized students. *Radical Teacher*, (103), 26. doi:10.5195/rt.2015.227

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Books and Publications at Digital Commons @ RIC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ RIC. For more information, please contact kayton@ric.edu.

Linde, Robyn and Mikaila Muriel Lemonik Arthur. "Teaching Progress: A critique of the grand narrative of human rights as pedagogy for marginalized students," *Radical Teacher*, vol. 103 (2015).

Introduction

After the United Nations adopted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) in 1948, education about human rights became an important focus of the new human rights regime and a core method of spreading its values throughout the world. The story of human rights is consistently presented as a progressive teleology that contextualizes the expansion of rights within a larger grand narrative of liberalization, emancipation, and social justice. Most modern narratives of human rights begin with World War II and demonstrate the learning and adapting of social movements over time, from the U.S. Civil Rights movement to the Arab Spring to #Black Lives Matter.

Drawing on our experience as professors who teach human rights, social justice, and social movements courses at an urban college in Providence, R.I., with a student body that includes large populations who are of color, first generation, economically disadvantaged, and nontraditional in other ways, we explore the relevance and impact of these grand narratives for the lives of our students and their sense of political agency. In particular, we advocate for a critical approach to human rights pedagogy to counter and overcome the pervasive individualization that undergirds the grand narrative of human rights. We argue that a critical (and radical) human rights pedagogy must evaluate the position of the individual in modern life if liberation through human rights law and activism is to be possible. By challenging the individualization that forms the basis of the grand narrative of human rights, we can unlock the power and promise of human rights and social justice education as a driver of student and community agency.

Our institutional setting and students

Located in Providence, Rhode Island College (RIC) is a comprehensive four-year public college offering a variety of degrees in the liberal arts and sciences, as well as professional and vocational degrees at the bachelor's and master's levels. We enroll just over 8,500 students, of whom about 7,500 are undergraduates. Sixty-nine percent of our students are female; sixty-three percent of undergraduates are white, eight percent black, and 14 percent Latino/a, with smaller numbers identifying as Asian, American Indian, and multiracial, and these numbers—particularly those of Latino/a students—are steadily rising. Twenty-four percent of our undergraduates are above the age of 24, and many have considerable family obligations, including caring for children, siblings, parents, and disabled relatives. Almost 86 percent of our students are from Rhode Island, with another 11.7 percent living outside of Rhode Island but within 50 miles of campus, mostly in Massachusetts; about 85 percent of undergraduates commute to campus (RIC Office of Institutional Research and Planning 19, 23, 26). Approximately half of our students are first-generation college students, and the majority work to pay their tuition. Among undergraduate degree-seeking students, twenty-four percent attend part-time (personal communication, Director of Institutional Research and Planning).

The authors of this paper are two faculty members who teach undergraduate courses in political science, nongovernmental organizations, sociology, and justice studies. Between us, we also have considerable experience teaching in other types of institutions, including flagship public research universities and selective private colleges; however, our analysis in this paper is based primarily on our collective teaching experience with RIC students in particular.

Human rights as a grand narrative

Human rights education has long been a central method of diffusing human rights norms, principles, and values. As discussed elsewhere in this edition, education was prominently featured in the vision of global progress articulated in the UDHR after the founding of the United Nations in 1945. Human rights education became part of educational systems globally, especially after the fall of the Soviet Union in 1989, and a part of curricula in the study of history, law, and the social sciences in colleges and universities (Webster 188-189).

There are many approaches to teaching human rights. The most common is to introduce students to the legal guarantees afforded them in international human rights law (Ely-Yamin 652). In these classrooms, the story of human rights is constructed or presented as a morality tale, replete with starkly drawn heroes and villains. The heroes emerged triumphant from the horror and chaos of World War II and formed a global society with the goals of ending impunity for gross human rights violations and applying universal jurisdiction for human rights crimes.

There is a progressive teleology that haunts most narratives of human rights, one that leads to a steadily expanding corps of rights being conferred upon ever increasing groups of marginalized peoples. Human rights museums are cropping up all over the world to tell this story, to contextualize new within old struggles. In this narrative, for example, voting rights expanded rapidly from the British reform acts of the 19th century, which empowered growing numbers of men, to the women's suffragette movement, enfranchising huge numbers of people around the world in little over a century. The rapid succession of other post-material rights and protections, such as protection from discrimination based on race, serves to further demonstrate the larger trajectory of human rights. Social movements seeking such rights learn from one another, adapting strategies and frames to suit their needs.

An important part of this narrative is the move from impunity to criminal sanctions for gross human rights violations and violators. This theme of accountability is traced from its origins at the trials of war criminals at Nuremberg to the international criminal tribunals of Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia and to the ongoing work of the International Criminal Court today. The speed with which these changes occurred, mostly in the decades after World War II, lent credence to the idea of the inevitability of human progress and liberation. This master narrative of the march of progress can be seen most recently in the rapid societal acceptance and legal diffusion of marriage equality in the United States. The story's appeal is simple, strong, and obvious: it is easy to seamlessly weave these events together and see the arc of human history in high relief.

Western history also plays an important role. In Europe, the individual states, long at war with one another, joined forces to reject the fascism and barbarism of the past and spread human rights norms to the world. Europe's moral authority comes not only from its means (normative) but also from its narrative—its transcendence of the depravity of the Holocaust and other horrors of World War II. Its authority on human rights stems in large part from the strength of its story, its historical transformation from war-torn region to moral arbiter.

