



Human Rights in Everyday Life: Partnering Human Rights and Service-Learning/Engaged Scholarship in Local Communities

Julie Shackford-Bradley

Partnerships: A Journal of Service-Learning & Civic Engagement
Vol. 4, No. 2, Fall 2013

This paper makes the case for integrating human rights and service-learning in the United States. After 50 years of invisibility in the U.S., the language and principles of human rights now form the basis for a national movement for addressing problems at the structural level, and as such, are deeply aligned with the goals and visions of the “critical service-learning” and “engaged scholarship” models. As U.S. human rights activities are based mainly at state, municipal and grassroots levels, they provide service-learning students with opportunities to directly engage the laws, principles and strategies of human rights in their own local communities. In turn, students’ enhanced knowledge of human rights principles and strategies for action can enhance linkages between community partners and global human rights networks. Ultimately, such partnerships transform both students’ knowledge and engagement of human rights and the engaged scholarship experience itself.

Key words: human rights, service-learning, engaged scholarship, community partnerships, grassroots, local, global

Human Rights pedagogy means that we are all responsible for injustice and we all have a role to combat it daily -- in both small and substantial ways. The creation of a human rights pedagogy, based on interwoven liberation, requires a transformation of the classroom space beyond the four walls in a room to analyze and think about injustice in all forms. (Falcón and Jacob, 2011, p. 31)

Two years ago, I embarked on an experiment to teach human rights in the U.S. domestic context through a service-learning pedagogical model. The plan to integrate service-learning and human rights arose out of my experience teaching two separate courses, one on international human rights and the other which included a service-learning component. Over time, I was increasingly troubled by the gap that separated the expansive, globally-oriented discussion of human rights activism and social movements in the world "out there," and the comparatively constricted local modalities for addressing community needs in the U.S. When addressing problems in other countries, students embarking on service projects were likely to frame their work in terms of international human rights violations. In the U.S. context, the local social justice lens, while salient, was more likely to highlight dysfunction and division within and among communities. Students often complained that they could not do much more than "apply Band-aids" on the problems they were encountering because they lacked the means to envision or enact real change. However, there also appeared to be a contradiction between the "international human rights framework"—which conveys a top-down approach-- and the values of the "local social justice" approach, which seeks answers to community problems from within. This paper illustrates my attempt to find common ground between the two pedagogical models of human rights education (HRE) and what is now called "critical service-learning," or, where I teach, "Engaged Scholarship." My contention is that, while human rights is often framed as a top-down, legalistic approach to solving problems at the local level, in practice, it works through a local/global dialectic, where people in local communities and students working with them can tap into an international network of principles, knowledge and discourse, and strategies for activism within their own local or national contexts.

In experimenting with human rights through engaged scholarship, I have found that the discourse of rights can have a clarifying effect for students who are unsure of their role in the field and which goals to pursue. Human rights are based on the foundational principles that everyone has the right to human dignity, to have their basic needs met, and to participate in making decisions about issues that affect them. These foundational principles can transform the relationship between the student who is providing services and the person who benefits from those services from one that is hierarchical into a mutual project for claiming and realizing rights together. As Falcon and Jacobs (2011) put it, this transformed relationship, based on "interwoven liberation," is at the heart of human rights pedagogy.

Many faculty work within the engaged scholarship model, defined as a pedagogical framework that shares the same evolutionary field with experiential education, service-learning, civic engagement and engaged public scholarship. The main goals of engaged scholarship are to "connect the resources of the university and the community to work toward a common goal," in large part through courses through which faculty maintain:

ongoing partnerships with community-based organizations to teach course content in a relevant and engaged manner; mobilize themselves and students to respond to community-identified assets, interests and needs; and share resources with the community to address critical issues. (Avila-Linn, Rice & Akin, 2012, p. 4)

UC Berkeley's Engaged Public Scholarship program emphasizes reciprocity, "where both partners play the role of the 'server' and the 'served'" (Avila-Linn et al., 2012, p. 5). It also acknowledges the relationship between community-based activism and academia that has characterized the parts of the ethnic studies movement made up of "groups of faculty, students and staff who were committed to specific [local] communities which had been excluded by higher education" (Avila-Linn et al., 2012, p. 5). In the process, this program questions the locus of the production of knowledge to recognize that "knowledge can legitimately be created through areas other than traditional research" (Avila-Linn et al., 2012, p. 6). Engaged scholarship envisions "robust" faculty community partnerships through which faculty and community members collaborate through the process of developing and executing courses and community service experiences and vigorous preparation of students with academic content as well as training that emphasizes "dialog about culture, identity and power" and "strategies to balance inequitable power" and many opportunities for reflection throughout the process. (Avila-Linn et al., 2012, p. 7)

