

Social Justice Frameworks in Action (SJFACT)

University Wide Course

4 credits

Instructors:

Michael Dorsch, School of Public Policy

Marie-Pierre Granger, School of Public Policy, International Relations, Legal Studies

Simon Rippon, Philosophy Department

Tamara Steger, Environmental Sciences and Policy Department

Pedagogical Support:

Helga Dorner/Sally Schwager, Center for Teaching and Learning

Ian Cook, PhD, Research Fellow CMDS, CTL Affiliate, CEU Alumni

Teaching Assistants:

Marko Konjovic, Doctoral Student, Philosophy Department

Felipe Gonzalez Santos, Doctoral Student, Doctoral School of Political Science, Public Policy and International Relations

Anna Varfolomeeva, Doctoral Student, Environmental Sciences and Policy

Course Summary:

Social justice is a widely engaged concept with varied definitions and ideological assumptions, as well as equally contrasting and diverse practical or empirical implications across disciplines and institutions. It is considered as a political philosophy, a social construction, a social movement's esprit de corps, and a normative or otherwise analytical framework or goal, among others. It has strong conceptual ties to equality, distribution, capacity, opportunity and others as well as some of what might be mutually aligned as their dichotomous counterparts such as inequality, discrimination, privilege and oppression.

In support of the open society principles of Central European University and its key role in "building open and democratic societies that respect human rights and human dignity," this course aims to engage faculty and students from different disciplines in a learning forum in which the dynamic, varied, contested, and complex notion of social justice is explored and critically engaged in the context of political participation.

SJFACT is comprised of diverse analytical frameworks from philosophy, political economics, legal studies, sociology and environmental studies that explore social justice in and through political participation from the perspectives of philosophical questions, voting, formal legal processes and social movements for environmental and social justice. Faculty from these disciplinary perspectives facilitate conceptually (theoretical and practical) based learning forums (e.g., lectures, seminars, interactive exercises, etc.) supported by key relevant readings. Four sessions involving three classes each are presented as follows:

Session 1. Philosophical questions on political participation (Simon Rippon, PHIL)

Session 2. A legal perspective on political participation (Marie-Pierre Granger, SPP, IR, Legal Studies)

Session 3. Rational choice and the role of inequality in voting (Michael Dorsch, SPP)

Session 4. Environmental justice and political participation (Tamara Steger, ENV SCI)

These sessions are complemented by work in the Social Justice Lab. In the lab, students work in teams to develop case study projects that explore social justice and political participation in a given context with the intention of articulating the promotion of social justice in and through political participation guided by the analytical frameworks presented in the four sessions.

Driving Questions:

Aim: How can we promote social justice in and through political participation?

Objectives: How are social justice and political participation mutually understood across multiple disciplinary fields? How do we measure and assess social justice as a dynamic and/or as an outcome of political participation? How do we translate our knowledge into concrete proposals to promote social justice in and/or through political participation?

Key Understandings/Learning Outcomes:

Students taking this course will build a unique interdisciplinary perspective and innovative analytical capacity for promoting social justice in and through political participation in different contexts.

Assessment:

1) Four individual one-page reflection papers based on each session and how it relates to your team's selected case study project (4 X 10% each= 40%).

2) Team case study project:

a) Project proposal (living document) (20%)

b) Multi-media curation (a compilation or "folder" comprising varied materials (e.g., texts, figures and tables, audio, video, images, etc.) --to be explained more in class) (30%)

c) Public Presentation (10%)

Important Course Considerations:

1) **Class Attendance:** Don't miss class! Class attendance is essential to maximizing your learning in this course, and promoting social justice across your peers in attendance :) We have worked hard to prepare a good course for you, and we don't want you to miss out on this learning opportunity! However, should you miss a session class, you will need to prepare and submit one paragraph for each required reading that summarizes the reading for that class (due one week after the missed class). Absences are excused, of course, due to illness (doctor's note) or family emergencies or bereavement.

2) **Plagiarism:** Please assure academic honesty in all your work. See CEU's policy on plagiarism [here](#).

3) **Late assignments** that are not excused by a doctor's note or a family emergency/bereavement will be marked down by 3% per day (e.g. 3 days late, mark is reduced by -12%). If one week late, grade cannot be higher than a minimum pass (50%). If more than one week late, grade is a fail (F – 0%) and at the discretion of the course director a new assignment and deadline may be set.