The American contribution to this narrative is threefold: First, the United States mythologizes its national origin as the world-changing story of a valiant underdog, a ragtag band of freedom fighters who fought the English king for independence and won. Its victory in 1776 is understood as central to global emancipation, the start of a cascade of democratization that continues to this day. Second, the United States positions itself historically not only as the victor of World War II, but as largely responsible for the more “peaceful” and “prosperous” world that followed. Third, the prevailing narrative depicts a United States that went astray after September

11, went on to be humbled and to become more humane, chastened by past failures, especially those in the Second Gulf War and Rwanda, and now seeks to (re)claim its moral authority through humanitarian intervention in Libya, Uganda, Syria, and Iraq.

What is important about the prevailing human rights narrative is not its veracity, but how it is used to contextualize European and American values, norms, and action within a larger progressive telos. We claim in this paper that this historical narrative of global history, one that “bends toward justice,”¹ has a purpose, impact, and outcome, that this narrative engenders a seamless connection between cause and effect that makes certain global futures possible and others impossible.

The impact of the grand narrative is explored in the work of Makau Mutua, who suggests that it is obscured by claims to rights and freedoms couched in neutral or universal language (206). Citing Louis Henkin, Philip Alston, and Thomas Franck, Mutua argues that the human rights script is widely recognized as “the key to the redemption of humanity” (210). The narrative itself, though grounded in a particular interpretation of history, is ahistorical, its universality and continuity evidence of its validity. Even so, it also expropriates history, neatly arranging major historical events on a linear path toward human rights (Mutua 213). Rejecting the notion that the ends justify the means in terms of human progress, Mutua contends that the narrative is rooted in European colonialism, and that it represents a continuation of the cultural dominance that has been exercised for many centuries (204, 210, 219).

The history of human rights is cast to serve an agenda, and that agenda often does not leave space for students to confront the hard truths that can provide real opportunities for critical

¹ This is a quotation from the abolitionist Theodore Parker, which was later paraphrased by Martin Luther King in an August 1967 speech, which can be accessed at http://kingencyclopedia.stanford.edu/encyclopedia/documententry/where_do_we_go_from_here_delivered_at_the_11th_annual_sclc_convention/

reflection. Such reflection is aimed toward questioning an existing explanation, or causal account, for particular phenomena; it also offers other lenses through which to interpret and understand phenomena. The ability to craft a causal story is itself a type of power (Barnett and Duvall 43, Guzzini 506). For example, the grand narrative of human rights suggests that World War II broke out in response to the human rights violations perpetrated by Nazi Germany and, to a lesser extent, the Japanese, and thus after World War II, the Nuremberg Trials and the formation of the United Nations symbolized the conclusive victory over fascism and barbarity. But such an account ignores the geopolitical realities that really drive global war and the complicity of the United States and other victor nations in allowing crimes against humanity to continue (Wyman 339-40, 350).

Neoliberalism and human rights

The relationship between neoliberalism and human rights is complicated. While the UDHR guarantees civil and political as well as economic, social, and cultural rights, the binding international law that would emerge two decades later divided the two types of rights into separate conventions: the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, mostly adopted by the United States and its allies, and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), mostly adopted by the Soviet Union and its allies. The rights-focused nongovernmental organizations that formed during the Cold War (Amnesty International, Helsinki Watch/Human Rights Watch, International Commission of Jurists) focused predominately on civil and political rights. Consisting primarily of negative rights, or rights that require the state to refrain from infringement or violation (of freedom of speech, for example), civil and political rights are much easier to enforce. Economic, social and cultural rights, in contrast, as mostly positive rights, require government action and means to create schools,

provide health care, and ensure a right to work. These rights were typically couched in language like “widest possible protection and assistance,” “with due regard...to national economy” and “progressive implementation” (ICESCR articles 2§3, 10§1, 14, and 22).

The rupture between civil and political rights *and* economic, social and cultural rights meant that the latter type of rights were largely left off the postwar international agenda. The new economic institutions, such as the International Monetary Fund, were designed not to promote or implement economic rights but to avoid global instability. Human rights institutions had little to say about international economic policy, especially the principles of free trade, free markets, and private enterprise (Moyn); this silence facilitated the rise of neoliberalism in the 1970s and 1980s. While major human rights organizations, like Amnesty International, have in recent decades adopted economic, social, and cultural rights as part of their mission, their methods, such as post-hoc protest, diplomacy, and reporting (naming, shaming, and framing) are no match for the global exploitation by corporations and national elites.

The danger of neoliberalism for students of higher education is the prevalence of its view of the role of the individual in education policy and practice in the United States and elsewhere (Lucal 5-6), sometimes termed ‘individualization’ (Beck 127). Market fundamentalists—those who espouse the ability of markets to solve society’s problems—have succeeded in creating an education policy in the United States where the burden of education is on the student. Bernie Grummell claims that this perspective of education “as a consumer choice” shapes learning in important ways (Grummell 190). Individuals bear the burden of acquiring skills for global competition, entering a market in which elites benefit from the flexibility of the labor force (Grummell 182, 191). Even research on higher education remains focused disproportionately on individual-level outcomes rather than considering the broad array of communal or collective

gains that increased access to and engagement in higher education can produce (Hout 380-95).