In this paper, I build on the engaged scholarship model to show how integrating human rights and engaged scholarship pedagogies can be beneficial for both and inform one another in critical ways. To demonstrate, the following defines the goals of service-learning as it pertains to the university's obligation in a democratic society:

A sustainable democracy depends upon the active engagement of an enlightened citizenry in the conduct of public affairs, and Service-Learning may provide a particularly effective way of transmitting the sense of responsibility for civic engagement from one generation to the next...[T]he perception of service-learning advocates is that normative values associated with civic engagement and democracy, learning and meeting specific community needs converge and are mutually reinforced in the service-learning pedagogy. (Steinke, Fitch, Johnson & Waldstein, 2002, p. 75)

Human Rights pedagogies have been similarly defined under the rubric of "Human Rights Education or HRE, which emphasizes both the study of human rights principles, law, and history, and their application through deliberative, participatory practice" (Padilla 2011, p. 93).

While individual human rights courses are extremely varied, those that ascribe to the HRE paradigm are expected to link content and advocacy: "Human rights education is not merely about valuing and respecting as we know, but also about advocacy to guarantee these conditions" (Tibbitts, 2002, p. 160). HRE focuses as well on developing an array of skills in students, including "recognizing one's own biases, accepting differences, taking responsibility for defending the rights of others, and mediation and conflict resolution" (Tibbitts, 2012, p. 160). As with the engaged scholarship paradigm, a key challenge for HRE is to achieve a convergence between abstract understanding of values and principles, and their contextualized application in communities. As Julie Mertus writes:

Students of human rights often complain that human rights are taught as abstract concepts, lists of norms, and institutional diagrams. "But what do human rights

organizations actually do?" they wonder. Practitioners of human rights, on the other hand, know a great deal about the day-to-day doing of human rights practice--conducting field missions, interviewing victims, lobbying policymakers, drafting grant proposals, conducting workshops--but they miss the larger picture of how human rights norms take root and become effective at the local level. (Mertus, 2009, p. 2)

Students of human rights can bridge the gap between theory and practice through community-based activities mediated through the philosophies and principles of engaged scholarship. Human rights courses with engaged scholarship structures can give students direct experience, but also challenge students to analyze that experience through multiple frames that integrate reflection on personal insights and interpersonal relationships, along with human rights and social justice principles and practices. Through a social justice lens, students focus on the local level, recognizing both the root problems that exacerbate the issues they work on, and the potential of local communities to address them. Through the human rights frame, students see those same issues in terms of violations of international human rights, and consider local/global structures that play a role in producing these problems and identifying appropriate responses. This inspires a radically different approach to understanding local issues and problems, which calls attention to the influence of global political and economic structures in local affairs, while emphasizing the connections between human rights actors at the local level around the world.

Some may ask, why human rights? They might argue, the U.S. already has active movements focused on social and economic justice. My response is twofold.

First, the U.S. is simply out of sync with the rest of the world where human rights are concerned. Americans who work on international human rights issues are highly aware of the historical trajectory whereby the U.S. civil rights movement principles and strategies have been adopted by other peoples across the world to inspire non-violent actions that have stopped invasive development projects, to send dictators packing, and to bring access to health care for millions of people suffering from HIV/AIDs. Yet human rights are rarely incorporated into our political discourse. Not only does the U.S. not adhere to the international norms that it demands others abide by, but many policies the U.S. has helped create and disseminate, such as intellectual property rights and emissions standards, are responsible for people's suffering around the world. Lacking our own human rights movements in this country, we not only appear hypocritical, but we also miss opportunities to work with people across borders in a global endeavor to promote systems and structures that are more likely to increase peoples' access to resources, information and peaceful environments.