Course Schedule

[Student-Centered Perspectives on Social Justice](#)

Date and Location: 2018 Jan 12, 11:00 - 12:40 Nador 13, 307/A

Driving Questions: We launch this course with a process to explore and engage your understanding of social justice and political participation.

- How do you understand social justice in the context of political participation based on your own experiences and/or previous studies?
- How might this class allow you to revisit your current conceptualizations of social justice in the context of political participation and originate an inter-disciplinary perspective?

Format: Syllabus overview presentation and discussion; Interactive forum and reflection on class-based word clouds; launch of moodle forum discussion on team formation and project case study selection.

Key Understandings/Learning Outcomes: Self-reflective and emerging critical sense of social justice in the context of political participation.

Preparation:

Review the moodle course syllabus.

Address the following two points in a word document (NOT pdf) and submit it on moodle **no later than January 8, 2018:**

1) What is your disciplinary affiliation (e.g., philosophy, international relations, environmental sciences, etc.)?

2) Write **one key word** that best captures what constitutes social justice in the context of political participation for you. (Note: You may wish to consider your own experiences or studies.)

We will discuss your submissions in the first class in the form of word clouds.

[Normative perspectives on political participation: Why democracy?](#)

Date and Location: 2018 Jan 12, 13:30 - 15:10, Nador 13, 307/A

Session 1. Philosophical questions on political participation

Simon Rippon, Philosophy Department

Format: Interactive lecture

Driving Questions:

- What is democracy and what kind of participation does it enable or even demand?
- Why might democracy be a desirable or morally justified system of governance?
- In what ways does democracy promote or constitute equality?

Key Understandings/Learning Outcomes: Understanding of the instrumental and non-instrumental values supporting democratic systems of governance.

Preparation:

Required Readings:

- Singer, P., 1973, *Democracy and Disobedience*. pp.1-45. Introduction and selection from part I "Democratic and Non-Democratic Models Compared".
- Sen, A., 1999, *Development as Freedom*. pp.146-159 (ch 6: "The Importance of Democracy") and p.178-186 (selection from ch. 7: "Famines and other crises")

Optional Readings:

- Christiano, T., "The Authority of Democracy," *Journal of Political Philosophy* (August, 2004): pp. 266-290.
- Waldron, J., 1999, *Law and Disagreement*, ch. 5

[The Problem of Democratic Citizenship](#)

Date and location: Jan 19, 11-12:40, N13, 307/A

Simon Rippon, Philosophy Department

Format: Interactive lecture

Driving Questions:

- Why trust ordinary people with power?
- Is democracy sustainable?

Key Understandings/Learning Outcomes: Understanding of epistemic and other challenges to democracy.

Preparation:

Required Readings:

- Brennan, J., 2016, *Against Democracy*. ch.1 "Hobbits and Hooligans" and ch.2 "Ignorant, Irrational, Misinformed Naturalists" (pp.1-53), especially pp.1-17, 23-43, 49-53.
- Landemore, H., 2017, *Democratic Reason: Politics, Collective Intelligence, and the Rule of the Many*. pp.97-108 (from ch. 4 "First Mechanism of Democratic Reason: Inclusive Deliberation"), pp.195-198 (from ch. 7 "Epistemic Failures of Majority Rule: Real and Imagined"),

Optional Readings:

- [Plato, Republic, book VI](#)
- Hobbes, 1651, *Leviathan*, ch. XIX

[Social Justice Lab](#)

Date and Location: 2018 Jan 19, 13:30 - 15:10 Nador 13, 307/A

Format: Meet with your TAs, form teams and select case studies for team projects.

The Social Justice Lab is for team work and interdisciplinary exchange for exploring social justice frameworks in action through concrete project development.

Preparation:

[DUE January 15:](#)

Read through “Team Projects: Instructions and Guidelines” and select three cases that you might be interested to engage for your team project (other cases may be considered as per the instructions and guidelines).

Fill out and submit the Team Learning Questionnaire. Students will be assigned to teams based on their responses and disciplinary affiliations to maximize learning and inter-disciplinarity.

[Representative Democracy, Democratic Division of Labor, and Epistemic Shortcuts](#)

Date and Location: 2018 Jan 26, 11:00-12:40 Nador 13, 307/A

Simon Rippon, Philosophy Department

Format: Interactive lecture

Driving Questions:

- Can representatives, political parties, non-governmental organizations, or social movements help solve the problem of democratic citizenship, or otherwise strengthen democracy?
- Can we enjoy a division of labor in politics while treating one another as equals?