Yet despite this emphasis on individual responsibility, individualization leaves people dependent on organizational structures, especially corporations, for their options and opportunities, meaning that individualization is far less liberating than it may at first seem (Ebert ch. 1).

Moreover, the individual is the central actor in the human rights corpus and in the grand narrative of human rights. In Western legal systems generally, the individual is the key subject of law, the rightsbearer whose rights are his or hers by virtue of birth. It is the individual who has agency. Economic, cultural, and social rights more often require the articulation of a community or group (the homeless, the Yazidis, Yiddish speakers, etc.) in order to be realized. The failure of the grand narrative to advocate forcefully for economic, social, and cultural rights is partly due to the salience of the individual in human rights law and partly due to the nature of globalization: The same forces that spread market fundamentalism around the world also spread Western norms of civilization, including human rights. The challenge of a critical human rights pedagogy, as discussed below, is to interrupt the received story of human rights and expose the impact that individualization has for our students' sense of agency, namely, that it provides a false sense of agency via the ideology of market choice.

Critical pedagogy and marginalized students

The students we often call “traditional”—those attending college full-time directly after high school, typically on a residential campus without having transferred between institutions, and without family or substantial work responsibilities—are a shrinking proportion of the overall student population (Deil-Amen 134-35). While students from all backgrounds have similar needs in terms of supportive but rigorous classroom environments, students from marginalized backgrounds often have a different set of needs with respect to the college experience. For

example, many undergraduate-focused institutions require—or strongly encourage—students to live on campus, especially at the beginning of their college career, citing the importance of residential life for students to develop important social skills and have access campus resources. For some students, however, such a requirement means taking on unsustainable debt loads (Settersten 116). In some cases, less prestigious colleges that facilitate commuting and do not demand competitive socializing may do more to facilitate achievement of personal goals among marginalized students than attendance at an elite residential campuses would (Armstrong and Hamilton 220). Or, to consider an issue more relevant to the classroom, in a study of community college students in composition courses, “...students exhibited very low tolerance for feeling confused or making mistakes, phenomena they could easily attribute to their own inadequacy rather than to the process of learning new skills or information” (Cox 37). Yet educators know that making mistakes is often a crucial part of learning.

Marginalized students may come to higher education with “a negative sense of identity” (Taylor 16) and a lack of awareness of the structural factors that have shaped their present circumstances. While students from wealthy backgrounds are aware of the privileges their family’s wealth has provided, students from economically disadvantaged backgrounds may reject the role of class in shaping their educational path (Aries and Seider 154). The rejection of class and other causal explanations for social and economic inequality further impedes efforts to develop alternative causal human rights stories.

Such dynamics are particularly pronounced for students at public colleges, perhaps because lower-income students at expensive private colleges are more directly confronted with the socioeconomic disparities between themselves and their classmates, while for public college students like ours, such disparities can be more easily ignored. Even students of color from

diverse urban communities may come to college unaware of the way in which structural racism has shaped their nation's history and their current opportunities (Rosen 71, 144, 300). What is needed is a human rights pedagogy which can transform students' understanding of themselves, their communities, and their history.

A human rights critical pedagogy addresses the social stratification of marginalized students, challenges hegemonic discourses, and exposes the connection between flawed social policies and inequalities in education (Giroux 14). This approach requires active learning and the participation of students to identify and expose the structural conditions that cause oppression (Grummell 182). Various authors have attempted a critical approach to human rights education, calling their approach "human rights learning," "inclusive education," or "transformative education" (Ely-Yamin 642-644, Falcon and Jacob 23-24, Liasidou 168, Magendzo 142, Lohrenscheit 176, Reardon 58). Many of these approaches draw a distinction between traditional human rights education and a pedagogy that strengthens and liberates the individual, develops initiative or a sense of efficacy, and allows students to "transcend mere critique" (Lohrenscheit 176; Reardon 62; Ely-Yamin 644).

Pedagogy beyond the grand narrative

We argue that critical pedagogy in the human rights classroom is possible and desirable. According to Henry Giroux, such an approach suggests that education is not merely a "technical practice," but rather a "political intervention" (Giroux 11). A critical human rights pedagogy must be contextualized within an analysis of global corporatism and the "self-valorization" of the market economy (McLaren and Fischman 126). Our task as educators is to challenge a market fundamentalist view, through which democracy itself is just another market-based concept (Giroux 39).

This approach to teaching human rights must begin by taking into account the history of human rights, in particular, its historical connection to European colonialism and American imperialism. It should provide students with the historical knowledge and analytical tools to recognize and take on economic and racial injustice and gendered inequalities (Giroux 11-12). It should begin with a discussion of empire and examine how human rights norms emerge and spread around the world. Norms diffuse in multiple ways, but one of the key methods of diffusion historically has been the spreading of norms and legal systems by empires to their colonies (Linde 555-556). British colonialism, for example, diffused its legal system throughout its colonies, institutionalizing the individual in law and expanding state authority (Linde 555-556). The United Nations spreads human rights norms through both the drafting and regulating of treaties and also in the various organs developing policy on women's rights, children's rights, the environment, discrimination, development, and other areas. Empire continues to work to spread market fundamentalism through international institutions such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the European Central Bank. The connection between empire, human rights, and neoliberalism needs to be explicitly drawn.