Second, without a human rights framework in the U.S., we lack the language and structures to articulate and work for basic principles of social and economic justice in ways that bring people together across issues and ethnic identities. For example, few people would argue with the basic principles that people have a right to safe working conditions, or that no one can be denied access to clean water on the basis of their race or economic class. While people

struggle on behalf of these issues throughout the U.S., they do so within their own community organizations or labor unions, which are often divided on lines of ethnicity, class or geography. Rarely do people collectively advocate for these issues as a basis for our policy at local, state and national levels. Human rights discourse changes the landscape in three ways: by making the claim for rights for everyone everywhere, by holding governments and other entities accountable for respecting and protecting those rights, and by linking rights together. Clean water, healthy food, good health, good education, access to good jobs, a voice in governance, and access to information are all related in a common commitment to ensure equity and dignity for all.

Further, few people are aware that the U.S. has signed on to and ratified three important human rights treaties, which can strengthen social justice movements and give them a platform to come together. One important human rights instrument is the CERD or Convention for the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination, through which people can hold the government accountable for eliminating environmental racism, and require governments to act affirmatively to reduce discrimination in workplaces and the criminal justice system. The second is the ICCPR or International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which ensures that all people, regardless of their status as citizens, are granted basic human rights, including freedom from unwarranted search and seizure or unreasonable detention. Both are important tools that organizations can use in solidarity to articulate basic core principles and build inclusive movements that address human rights for all.

Courses that integrate human rights education and engaged scholarship are ideal for introducing human rights principles and strategies into the U.S. context, precisely because they both shed new light on the ongoing social justice movements through which people are struggling for these rights--often in harsh and resource-poor environments--and because they require students to think critically about human rights in general and also in practice. The course allows maximum engagement, through debates, reflective circles, experiential learning and community-based research, so that students understand the challenges and the benefits of bridging these worlds.

Foundations for Integrating Human Rights and Engaged Scholarship Pedagogies

As many students are engaged in community partnerships that focus on the provision of basic services, courses that link human rights and engaged scholarship are likely to encounter the issues of "second-generation" human rights, or economic, social and cultural rights. These rights--to food, housing, health care, and safe labor conditions--are not guaranteed through the U.S. constitution and are subject to ideological, legal and political whims and shifts. Where government programs or the forces of the market (or both) leave people in situations of need, nonprofit organizations or non-governmental organizations (NGOs); or community-based or grassroots organizations (CBOs or GROs); along with other participants in "civil society" are left

to provide missing services, to struggle for access to better resources and services, or to advocate for larger political change.

In both international and U.S. settings, students will likely confront the paucity of resources and capacity of the organizations with which they work. As Steinke, Fitch, Johnson and Waldstein (2002) have explained:

Service-learning is a response not only to the recognition that student education is in need of reform but also that many communities are in dire need of service, and that nonprofit agencies for delivering many community services are often underfunded and understaffed. (p. 76)

When students experience the incapacity of organizations to address the larger issues, but do not know how to contextualize this experience, they often end up blaming the organizations themselves, the poorly paid people who work at the organization, or worse yet, the people who access its services. Such experiences can be “miseducative” (Bringle and Hatcher, 1999, p. 114), in the sense that they can reinforce negative stereotypes and push people away from public service in general. Fortunately, these problems can be partially or even mostly alleviated when the service experience is analyzed through “critical service-learning” or engaged scholarship paradigms.

Recent research produced through UC Berkeley’s ACES (American Cultures Engaged Scholarship) program by Cynthia Gordon for her forthcoming dissertation, suggests that students’ experiences of community public service will be deepened by the courses that focus on the “why” questions behind the services students are performing; that is, analysis of structural or institutionalized racism and other forms of historically embedded inequities in the U.S. Through surveys of students involved in service-learning courses, Gordon (2013) found that the amount and quality of that content was directly proportional to positive or negative experiences with community partnerships. Across the board, proponents of “critical service-learning” advocate for more analysis of the root causes behind the problems and issues that students face while performing service (Butin 2010; Marullo and Edwards 2000; Mitchell 2008).

Critical service-learning is distinguished from other service-learning approaches which offer students the opportunity to provide direct services to communities with a primary goal of developing a sense of “multicultural competence” among students (Butin 2010, p. ix). In the past, issues of identity were foregrounded, such that the goal of service-learning was to provide students with the opportunity to reflect

upon their own assumptions and stereotypes about the individuals with whom they serve. This type of service-learning approach requires “foregrounding issues of identity and difference as a way of helping students alter their personal and world views and preparing students with new ideas that can help them understand and work across differences. (Mitchell 2008, p. 52, quoting Chesler and Vasques-Scalera)

While serving a particular purpose for “privileged” students whose worldviews will be expanded through close encounters with the “other,” the emphasis on multiculturalism has been critiqued for its lack of attention to community transformation or the “revolutionary” potential of service-learning, which is realized through analysis of structural or root causes of the problems (Mitchell, 2008, p. 52).