Key Understandings/Learning Outcomes: Understanding of the ways in which democratic division of labor is possible, and provides potential answers to some of the challenges to democracy.

Preparation:

Required Readings:

- Christiano, T., 2012, "Rational Deliberation Among Experts and Citizens" in Parkinson and Mansbridge (eds.) *Deliberative Democracy at the Large Scale*
- Young, IM, 2001, "Activist Challenges to Deliberative Democracy"

Optional Readings:

- [Burke, 1774, "Speech to the Electors of Bristol"](#)
- Christiano, T, 2015, "Voter Ignorance is Not Necessarily a Problem", *Critical Review*

Law and participation in electoral and consultation processes: opening or closing the gates?

Date and Location: 2018 Jan 26, 13:30-15:10 Location: TBC

Session 2. Law, public participation and social justice

Marie-Pierre Granger, SPP, IR, Legal Studies

Driving questions: How does law, as an object of study and a discipline, address the question of political participation and notions of social justice which such participation involve? In doing so, how does law relate and engage with other disciplines?

For this class:

- Which legal instruments or other sources of law define who can vote in national (and/or) local elections?
- What rules do they provide which help determine who can vote or not?
- Who (which institutions/bodies) adopted those rules, how and when?
- Can these rules be challenged, and if so, how?
- Can the rules be changed? If so, how?

- Are the written rules defining who can vote in which elections clear or did they require some interpretation by courts or other bodies? If so, did courts provide for more extensive or more restrictive interpretations? On which grounds?
- Are legal scholars studying voting rights (in country X) assessing the situation as satisfactory or do they call for reform? On which grounds?
- Does the 'legal system' (as it results of political and judicial law-making processes) make it easy to exercise one's right to vote?
- Can certain persons be temporarily (e.g. prisoners, expatriates)/permanently (e.g. young people, mentally disabled persons, foreigners) be deprived of the right to vote? If yes, how and on which grounds? Is it 'just'? Why?
- Does the law provide for other forms of popular involvement in law and policy-making, such as national/local referendums and consultations? If so, on which kind of issue? Who can participate in these consultations? What are their implications? Can these consultations or their consequences be challenged?

Key Understandings/Learning Outcomes: understanding the processes through which law comes to define who can vote, and on which basis.

Preparation:

Required Readings

Fox, Gregory H (1992). "The right to political participation in international law." Yale J. Int'l L. 17, 539-607, read only pp. 539-570.

Blais, André, Louis Massicotte, and Antoine Yoshinaka (2001). 'Deciding who has the right to vote: a comparative analysis of election laws.' Electoral studies, 20(1), 41-62.

Bauböck, R. (2005). Expansive citizenship—voting beyond territory and membership. PS: Political Science & Politics, 38(4), 683-687.

Vintro, J (2017), "Legality and the referendum on the independence of Catalonia" at http://idpbarcelona.net/docs/blog/legality_referendum.pdf , 1-3.

After having read the required readings, and checking the overall 'situation' in a country of your choice (which can be your own) in relation to the driving questions, identify feature(s) of electoral laws (including elections and referenda that exclude an important part of the population who are likely to be affected by decisions resulting from the electoral or referendum process. Be ready to discuss in class in what way it is problematic (i.e., scope and nature of exclusion); and what are the likely implications for social justice; and whether, why and how it should be changed. For that purpose, you should outline these key points on a dedicated wiki on the Moodle e-learning site (300-400 words).

Exercise

Comparing and contrasting experiences of contested elections/referendums laws.

[Legal mobilization as political participation](#)

Date and Location: 2018 Feb 02, 11:00 - 12:40 Nador 13, 307/A

Marie-Pierre Granger, SPP, IR, Legal Studies

Key understandings/Learning outcomes: understand how legal mobilization and courts can offer alternative mode of political participation, and how much it impacts on political and policy processes.

Driving questions:

- How is the judicial system organized in country X (number/levels of courts, hierarchy, guarantees of judicial independence, judicial training and elections, etc.)?
- What powers do courts have in country X? In particular, can they invalidate legislation adopted by parliament? If so, on which grounds? Do they often do so? Can they invalidate executive measures? Are there some policy areas or types of state measures which cannot be challenged in court?
- When courts assess or interpret legal instruments, do they do it in way which improves political and social inclusion, or on the contrary, do they 'defer' to more restrictive

political choices or the status quo? Have courts displayed progressive or conservative attitudes? Why?