As the above discussion on neoliberalism suggests, this approach is all the more challenging in a system premised on the notion of education as an individual choice rather than as a shared or collective endeavor. Both scholarship and political commentary on higher education emphasize outcomes of education that accrue on the individual level, such as increased earnings and job satisfaction. Even research on the social benefits of higher education often focuses on outcomes that accrue to individuals but have economic consequences for the polity, such as improved health and family stability (Hout 393-94). This stress on the individual-level gains accruing to participants in higher education has made it easier for states and citizens to

devalue and disinvest in public funding for higher education, assuming instead that individuals should bear the financial burden for an education that will benefit them individually. Indeed, even civic engagement has become a tool for the developing of professional skills among middle-class and elite students, a process that some research suggests results in the demobilization of student activism and its redirection into the nurturing of “administrative competence” (Lee). Perhaps where vocationalized education is emphasized, such education is primarily a private good, and students in such contexts have the personal responsibility to pay for and then capitalize on the opportunity to develop marketable skills. But where critical pedagogy in liberal arts classrooms can still be found, human rights education has important collective, communal, and social benefits, promoting civic engagement, diffusing social and cultural capital to wider populations, and fostering innovation in research that benefits the public good, reduces human rights violations, and empowers people in relation to human rights law. So how do we put critical pedagogy into practice for marginalized students?

Connecting to the local

A critical human rights pedagogy should explore the connection between systemic violence and local injury—for example, the human rights of refugees and the struggles of local undocumented students. A radical and critical classroom would focus not only on exposing imbalances of power and obstacles (both current and historical) to change, but also on linking these insights to local human rights conditions. Students would be encouraged to critically analyze their position in society, to contextualize themselves and their families within cultural practices and biases and to develop strategies for challenging the status quo (Degener 1). The development of a critical consciousness necessitates the connection of the conditions of everyday lived experiences with the broader reality of structural and systemic exploitation. In the

discipline of sociology, such connections are often an explicit part of introductory undergraduate pedagogy, as instructors rely on the frame of the sociological imagination to help students see how structural inequalities and institutional conditions—“public issues”—shape and relate to individual lives—“private troubles” (Mills 8). Such a framework readily applies to human rights education as well, in the context of such local or community-level human rights concerns as food insecurity, police violence or environmental injustice. For example, in one of our courses, students are asked to think about disparities in neighborhood socioeconomic, social, and political capital as explanations for supermarket locations as well as for the ability of said neighborhoods to resist the imposition of toxic, dangerous, or disruptive facilities. By seeing how such phenomena work in the tangible local contexts in which students live, students develop clear conceptions of power and exploitation at the local level, which they can then use to situate their understandings of global human rights struggles.

Knowing our students

A critical human rights pedagogy requires that teachers know their students’ and their communities’ struggles and create space in class for these to be shared and contextualized within larger human rights issues. Knowing the communities of our students is a strategy that is particularly well-suited to colleges like ours, with nontraditional student bodies and relatively large student populations of color and with faculty that are predominately White. Indeed,

“...although faculty members hold office hours or communicate with students via email, many do not reveal their inner selves in an authentic way, which is the foundation for a meaningful human connection. Faculty members who forge authentic relationships with students often are able to connect with students at deeper levels and challenge them to previously unrealized levels of achievement and personal performance.” (Kuh et al. 281)

A longitudinal study of students at an elite residential college found that personal connections, especially with faculty mentors, are perhaps the most important factor in driving student success

(Chambliss and Takacs 124-5), and if this is true for advantaged students, how much more true it is for students without the economic, social, and cultural capital to navigate the thorny pathways through college. Today, more than three quarters of instructional faculty are contingent workers, (Curtis and Thornton 7), with over half working part-time or while focusing on graduate studies. Such figures make it even more clear that students at many colleges may be largely deprived of the opportunity to build enduring personal connections with faculty. Thus, it is essential that those of us who are privileged to hold full-time tenured or tenure-track appointments be committed to knowing our students as people.

Peter McLaren and Gustavo Fishman go even further, suggesting that teachers (and programs that educate them) should ally with movements for change, “to assure that what transpires in...classes...is grounded in a well-articulated political project aimed at the transformation of asymmetrical relationships of power and privilege” (131). Service-learning projects in the community are especially conducive to the implementation of a critical human rights pedagogy. Our students, mostly from local communities, may not face the same sort of cognitive dissonance experienced by wealthier students exploring poorer neighborhoods. This type of community engagement – with students’ own communities, can have a profound impact on students’ ability to identify structural conditions of poverty, crime, discrimination, and exploitation. They may see their neighborhoods from an altogether new perspective, not as visitors, but as residents stepping back to see the larger picture. This type of hands-on community work also fosters a sense of agency among students and strengthens the community ties required for solidarity. Indeed, in order for students to become effective change-makers, they must remain grounded in their communities to resist co-option as they gain increased legitimacy outside of their communities (Meyerson and Tompkins 319).

Service learning can provide a pedagogical opportunity to address several of these concerns simultaneously. Well-designed service-learning projects are not just about sending students out to communities on their own, but rather involve going into communities *with* our students to develop projects collaboratively that will benefit the community partner. In this process, instructors become students too, as we learn both about the community and about our students. Furthermore, such a process enables instructors to contextualize the lessons of the service-learning project within the community and fosters student engagement in social change, including skills in social entrepreneurship.