As Mitchell notes, while some practitioners point to the “‘encounter with difference’ as an aspect of the service-learning experience that leads to the ‘development and change desired,’ we must be cautious in asking students to engage in these experiences without challenging unjust structures that create differences” (2008, p. 56). She continues, if service programs are not asking the questions of why specific groups suffer from systemic inequality, or are neglecting to “encourage students to investigate the links between ‘those served’ and institutional structures and policies, service-learning students may never move beyond “Band-aid” service and toward action geared to the eradication of the cycles of dependence and oppression” (Mitchell 2008, p. 54). Or, as Marullo and Edwards put it:

When one’s goal is social justice, one attempts to alter the structural or institutional practices that produce excessive or unjustified inequalities among individuals or that treat people unfairly—for example discriminating among people on the basis of race, sex social class, religion, nationality, ethnicity, sexual orientation, or disability status. (2000, p. 899)

Many proponents of critical service-learning identify a strict division between those experiences that focus on providing direct service to people, and those that emphasize political or social justice advocacy (Mitchell 2008; Robinson 2000). The emphasis on direct service has resulted in a situation in which “we are experiencing greater than ever levels of community service,” but at the same time, “suffering from a decline of civic life” (Marullo & Edwards, 2000, p. 899). Robinson likewise calls attention to the “Division of thought in the emerging celebration of service-learning between the kind of service-learning that provides direct, charitable services to needy communities ... and that kind... that engages students in political organizing and social advocacy” (2000, p. 607).

Addressing this polarity, Westheimer and Kahne (2004) introduce a third category in their formulation of three types of citizen education: traditional, progressive, and advanced. In traditional citizenship education, students learn, in a passive way, core democratic values and how government works. Progressive education emphasizes agency through strong democracy and civic participation (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004, p. 238). Advanced education adds “the politics of recognition,” that is, the social justice element that links current conditions with historically inscribed inequities that are based on racial, ethnic or gendered difference (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004, p. 239).

Aligning these three education modalities with the form of citizenship they are likely to produce in students, Westheimer and Kahne see traditional citizen education resulting in a form of “responsible” citizenship which emphasizes the role of service; progressive education leading to increased civic participation, and advanced education bringing about “justice-

oriented citizenship" which is more analytically-based. The authors note that the majority of service-learning programs they researched aimed at only one of these goals, rather than a "cumulative approach" (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004, p. 238). Thus, while one group of students developed a proficiency in the "technical aspects" of civic engagement, another another gained a strong theoretical understanding of the root causes of problems and issues in their community. The authors suggest that any one of these forms of citizenship without the other leaves a gap in students' ability to fully engage in such a way as to take on the complex and rooted issues of our times (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004, p. 241). In other words, critical service-learning, to be translated into relevant action, must include not only critical analysis, but also technical tools for change on the ground. It may not be enough to expect students to gain these tools at their community partnerships; they must also be addressed in class.

HRE theorists have produced a similarly tripartite model for global citizens which locates values and awareness on the lower tier of a pyramid, followed by the accountability model and capped by the transformational model. The accountability model focuses on leadership in the field of law, politics and policy, while the transformational model, as its name suggests, requires deep analysis of structures and experiences that either obstruct or enable the realization of human rights (Tibbitts, 2002, p. 167-168).

The linking of engaged scholarship and human rights education is not meant to be seen as a cure-all, but rather a new paradigm through which to understand service, responsibility, civic engagement and activism. While this paradigm has yet to take hold in U.S. social justice efforts and movements, a course that combines human rights and engaged scholarship offers new platforms for discussion of the intersections of service, social justice and political change. From the legal perspective, a human rights paradigm clarifies the relationship of government and people. The Columbia University Law School report on Human Rights in the United States notes:

...an international human rights framework articulates governments' responsibility for taking measured, concerted steps to respond to a full range of issues facing local communities, including race discrimination, poverty, hunger, disease, unemployment and other socioeconomic crises. (2009, p. 3)

Community activists at the grassroots level focus more on peoples' reciprocal responsibilities and the potential for solidarity across difference:

The key to applying human rights to community development lies in the necessary connection between rights and responsibilities. If I have a right, others have the responsibility to respect that right, to allow me to exercise it and to provide me with an environment where I can do so. These obligations are usually collective rather than individual... Rights thus require a society where people are drawn together by mutual obligations...recognizing each other's rights and the responsibilities they entail and working for their collective benefit; and that is not a bad definition of "community." (Ife, 2003, p. 6)

The “Deliberative School” of human rights activism goes further to emphasize the importance of negotiation, dialog and debate among people who are likely to be victims of human rights violations, and nonprofits or NGOs, governmental institutions and other actors, regarding the best practices of ensuring human rights for all:

Scholars and policymakers associated with the Deliberative School emphasize that human rights are political values that socially liberal societies consciously choose to adopt. Human rights in this sense are not natural to people, and they only come to exist through social agreement and institutionalization: “Over time, a gradual expansion of norms creates institutional structures, leading ultimately to a norms cascade as the ideas of human rights become widespread and internalized.” (Miller, Rivera & Gonzalez 2011, p. 71)

According to these authors, community-based research plays an integral role in upholding the ideals of the deliberative process, as it ensures the inclusivity of the processes of claiming human rights.

This kind of education is especially important in U.S. contexts because, in addressing basic problems, a responsibility vacuum often emerges, since potentially responsible entities (communities, cities, counties, states, charitable organizations, the federal government, or individuals themselves) can simply point fingers at each other when problems arise. For students, this can be daunting. Consider, for example, the experience of a student who worked on an advocacy project for the homeless in Berkeley. This student spent months collaborating with other local organizations to plan a rally for affordable housing on the anniversary of President Obama’s inauguration address in January of 2010. While the rally was successful, in that it brought out many organizations and activists, it did not result in the development of a plan for more affordable housing. The student learned a powerful civics lesson, but it was a negative lesson regarding the many constraints that state and local officials face in a bleak economic landscape. It was clear that the mere act of voting in new politicians would not change the system; but beyond that, there were few new ideas that these organizations and local officials could agree on.

Going along with Westheimer and Kahne’s (2004) premise, then, even if a student recognizes histories of discrimination and how these lead to resource scarcity and poverty, and even if that student has developed high levels of empathy *and* skills in civic engagement, the path to the kind of deep structural change that critical service-learning advocates imagine may indeed remain illusive. The problem is not with the efforts of engaged scholarship practitioners, community partners and students, but rather, in the larger systems in which we work, where the overarching paradigms of neoliberalism, privatization and individualism present profound obstacles to the kinds of change that critical service-learning advocates imagine (Tomlinson & Lipsitz, 2013).

When human rights strategies are applied to community service situations, students can gain clarity on how structures can be transformed. Economic and social rights activists now look to

the “respect, protect, fulfill” paradigm to realize people’s rights. This paradigm conveys three levels of obligation for states that are signatories to the International Convention on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) (Balakrishnan & Elson, 2008, n.p.). *Respecting* rights such as housing, food or health care means that states must not themselves engage in activities that will actively deny people those rights, through discriminatory policies, or by, for example, expropriating homes or lands without adequate compensation, polluting waterways, or refusing to provide health care to people in the government’s custody. The next level, of *protecting* these rights, obliges states to ensure that other actors, such as banks, insurance companies, large corporations or developers also refrain from acting in ways that deny people adequate food and housing, a healthy environment and access to health care. In other words, this places duties and obligations on governments to oversee and regulate the actions of “non-state actors” and to create conditions in which citizens can or must also realize their duties and obligations to each other and to the state as protectors of each others’ basic rights. At the third level of obligation, *fulfilling* these rights, states are obligated to provide everyone with the resources to ensure all their basic needs are met.

The respect, protect and fulfill paradigm proposes a strategy through which human rights actors can focus on “arbitrary or discriminatory governmental conduct that causes or substantially contributes to an [economic, social and cultural] rights violation” (Neier, quoting Kenneth Roth of Human Rights Watch, pp. 79-80). The first two levels, of respecting and protecting economic and social rights, provide a solid framework for holding governments accountable for rights *violations*. In other words, human rights researchers can gather evidence to show how people are being denied access to the basics through policies and actions. The basic assumption about economic and social rights is that these rights are already inscribed and understood as inalienable, rather than based on the vagaries of the economic system or popular political ideology. This is no longer just a matter of distributive justice, where we debate how the “economic pie will be divided,” as Neier (2012) explains, but rather, shifts the focus to those cases in which government bodies are either engaging in discriminatory policies and other willful violations of basic rights or failing to protect people from discriminatory, fraudulent, illegal or inappropriate behavior that reduces human security.