- Do lawyers' training and judges' selection encourage them to creatively use law and legal processes to foster political inclusion and social justice, or are they on the contrary more likely to preserve the status quo and defer to politicians?
- Is litigating a 'cheap and easy' alternative to other forms of political participation, or is it on the contrary a demanding enterprise?
- Is litigating an effective mode of public participation? Can it trigger actual legal and policy change, resulting in greater political participation and inclusion?
- Do excluded groups or NGO representing them make an active use of legal processes to secure greater political participation and/or greater inclusion of their interests in political/policy processes? Which norms do they invoke? Which courts do they litigate in? Are they successful?
- Why do social movements go to court?

Preparation:

Required Reading:

Galanter, M. (1974). Why the "haves" come out ahead: Speculations on the limits of legal change. *Law & society review*, 9(1), 95-160.

Hilson, Chris (2002) 'New social movements: the role of legal opportunity', *Journal of European Public Policy*, 9:2, 238-255, DOI: 10.1080/13501760110120246

Hilson, C. (2013) 'The Court and Social Movements?: Two literature and two methodologies', Blog post Mobilising ideas, <https://mobilizingideas.wordpress.com/2013/02/18/the-courts-and-social-movements-two-literatures-and-two-methodologies/> (optional)

Having read the core reading, and reflecting on the overall 'situation' with regard to the driving questions in a country of your choice (can be your own), identify one instance of either successful or failed attempt(s) regarding mobilization of courts to initiate and/or trigger policy changes. Draw a few take away points on the scope and limits of social change through courts. Outline your 'case' and the take-away points in the dedicated wiki section on the Moodle e-learning platform (300-400 words)

Exercise

Contrasting experiences of legal mobilization across the world and drawing lessons on the capacity of law to promote inclusiveness and social justice

Social Justice Lab

Date and Location: 2018 Feb 02, 13:30 - 15:10 Nador 13, 305, 306, 310; Faculty Consultations location to be confirmed.

Format: TA Team Support and Faculty Consultations

Teams will be scheduled to consult with each faculty member (Michael Dorsch, Marie-Pierre Granger, Simon Rippon, and Tamara Steger) for 45 minutes to receive multi-disciplinary assistance and support for case project development which may include guidance on the organization and conceptualization of your project, methods, resources and materials, analytical approaches, etc. Bring questions and inquiries!

NOTE: Assigned teams will ideally meet with faculty members first, second, third and fourth based their specific projects and anticipated methodologies and potential materials.

Teams will have class with TAs for other 45 minutes when not consulting with faculty members.

Milestones for this class:

- case specific research sub-questions
- a list of materials to be gathered for analysis

Rights, Political Participation, and Justice?

Date and Location: 2018 Feb 09, 11:00 - 12:40 Nador 13, 307/A

Marie-Pierre Granger, SPP, IR, Legal Studies

Key Understandings/Learning Outcomes: understand how framing justice claims as rights affects political and policy processes and outcomes.

Driving Questions:

- Have claims for more inclusive political participation been framed in terms of rights? Which formal rights have been invoked, where and how?
- Have rights been successfully activated to challenge restrictive participatory practices?
- Have attempts to promote/protect rights of marginalized/excluded populations been perceived/presented as 'anti-democratic'?
- Did presenting a policy issue as a matter of right confers it greater legitimacy?
- Are protecting rights and ensuring democracy compatible?

- Does having formal rights actually make a difference in practice? Are rights-conferring legal instruments (ie constitutions, Bills of Rights, international treaties) "empty shell" or powerful instrument to ensure social justice and just participation?
- Do (private, government) actors comply with the law? Why? Is it because of the – lack of - fear of sanction or because it is the right thing to do because of the authority attached to the law?).
- What does it take for laws/rights to be respected?

Preparation:

Required Reading:

Hilson, Chris (2017), 'The visibility of environmental rights in the EU legal order: Eurolegalism in action?' Journal of European Public Policy (June) 1-21

Epp, C. R. (1996). 'Do bills of rights matter? The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms'. American Political Science Review, 90(4), 765-779.