Human rights and higher education politics

A critical human rights pedagogy must face the challenges to higher education head on. Giroux argues that a transformative pedagogy must “relentlessly questio[n] the kinds of labor, practices, and forms of production that are enacted in public and higher education” (37). For example, we might focus on the exploitative labor practices of adjunctification (Tirelli 82-83), the growth of assessment and accountability cultures that emphasize quantifiable learning outcomes (Arum and Roksa 169-73; Smelser 88), political pressures driving performance funding (Dougherty and Natow ch. 8), the move away from valuing the liberal arts and towards workforce training (McPherson and Schapiro 49; Brint et al. 172; Baker, Baldwin and Makker), and government financial disinvestment in higher education driven by the increased conception of education as a private good (leading to increased tuition costs) (Ehrenberg 11-12). By making such issues transparent (Lucal 12), we show students how rights matter even in the hyperlocal context of our own institutions and classrooms. Even where human rights education incorporates experiences that provide professional training, such as internships, the kinds of questions and ideas we grapple with in our classrooms are deeply embedded in the legacies of the best liberal

arts education. For example, a recent service-learning project in one of our classes, in a poor and largely minority school district with many recent immigrants, began with discussions about why this particular neighborhood and these particular students do not go to college at the same rate as those enrolled in a wealthier district only a few miles away. We began by talking about actual local neighborhoods, why people of similar ethnicity and race live close to each other, discussing community, familial, and economic bonds but also government policies of zoning, redistricting, and racial segregation. By emphasizing this sort of thinking in our classrooms, and by helping students to uncover its real value for them personally, our courses and classrooms can themselves become sites of the critique of vocationalization and commodification of higher education (Lucal 12).

Schooling itself can reproduce relations of colonialism, just as the human rights regime has often done. Schools, including colleges and universities, are often structured to reproduce status quo relations of power and support capitalist institutions (Carnoy 16-17; Bowles and Gintis 5, 53, 240). While liberation from colonialism required a “redevelopment of humanness and self-esteem”(Carnoy 20), current trends in higher education entail just the opposite. States and educational institutions are redoubling their efforts to diminish the liberatory potential of learning, requiring proscribed curricula (Complete College America 9, 16) linked directly to job-market outcomes as a condition for educational funding (Dougherty et al. 164-65; Dougherty and Natow 43; Arum and Roksa 182), and performance funding regimes hold colleges accountable for students’ choices to pursue paths that may meander or turn out to be less lucrative. These trends are intensifying, despite the fact that over 90 percent of Americans believe that the benefits of higher education rest upon individual student initiative rather than the caliber or

prestige of the institution, in direct contrast to views about K-12 education that place the responsibility for learning squarely on teachers and schools (Doyle and Kirst 203).

Such trends fly in the face of what human rights education seeks—or ought to be seeking—to achieve. A critical human rights pedagogy requires that the teaching of human rights be coupled with a real commitment to self-determination, both in general and in the specific context of education. Students need to be able to choose, within classrooms, curricula, and colleges, pathways that support their own priorities and values, rather than being shamed, cajoled, or forced onto tracks that support institutional or state preferences. This of course does not mean that human rights educators should abandon their commitment to intellectual leadership and student mentoring, but if the teaching of human rights is not coupled with a commitment to student self-determination, our classrooms simply recapitulate the internal colonialism marginalized students have faced throughout their schooling experiences.

As human rights educators, furthermore, we must recognize our own “cultural and political baggage” and be “ethically and politically accountable for the stories [we] produce, the claims [we] make upon public memory, and the images of the future [we] deem legitimate” (Giroux 37-8). As teachers, we must be aware of the effects and implications of our own human rights stories. We should also recognize that not all students have similar experiences with oppression; the intersection of race, ethnicity, gender, class, sexuality, ability, and citizenship produces multiple configurations of exploitation. Human rights pedagogy and practice can gloss over differences among rightsholders for the sake of universality. Yet it is precisely this diversity of experiences and views which can enrich our students’ (and our own) learning: As John Stuart Mill wrote, those who “have never thrown themselves into the mental position of those who

think differently from them...do not, in any proper sense of the word, know the doctrine which they themselves profess” (68).

Confronting the hegemonic narrative

A critical human rights pedagogy must call attention to the hegemonic position of human rights itself in academia and international institutions. It should critically examine the tendency of human rights to usurp other sub-disciplines in its interpretation of history through a progressive, teleological lens and a grand narrative as well as in the menu of options available to express grievances. This is especially urgent in an environment where all social movements are framed as a continuation of human rights progress. The human rights frame has been so successful at achieving certain types of gains, including civil equality, that emerging movements adopt the frame without much debate. The cost can be dear. Recent marriage equality efforts, for example, have forestalled earlier, more inclusive movement objectives, such as economic justice and sexual liberation (Ettelbrick). The ability to critically assess the utility, value, and cost of this frame demands an intimate knowledge of the movements themselves and the willingness to endorse alternative articulations of social justice.