Robinson has noted the skepticism toward service-learning courses because of their potential to “politicize education” (2000, p. 607); the addition of a human rights framework will only increase those suspicions. But I would argue that a study of human rights movements in the United States is critical for appreciating U.S. history in general and histories linked to social justice concerns because these two histories are interwoven throughout. The story of human rights in the United States links directly to social justice histories that include the abolition of slavery, the movement for the women’s vote, and the civil rights movement, as well as the more controversial movements for the so-called “second generation” human rights that focus on an equitable distribution of society’s resources and service. While the former are now celebrated as part of a legacy of democracy in the U.S., the latter remain shrouded in the complex history of the Cold War, a history that needs to be further disentangled and explored as integral to current social justice and human rights movements in the U.S.

Recent scholarship by Anderson (2007; 2003) and Soohoo (2007) begins to tell the story, which, in a nutshell, features the NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) as instrumental in struggling for and helping to articulate the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR). Even before the Human Rights Commission was fully established, the NAACP submitted a book-length petition entitled “An Appeal to the World,” which documented the historical denial of rights and privileges for African Americans (Anderson, 2007, p. 89). Sensing the threat of international condemnation for human rights violations, U.S. leaders worked to ensure that, even as the U.S. played a major role in developing human rights structures under the leadership of Eleanor Roosevelt, human rights would not be enforced at the international level in a way that would interfere with local or state-level economic, political or legal policies and structures in the U.S. (such as Jim Crow).

More egregiously, from the mid-1940s onward, U.S. leaders explicitly linked human rights activism with communism and anti-American activities, effectively silencing any discussion of human rights in U.S. political discourse, at least where the U.S. was concerned. Cold War censorship ensured that President Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s “Economic Bill of Rights” would never be incorporated into U.S. constitutional law, and that the ICESCR would remain signed but not ratified (Sunstein, 2004). While it eventually became “politically expedient” to make changes in the arena of civil and political rights in the 1950s and 1960s (Soohoo, 2007, p. 77), as Anderson emphasizes, those gains were offset by a lack of attention toward economic and social rights, especially in the African American community:

...(civil rights), no matter how bitterly fought for, could only speak to the overt political and legal discrimination that African Americans faced. Human Rights, (which encompassed economic and social rights) on the other hand... had the language and philosophical power to address not only the political and legal inequalities that African Americans endured, but also the education, health care housing and employment needs that haunted the African American community. (2003, p. 2)

The historical work of Anderson and Soohoo (2007), along with a great deal of literature that is now being produced both by human rights organizations and in academic contexts, makes clear the natural linkages between human rights histories and issues and current social justice movements, struggles, and analytical frames. Yet, actors within social justice movements continue to be skeptical of the possibilities of human rights discourse. In the next section, I will explore some of the challenges of integrating human rights and engaged scholarship pedagogies.

From “Saving” Victims to Building Solidarity

In the words of Jim Ife (2004), “Human rights...involve all aspects of our humanity, and involve everything we do in interaction with other human beings” (p. 7). With this in mind, the 30 articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) can be an excellent starting point for articulating aims and objectives of relationships in general and community partnerships in

particular. The Declaration lays out the basic principles for relationships between people and states, as well as other institutions and actors locally and internationally. These principles emphasize that *all* people have rights and obligations, and that *all are expected to act* with the aims of developing and perpetuating the *basic human dignity* of all people. These principles form the foundation for open debate and negotiation regarding how rights can best be realized in any given social or political context.

As many have argued, the rights laid out in the UDHR are interconnected, mutually reinforcing, and form a network through which to realize equality and pursue human potential individually and collectively (Donnelly, 2003; Kahn, 2009). The UDHR's preamble statements claim that human rights and the international laws formed around them will give oppressed peoples the tools to realize rights through nonviolent means; that is, through the rule of law, reducing the potential of violence in the world. Throughout the UDHR, some contradictions arise, for example regarding rights to private property and access to intellectual property. On these issues, the UDHR proposes finding a balance between conflicting forces and interests in a society, in ways that will remain true to the rights themselves. There is an assumption of "reasonableness," also laid out in the preamble. In articles 29 and 30, the UDHR emphasizes the point that no person or entity may use a claim to the rights laid out in its 30 Articles in an effort to take away or reduce other rights. In other words, the letter of the law cannot be used to supersede the spirit of the law.