Scheingold, Stuart A. 1974. The Politics of Rights: Lawyers, Public Policy, and Political Change. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 'Ch. 7 Rights as resources' and 'Ch.9 Legal Rights and Political Mobilization'

Having read the core reading, and reflecting on the situation in a country of your choice (can be your own) in relation to the driving questions, identify an interesting example of the framing of a particular political or social issue in terms of rights. Analyze briefly the success or failure of the strategy, and what lessons can be drawn from the case. Outline key elements of the "case" and implications on the dedicated wiki on the e-learning platform.

Exercise: contrasting experiences with rights-framing across the world, and discuss the pros and cons of framing objectives of political participation and social justice as rights.

[Social Justice Lab](#)

Date and Location: 2018 Feb 09, 13:30 - 15:10 Nador 13, 305, 306, 310

Format: TA Team Support (and Faculty Consultations depending on team numbers)

Milestones for this class:

- updates on who has gathered what

- discussions based on preliminary examination of the materials

NOTE: MID-COURSE EVALUATION or STUDENT FEEDBACK after every session including social justice lab feedback. TA/Faculty meeting!

Rational choice political economic models: The median voter and inequality

Date and Location: 2018 Feb 16, 11:00 - 12:40 Nador 13, 307/A

Session 3: Rational choice political economic models: The median voter in a representative democracy, inequality, and redistribution

Michael Dorsch, SPP

Format: Interactive Lecture

Driving Questions:

- How does the level of inequality shape political outcomes within the context of "rational" political decision-making?

Key Understandings/Learning Outcomes:

- Solid understanding of the classical political economic model of political competition and the role of economic inequality within that model.

Preparation:

Required Reading:

J. Stiglitz and J. Rosengard (2015). *Economics of the Public Sector, 4e*. W. W. Norton & Co. (pages 230 -249).

A. Meltzer and S. Richard (1981). "A rational theory of the size of government," *Journal of Political Economy*. 89: 914- 927.

D. Acemoglu, S. Naidu, P. Restrepo, and J. Robinson (2015). "Democracy, redistribution, and inequality," in *Handbook of Income Distribution*. Elsevier. (pages 1886 - 1895).

If you have never had a course on Microeconomic theory, the following will be helpful:

R. Frank (2015). "Rational consumer choice," chapter 3 of *Microeconomic and Behavior*. McGraw Hill. (on reserve at CEU library)

Background material on inequality:

CORE Project (2017). "Economic inequality," chapter 19 of *The Economy*. <http://www.core-econ.org/the-economy/book/text/19.html>

Z. Beddoes (2012). "For richer, for poorer: Special report on inequality," *The Economist*. http://www.economist.com/sites/default/files/20121013_world_economy.pdf

Background material on democracy:

D. Acemoglu and J. Robinson (2006). *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*. Cambridge University Press. (Chapter 3).

Z. Beddoes (2014). "What's gone wrong with democracy?" *The Economist*. <http://www.economist.com/news/essays/21596796-democracy-was-most-successful-political-idea-20th-century-why-has-it-run-trouble-and-what-can-be-do>

Further expositions of the basic economic model of politics:

T. Persson and G. Tabellini. (2002.) *Political Economics: Explaining Economic Policy*. MIT Press. (Chapters 2 and 3).

D. Acemoglu and J. Robinson (2006). *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*. Cambridge University Press. (Chapter 4).

Social Justice Lab

Date and Location: 2018 Feb 16, 13:30 - 15:10 Nador 13, 305, 306, 310.

Milestones for this class:

- refinement of project proposal (due Sunday evening)

Project proposals should be a 1-2 page outline including:

- 1) Title (and acronym, if desired) of project
- 2) Problem statement and short case description including: issue, actors, key events, etc.
- 3) Adaptation of guiding questions for the course in the context of the chosen case.

Driving Questions for the Course:

Aim: How can we promote social justice in and through political participation?

Objectives: How are social justice and political participation mutually understood across multiple disciplinary fields? How do we measure and assess social justice as a dynamic and/or as an outcome of political participation? How do we translate our knowledge into concrete proposals to promote social justice in and/or through political participation?]

5) Methods and materials

6) Workplan: Who will do what by when

Project Proposals (living document) Due!

Rational choice political economic models: Limitations of the basic theory

Date and Location: 2018 Feb 23, 11:00 - 12:40 Nador 13, 307/A

Michael Dorsch, SPP

Format: Interactive lecture

Driving Question:

- Why don't democracies redistribute more?

Key Understandings/Learning Outcomes:

- Further understand the workhorse economic model of politics by coming to terms with its simplifications.