Change—and movements—are not always progressive, and incorporating a deeper understanding of conservative, reactionary, and/or corporatist movements into courses can go far in helping students develop a critical consciousness in relation to the hegemonic narrative of human rights progress. Our courses examine cases that are typically excluded from social justice, social movement and human rights courses such as Anita Bryant’s anti-Equal Rights Amendment campaign, the English Defence League and the National Front in France. Conservative movements have utilized the strategies developed by progressive organizations to create structural support for conservative viewpoints (Teles 42-45). Even corporations have

gotten in on the act, drawing on the repertoire of contemporary social movements (Walker 48) to create fake grassroots or “astroturf” campaigns to protect corporate interests (Walker 33). While claims that corporate interests are aligned with freedom are nothing new, corporate-sponsored movement-like techniques can be used just as easily to undermine human rights. For example, companies can utilize public affairs consultants (Walker 48) to mobilize local residents in support of energy exploitation (which might gravely imperil their health) or the development of new big-box stores (which might destabilize local economies and reduce local wages).

There are both costs and consequences to a continued reliance on the progressive teleology of human rights. This progressive narrative calls attention to problems and offers a single solution: activism through law and civil society. Human rights NGOs, accustomed to such a perspective, remain tightly coupled to the human rights legal establishment, thus perpetuating a hegemonic legal frame. But law is not the only way to make change, and indeed sometimes legal change is ineffective or impossible. There are a variety of important arguments that challenge the hegemonic legal frame, and incorporating a discussion of such arguments into the human rights classroom has the potential to reshape and expand students’ conceptions of the potential of social change.

For example, Kenji Yoshino has persuasively argued that many experiences of oppression are enacted not by states or employers but by those whom the law cannot hold accountable—one’s parents, neighbors, lovers, friends, or indeed one’s self (8). Thus, human rights regimes can require that parents send their daughters to school and reserve spots in advanced degree programs for women, but the law cannot make parents see their daughters and sons as equally intelligent, protect young women from social pressure to choose traditionally-gendered fields of study, or abolish the stereotype threat that reduces women’s performance in

advanced math (Spencer, Steele, and Quinn 21). Our students find Yoshino's message particularly powerful, and often comment on how surprised they were to find so much value in an assigned reading. Even where law can and does play a role in promoting social change, a focus on legally oriented strategies can distract from other ways of seeking change and even backfire. Courts in particular are much more limited in their ability to enable lasting social and political change than is often realized, and, in some cases where legal change does occur, it may be better seen as a culmination of broader social change than as a catalyst (Rosenberg 239, 427).

Thus, we argue for a more open-ended conception of rights that does not assume a pre-conceived endgame. Beyond the study of progressive movements for legal change, human rights classrooms can and should expose students to the wide array of actors and actions that move social change in both progressive and reactionary directions. Such a pedagogy helps our students come to see that their own voices can matter in creating cultural change on the most local level, within their own communities and families, and even within themselves.

Conclusion

Drawing on these four elements, a critical human rights pedagogy should have as its goal a vibrant critique of the impact of the grand narrative of human rights, its individualization, its refusal to challenge or engage critically with neoliberalism, and its neglect of economic, social, and cultural rights. In mounting such a critique, this pedagogy enables our classrooms to serve as sites of resistance (Lucal 10-12) against neoliberalism's encroachment into both higher education and human rights. Along with this goal of resistance, a critical human rights pedagogy cannot limit itself to providing students with the tools for transformative and liberatory critiques, but furthermore must enable students "to become the authors of their own lives" (Ayers and Ayers 37). Such authorship is obviously constrained in a context in which the grand narrative of history

is predetermined, and it is also constrained when educators—or, for that matter, human rights professionals—believe that we and our institutions know best what is right for the people we serve. Catherine Taylor (16) asks whether students are “...in need of affirming? Or are they, and the world, in need of transforming? Do educators get to decide?” We argue that educators do not get to decide. Rather, a critical human rights pedagogy provides students with the tools, the experiences, and the skills to decide for themselves, and to put those decisions into action to make better lives for themselves, their communities, and the world.

Works Cited

- Aries, Elizabeth, and Maynard Seider. “The Role of Social Class in the Formation of Identity: A Study of Public and Elite Private College Students.” *The Journal of Social Psychology* 147.2 (2007): 137-57. Print.
- Armstrong, Elizabeth A., and Laura T. Hamilton. *Paying for the Party: How College Maintains Inequality*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013. Print.
- Arum, Richard, and Josipa Roksa. “Measuring College Performance.” *Remaking College: The Changing Ecology of Higher Education*. Eds. Kirst, Michael W. and Mitchell L. Stevens. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2015. 169-89. Print.
- Ayers, Rick, and William Ayers. *Teaching the Taboo: Courage and Imagination in the Classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press, 2011. Print.
- Baker, Vicki L., Roger G. Baldwin, and Sumedha Makker. “Where Are They Now? Revisiting Breneman’s Study of Liberal Arts Colleges.” *Liberal Education* 98.3 (2012): 48-53. Web. 4 June 2013. <<https://www.aacu.org/publications-research/periodicals/where-are-they-now-revisiting-brenemans-study-liberal-arts>>
- Barnett, Michael and Raymond Duvall. “Power in International Politics.” *International Organization* 59.1 (2005): 39-75.
- Beck, Ulrich. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1992. Print.
- Black, Edwin. *IBM and the Holocaust*. New York: Crown Publishers, 2001. Print.
- Bowles, Samuel, and Herbert Gintis. *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life*. New York: Basic Books, 1976. Print.
- Brint, Steven G., et al. “From the Liberal Arts to the Practical Arts in American Colleges and Universities: Organizational Analysis and Curricular Change.” *The Journal of Higher Education* 76.2 (2005): 151-80. Print.
- Carnoy, Martin. *Education as Cultural Imperialism*. New York: David McKay Company, 2012. Print.
- Chambliss, Daniel F., and Christopher G. Takacs. *How College Works*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014. Print.
- Complete College America. *Time Is the Enemy: The Surprising Truth About Why Today’s College Students Aren’t Graduating...And What Needs to Change*. Washington, D.C.:

- Complete College America, 2011. Web. 3 June 2014. <http://www.completecollege.org/docs/Time_Is_the_Enemy.pdf>
- Cook, Bryan and Natalie Pullaro. 2010. "College Graduation Rates: Behind the Numbers." American Council on Education Center for Policy Analysis, Washington, D.C. Web. 3 June 2015. <<http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/College-Graduation-Rates-Behind-the-Numbers.pdf>>
- Cox, Rebecca D. *College Fear Factor: How Students and Professors Misunderstand One Another*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009. Print.
- Curtis, John W. and Saranna Thornton. "Here's the News: The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession, 2012-13." *Academe* March-April 2013: 4-19. Web. 18 Sept. 2015. <<http://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/files/2013%20Salary%20Survey%20Tables%20and%20Figures/report.pdf>>
- DeAngelo, Linda, et al. *Completing College: Assessing Graduation Rates at Four-Year Institutions*. Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute of the University of California Los Angeles, 2011. Web. 3 June 2015. <<http://heri.ucla.edu/DARCU/CompletingCollege2011.pdf>>
- Degener, Sophie C. "Making Sense of Critical Pedagogy in Adult Literacy Education," *National Center for the Study of Adult Learning and Literacy* 2(2001): 1-22. Web. 14 July 2015. <<http://www.ncsall.net/index.html?id=562.html>>
- Deil-Amen, Regina. "The 'Traditional' College Student: A Smaller and Smaller Minority and Its Implications for Diversity and Access Institutions." *Remaking College: The Changing Ecology of Higher Education*. Eds. Kirst, Michael W. and Mitchell L. Stevens. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2015. 134-65. Print.
- Dougherty, Kevin J., et al. "Performance Funding for Higher Education: Forms, Origins, Impacts, and Futures." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 655.1 (2014): 163-84. Print.
- Dougherty, Kevin J., and Rebecca S. Natow. *The Politics of Performance Funding for Higher Education: Origins, Discontinuities, and Transformations*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2015. Print.
- Doyle, William R., and Michael W. Kirst. "Explaining Policy Change in K-12 and Higher Education." *Remaking College: The Changing Ecology of Higher Education*. Eds. Kirst, Michael W. and Mitchell L. Stevens. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2015. 190-209. Print.
- Ebert, Norbert. *Individualisation at Work: The Self between Freedom and Social Pathologies*. Surrey, UK: Ashgate, 2012. Print.
- Edsall, Thomas. "Why Don't the Poor Rise Up?" *The New York Times* (June 24, 2015). Web. 14 July 2015. <<http://www.nytimes.com/2015/06/24/opinion/why-dont-the-poor-rise-up.html>>
- Ehrenberg, Ronald G. *The Economics of Tuition and Fees in American Higher Education*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Higher Education Research Institute, 2007. Web. 7 June 2013. <<http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1068&context=workingpapers>>
- Ely-Yamin, Alicia, "Empowering Visions: Toward a Dialectical Pedagogy of Human Rights," *Human Rights Quarterly* 15:4 (Nov 1993): pp. 640-685. Print.
- Ettelbrick, Paula. "Since When is Marriage a Path to Liberation?" *OUT/LOOK* (Fall

- 1989).Falcon, Sylvanna and Michelle M. Jacob. "Human Rights Pedagogies in the Classroom: Social Justice, US Indigenous Communities, and CSL Projects," *Societies Without Borders* 6:2 (2011): 23-50. Print.
- Giroux, Henry A. "Critical Pedagogy and the Postmodern/ Modern Divide: Towards a Pedagogy of Democratization," *Teacher Education Quarterly* 31:1 (Winter 2004), 31-47. Print.
- Grummell, Bernie. "The 'Second Chance' Myth: Equality of Opportunity in Irish Adult Education Policies," *British Journal of Educational Studies* 55:2 (2007): 182-201. Print.
- Guzzini, Stefano (2005). "The Concept of Power: a Constructivist Analysis," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 33:3, (2005): 495-521. Print.
- Hout, Michael. "Social and Economic Returns to College Education in the United States." *Annual Review of Sociology* 38 (2012): 379-400. Print.
- Kuh, George D., et al. *Student Success in College: Creating Conditions That Matter*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, 2005. Print.
- Mills, C. Wright. *The Sociological Imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000 [1959]. Print.
- Lee, Caroline. "Civic Authenticity and Demobilization in Higher Education." Contention Goes to College: Movements in and of Higher Education, CBSM Workshop: Protesters and their Targets. Collective Behavior and Social Movements Section of the American Sociological Association. Northwestern University, Chicago, IL. 20 Aug. 2015. Conference Presentation.
- Liasidou, Anastasia. "Inclusive education and critical pedagogy at the intersections of disability, race, gender and class," *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies*, 10: 1 (2012): 168-184. Print.
- Linde, Robyn. "The Globalization of Childhood: The international diffusion of norms and law against the child death penalty," *European Journal of International Relations*, 20, no. 2 (2014), 544-568. Print.
- Lohrenscheit, Claudia. "International Approaches in Human Rights Education," *International Review of Education*, 48: 3-4 (2002): 173-185. Print.
- Lucal, Betsy. "Neoliberalism and Higher Education: How a Misguided Philosophy Undermines Teaching Sociology." *Teaching Sociology* 43.1 (2015): 3-14. Print.
- Magendzo, Abraham. "Pedagogy of human rights education: a Latin American perspective," *Intercultural Education* 16:2 (May 2005): 137-143. Print.
- McLaren, Peter and Gustavo Fischman. "Reclaiming Hope: Teacher education and social justice in the age of globalization," *Teacher Education Quarterly* (Fall 1998): 125-133. Print.
- McPherson, Michael S., and Morton Owen Schapiro. "The Future Economic Challenges for the Liberal Arts Colleges." *Daedalus* 128.1 (1999): 47-75. Print.
- Meyerson, Debra E., and Megan Tompkins. "Tempered Radicals as Institutional Change Agents: The Case of Advancing Gender Equity at University of Michigan." *Harvard Journal of Law and Gender* 30 (2007): 303-22. Print.
- Mill, John Stuart. *On Liberty* 3rd ed. London, UK: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts, & Green, 1864. Print.
- Moyn, Samuel. "Do Human Rights Increase Inequality?" *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (May 26, 2015). Web. 4 June 2015.
- Mutua, Makau W. "Savages, Victims, and Saviors: The Metaphor of Human Rights," *Harvard International Law Journal*, 42:1 (2001): 201-245. Print.