To develop students' sense of the power of the UDHR as a set of principles, I begin the semester by asking students to read through it on their own and to choose one right that is meaningful in their own lives. This initial reflection on the language and content of the UDHR can imprint on students the concept of claiming rights in one's own experience, and hearing others in the class making their own claims. Students choose an array of different rights, from those that address immigration, to free speech, to political organizing, to access to equal education, labor rights, and so on. This initial discussion demonstrates to the class that everyone comes to the human rights framework through their own personal experience and collective history. From this point, we move into a more general discussion about what rights are, the role of citizen's and government obligations and the meaning of human dignity and respect in specific contexts. Ideally, this exercise will shape students' future experience working with local communities, and constructing community partnerships as part of a mutual and collective effort to realize rights, rather than as the one helping or providing services for others, which is a problem in both the engaged scholarship and human rights fields.

Much has been written, in both fields, about the pitfalls of the victim/savior fallacy. Whether students are leaving the safety of their campuses to go out into the local community or leaving the comfort zones of their home states/cultures to travel to the other side of the world, they inevitably experience hierarchical structures that position them as saviors and "others" as victims who need saving. In the service-learning context, this has been labeled as the "white knights" phenomenon (Butin, 2010, p. 5). As Falcón and Jacob put it:

If our goal as teachers is to dismantle race, gender and class oppressions, then a radical educational model must be developed that refuses to frame service-learning projects in paternalistic terms (i.e., students needing to help the poor and unfortunate). Instead, service-learning projects should be framed in terms of justice (i.e., students have a responsibility to combat inequality). (2011, p. 41)

Likewise, critics of human rights have drawn attention to the ways in which, when working with others, particularly groups of people who have experienced histories of discrimination, human rights actors can actively enforce hierarchy, by "reinscribing and recodifying...identities that have been produced through domination" (Souter, 2008, p. 14). To be more specific, when we construct others as *merely* victims of human rights violations, we risk emphasizing the victim-identity over all others (Brown, 1997, p. 127). As Fisher and Benson note, when whole groups of people are reduced to the status or category of "victim," this can result in a form of "representational and symbolic violence." They continue, "While championing the rights of the oppressed, [models of victimization] very often give little voice to the very same oppressed." Rather, they reflect on the "savior," by playing "to our hidden and overt presuppositions of superiority—'At least we aren't like that...'" (Fisher & Benson, 2006, p. 142). At worst, human rights actors and students working with community partnerships can function as little more than "spectators" of others' suffering and victimization (Hesford, 2011, p. 7).

Both engaged scholarship and human rights discourses offer possible remedies for what is clearly an endemic problem in both fields. As Mitchell notes, the goal for service-learning is not to "artificially homogenize all people in the service-learning experience" but rather to "theorize" the "complex relationships" they find themselves in (Mitchell 2008, p. 59). Students may build authentic relationships that acknowledge differences while establishing various kinds of connections. The human rights framework also presupposes a basic human connection through the discourse of rights when it is stated, through the UDHR and all other human rights instruments—that *all people everywhere* have rights and that these rights are the foundation for human dignity. In many U.S. contexts, this basic principle is not understood or accepted; on the contrary, many U.S. policies and practices explicitly deny the full legal subjectivity of certain kinds of people, including those without U.S. citizenship, the homeless, people with addiction, those who have served time in prison or who come from communities with high crime statistics. This notion that certain people have more rights than others is naturalized through public and political discourse.

To acclimate students to the human rights worldview, I assign a reading on strategies for supporting the human rights of drug-addicted persons around the world (see Kaplan, 2009). Most students know someone with an addiction problem or have experienced one themselves, yet do not realize the extent to which people with drug addictions can be denied rights to health care, to safe living conditions, freedom from unwarranted beatings by police, and so on. In addition to feeling empathy for people with drug addictions, through reading and discussion, this reading helps students to see those who are addicted to drugs as *fellow rights-bearers* in a legal sense as well as more abstractly. The discussion generated by this new

realization inevitably turns to other categories of people whose rights are routinely denied (not just violated), such as sex workers, people in prison or the undocumented. Re-envisioning people as fellow rights-bearers establishes a point of connectivity and an essential equality between students and community members. An obvious point of difference is the extent to which rights are claimed, realized or recognized by the rest of society and through legal structures, in both the short and long term. These are differences that people can address together, utilizing unique skills and kinds of knowledge. Rather than separate people into categories of victim and savior, they can, through training and awareness, be foundations on which to build solidarity and common cause.