Preparation:

Required Reading:

P. Harms and S. Zink (2003). "Limits to redistribution in a democracy: A survey," *European Journal of Political Economy*. 19: 651 – 668.

A. Bonica, N. McCarty, K. Poole, and H. Rosenthal (2013). "Why hasn't democracy slowed rising inequality?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives*. 27: 103 – 124.

D. Acemoglu, S. Naidu, P. Restrepo, and J. Robinson (2015). "Democracy, redistribution, and inequality," in *Handbook of Income Distribution*. Elsevier. (pages 1895 – 1909).

Further Reading:

M. Gilens and B. Page (2014). "[Testing theories of American politics: Elites, interest groups, and](#)

[average citizens.](#)” *Perspectives on Politics* 12: 564 - 581.

J. M. Figueiredo and B. K. Richter (2014). "Advancing the empirical research on lobbying," *Annual Review of Political Science*. 17: 163 – 185.

R. Borck (2008). “Voting, inequality and redistribution,” *Journal of Economic Surveys*. 21: 90 – 109.

[Social Justice Lab](#)

Date and Location: 2018 Feb 23, 13:30 - 15:10 Nador 13, 305, 306, 310

Studio Time!

Milestones for this class:

- selection of the platform that will be used for the final project

[Rational choice political economic models: Zeroing in on the role of participation](#)

Date and Location: 2018 Mar 02, 11:00 - 12:40 Nador 13, 307/A

Michael Dorsch, SPP

Format: Interactive Lecture

Driving Questions:

- Who votes and who doesn't?
- What are the implications for redistribution?

Preparation:

Required Reading:

A. Blais (2006). "What affects voter turnout?" *Annual Review of Political Science*. 9: 111 – 125.

F. Solt (2008). “Economic inequality and democratic political engagement,” *American Journal of Political Science*. 52: 48 – 60.

K. Smets and C. van Ham (2013). "The embarrassment of riches? A meta-analysis of individual-level research on voter turnout," *Electoral Studies*. 32: 344 – 359.

Further Reading:

J. Cancela and B. Geys (2016). "Explaining voter turnout: A meta-analysis of national and subnational elections," *Electoral Studies*. 42: 264 – 275.

Optional:

Feel free to Investigate the data on political participation and voter turnout in the Varieties of Democracy database:

M. Coppedge, J. Gerring, S. Lindberg, S-E. Svending, J. Teorell, D. Altman, M. Bernhard, M. Fish, A. Glynn, A. Hicken, C. H. Knutsen, K. L. Marquardt, K. McMann, V. Mechkova, P. Paxton, D. Pemstein, L. Saxer, B. Seim, R. Sigman, and J. Staton. (2017). "V-Dem Codebook v7.1." *Varieties of Democracy (V-Dem) Project*

[Social Justice and Political Participation from an Environmental Justice Perspective](#)

Date and Location: 2018 Mar 02, 13:30 - 15:10 Location: TBC

Session 4. Environmental Justice and Political Participation: Social Justice and Political Participation from an Environmental Justice Perspective

Tamara Steger, Env Sci

Format: Interactive Lecture

Driving Questions:

- What is environmental justice?
- How is justice as political participation conceptualized in environmental justice?

Key Understandings/Learning Outcomes:

- Understanding of "nature" and "environment" from an environmental justice movement perspective.
- Discerning disposition toward justice from an environmental justice perspective.

Preparation:

Required Reading:

Sclosberg, D. 2003. The justice of environmental justice: reconciling equity, recognition, and participation in a political movement. In *Moral and Political Reasoning in Environmental Practice*, pgs. 77 - 106.

Optional Reading:

Di Chiro, G. 1995. Nature as community: The convergence of environment and social justice. In Cronon, W., ed. *Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature*. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company Inc. And in *Privatizing Nature: Political Struggles for the Global Commons*. Ed. Michael Goldman. New York: Pluto Press, 1998.

Williams, G. and E. Mawdsley. 2006. Postcolonial environmental justice: Government and governance in India. *Geoforum* 37, 5: 660-670

Dorceta, E., 2000. The Rise of the Environmental Justice Paradigm Injustice Framing and the Social Construction of Environmental Discourses *AMERICAN BEHAVIORAL SCIENTIST*, Vol. 43 No. 4, January 2000 508-580.

[Promoting Environmental Justice](#)

Date and Location: 2018 Mar 09, 11:00 - 12:40 Nador 13, 307/A

Tamara Steger, Env Sci

Format: Team-led discussions.