- Reardon, Betty A. "Human Rights Learning: Pedagogies and Politics of Peace," Lecture delivered for the UNESCO Chair for Peace Education Master Conference at the University of Puerto Rico (April 15, 2009). Web. 14 July 2015.
<<http://www.pdhre.org/HRLreardon.pdf>>
- Rhode Island College Office of Institutional Research and Planning. *Fact Book 2014-2015*. Providence, RI: Rhode Island College, 2015. Web. 2 June 2015.
<<http://www.ric.edu/oirp/pdfreports/FactBook2014-15.pdf>>
- Rosen, Michael. *What Else but Home? Seven Boys and an American Journey between the Projects and the Penthouse*. New York: PublicAffairs, 2009. Print.
- Rosenberg, Gerald N. *The Hollow Hope: Can Courts Bring About Social Change?* 2nd ed. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2008. Print.
- Siegel, Robert. "Inside the Vacant Caverns of St. Louis' Other Beer Baron." *All Things Considered*, National Public Radio. 16 Sept. 2015. Radio. <<http://www.npr.org/2015/09/16/440914091/inside-the-vacant-caverns-of-st-louis-other-beer-baron>>
- Settersten, Richard A., Jr. "The New Landscape of Early Adulthood: Implications for Broad-Access Higher Education." *Remaking College: The Changing Ecology of Higher Education*. Eds. Kirst, Michael W. and Mitchell L. Stevens. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2015. 113-33. Print.
- Shor, Ira. *Empowering Education*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1992. Print.
- Smelser, Neil J. *Dynamics of the Contemporary University: Growth, Accretion, and Conflict*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2013. Print.
- Spencer, Steven J., Claude M. Steele, and Diane M. Quinn. "Stereotype Threat and Women's Math Performance." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 35.1 (1999):4-28. Print.
- Taylor, Catherine G. "Teaching for a Freer Future in Troubled Times." *Inside the Academy and Out: Lesbian/Gay/Queer Studies and Social Action*. Eds. Ristock, Janice L. and Catherine G. Taylor. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998. 15-30. Print.
- Teles, Steven M. *The Rise of the Conservative Legal Movement*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008. Print.
- Tirelli, Vincent. "Adjuncts and More Adjuncts: Labor Segmentation and the Transformation of Higher Education." *Social Text* 51.Academic Labor (1996): 75-91. Print.
- Yoshino, Kenji. *Covering: The Hidden Assault on our Civil Rights*. New York: Random House, 2007. Print.
- Walker, Edward T. *Grassroots for Hire: Public Affairs Consultants in American Democracy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2014. Print.
- Webster, Lindsey N. "The Rise of Human Rights Education: Opportunities, Challenges, and Future Possibilities," *Societies Without Borders* 9:2 (2014): 188-210. Print.
- Wyman, David S. *The Abandonment of the Jews: America and the Holocaust 1941-1945*. 1984. New York: The New Press, 1998. Print.

BIOS:

Robyn Linde is an assistant professor of political science and the director of the International Nongovernmental Organizations Studies program at Rhode Island College in Providence, R.I. Her teaching and research interests in the field of international relations include international law and human rights, specifically, the rights of children and queer rights. Her book, entitled *The Globalization of Childhood: The international diffusion of norms and law against the child death penalty*, will be published in 2016 by Oxford University Press.

Mikaila Mariel Lemonik Arthur is an associate professor of sociology at Rhode Island College in Providence, R.I. She is a scholar of higher education and organizational change and teaches courses on research methods, law, education, and social justice. Her book *Student Activism and Curricular Change in Higher Education* was published by Ashgate, and she has extensive publications and presentations in the area of sociological and legal studies pedagogy.