Guiding Questions: What promotes environmental justice? What can we learn from research on environmental justice?

Key Understandings/Learning Outcomes:

- explore different ways of promoting environmental justice

Preparation:

Read only the reading associated with your team:

Team Migszol:

Kallius, A., D. Monterescu, and P. Kumar Rajaram. 2016. [Immobilizing Mobility](#). *AMERICAN ETHNOLOGIST*, Vol. 43, No. 1, pp. 1–13,

Optional:

Bhimji, Fazila (2016) Visibilities and the Politics of Space: Refugee Activism in Berlin. *Journal of Immigrant and Refugee Studies*, 14 (4). pp. 432-450. ISSN 15562948

http://clock.uclan.ac.uk/13419/1/13419_bhimji.pdf

Nyers, P. (2006). [Taking rights, mediating wrongs: Disagreements over the political agency of non-status refugees.](#)

Team Alter-Globalization:

Zwarteveena, M.Z. and R. Boelens. 2014. Defining, researching and struggling for water justice: some conceptual building blocks for research and action. *Water International*, 2014 Vol. 39, No. 2, 143–158.

Optional:

Mehta, L. J. Allouche, A. Nicol, A. Walnycki. 2014. Global environmental justice and the right to water: The case of peri-urban Cochabamba and Delhi. *Geoforum* 54, 158-166.

Team Christiania:

Hansen, A. 2010, 11. Forty Years of System Change: Lessons from the free city of Christiania. Chapter in *Climate Change: Who's Carrying the Burden*. Ottawa: CCPA.

Optional Reading:

Schelly, David and Stretesky, Paul B. (2009) 'An Analysis of the "Path of Least Resistance" Argument in Three

Environmental Justice Success Cases, *Society & Natural Resources*, 22:4, 369 — 380.

Roberts, G. (1998-1999) *Environmental Justice and Community Empowerment: Learning from the Civil Rights Movement* 48 *Am. U. L. Rev.* 229.

Foster, Sheila. "Justice from the Ground Up: Distributive Inequities, Grassroots Resistance, and the Transformative Politics of the Environmental Justice Movement." *California Law Review* 86, no. 4 (1998): 775-841.

Bullard, R. D. and Johnson, G. S. (2000), *Environmentalism and Public Policy: Environmental Justice: Grassroots Activism and Its Impact on Public Policy Decision Making*. *Journal of Social Issues*, 56: 555–578.

Meredith, M., Victoria Breckwich Vásquez, Mansoureh Tajik, and Dana Petersen. 2006. Promoting environmental justice through community-based participatory research: The role of community and partnership capacity. *Health Education & Behavior*. Vol 35, Issue 1, pp. 119 - 137.

[Social Justice Lab](#)

Date and Location: 2018 Mar 09, 13:30 - 15:10 Nador 13, 307/A

Faculty/Student Roundtable: an interdisciplinary discussion about Christiania, the Bolivian Water War: Cochabamba and Migszol

[Environmental Justice in Central and Eastern Europe](#)

Date and Location: 2018 Mar 23, 11:00 - 12:40 Nador 13, 307/A

Format: Guest Lecture:

Dr. Angéla Kóczé

Assistant Professor, Romani Studies Program (RSP)

Academic Director, Roma Graduate Preparation Program (RGPP)

Reading:

Interview with Nancy Fraser

Optional Reading:

Steger, T, R. Filcak, and K. Harper. (2017). Environmental Justice in Central and Eastern Europe: Mobilization, Stagnation, and Detraction. In Chakraborty, J., R. & G. Walker (eds.) Handbook on Environmental Justice, Routledge.

Filcak, R. and T. Steger. 2014. Ghettos in Slovakia: Confronting Roma Social and Environmental Exclusion. *Analyse & Kritik*. 2014;36(2):229-50.

Velicu, I. and M. Kaika (2015) "Undoing environmental justice: Re-imagining equality in the Rosia Montana..." *Geoforum*.

[Social Justice Lab](#)

Date and Location: 2018 Mar 23, 13:30 - 15:10 Nador 13, 305, 306, 310

In-class team presentations in preparation for summit event.

Multi-media curation DUE March 29.

SJFACT: Summit Event and Course Reflections

Date and Time: March 29.

5:30 - 7:00 Interactive Project Presentation Forum.

6:00-7:15 Reception.

Location: To be confirmed.

Summit event to present and share projects.