Social justice advocates also maintain skepticism toward human rights in the U.S. because of what is understood as the *individualizing* tendency of human rights structures, since rights-bearers, in human rights discourse, are understood to be individuals who claim their personal rights from state or other governmental bodies. As Brown has argued, people experience human rights violations not necessarily as individuals but because of their membership in a particular group. When groups who have experienced collective harm based on their identities or another essential aspect of their being are reclassified as individuals with rights, the new paradigm can “mask the power that produced” those identities (Souter, 2008, p. 14) and further, obscure or erase histories of oppression as well as collective struggle (Brown, 1997, p. 87).

On the other hand, as students discover when working in the field, and as Donnelly (2003) persuasively argues, while human rights are indeed legally granted mainly to individuals, the realization of rights can only occur when people come together to struggle for those rights collectively. Myriad examples of human rights action from around the world amply demonstrate this point. In addition, U.S. examples of human rights actions, whether Vermont’s “Healthcare is a Human Right” campaign, or the Mossville, LA., struggle for environmental justice, or Immokalee strikes of the last several years emphasize the power of solidarity, not only among victims of human rights abuses, but local, national, and even international NGOs (Alisa, Davis, & Soohoo, 2007 vols. 1-3).

Luna’s (2009) work demonstrates how a human rights frame can increase the possibilities for “intersectional analysis” of the ways in which certain groups of people experience an array of rights violations simultaneously. The group she worked with, SisterSong Women of Color Reproductive Collective, found that the language and framing of human rights filled gaps they had experienced in their work with both the male-dominated Civil Rights movement leadership and the white-middle class orientation of the Feminist movement. By addressing sexism, racism and economic and social rights together in a human rights framework, the women of SisterSong were able to articulate their own uniquely holistic approach to reproductive rights, while also developing sense of solidarity with women worldwide:

A human rights framework both speaks to the need to demand rights, not ask for privileges, and the need to connect with other women and struggles worldwide through using a universal, internationally agreed upon framework. . . . (Luna, 2009, p. 354).

Luna's reading of SisterSong's experience illustrates that people, as agents who have experienced violations of human rights, need not be circumscribed by human rights language and discourse, but rather, can locate within human rights the meanings and possibilities that are aligned with their backgrounds, experiences and desires. While most students will not encounter groups that already work within a salient human rights frame like the one described here, they can introduce the possibilities through dialog and research. Their goal should not be to teach human rights to their community partners, but to see where the points of intersection are to be found.

For example, many students at UC Berkeley develop an interest in food security and the problem of "food deserts" in the Oakland area (stretches of residential living spaces without grocery stores that carry healthy and fresh foods). In one of my classes, two students with these interests went to work with the Ecology Center that organizes farmers' markets in Berkeley and Oakland. Both found themselves doing relatively low-level work at the farmers' market, since this is where the organization needed the most help—setting up and taking down tables and booths, and giving people tokens to buy food from funds extracted from EBT (Electronic Benefit Transfer) and WIC (Women, Infants and Children) cards, otherwise known as food stamps. However, because of their interest in food security and requirement (discussed below) to engage in community-based research, the students interviewed the head of the organization on camera about her understanding of food security as a human right, and then applied this knowledge in a research project aimed at discovering why more women with WIC cards did not shop at the farmers' market, or, in other words, how to best help people realize their right to healthy and fresh food. As it turned out, the main obstacle was location and access; people with few resources are unlikely to take a long trip on a bus to get to the farmers market. Armed with this information, the Ecology Center was able to set priorities to locate the markets in more accessible areas.

Developing Skills for Engaged Scholarship/Human Rights Action

As noted previously, one of the goals of engaged scholarship is to combine empathy, social justice analysis and civic engagement skills. It is also important, as Mitchell (2008) notes, to prepare students for their service experiences by ensuring they know something about the communities they will work in as well as something about the aims and goals of the community partner, and to have skills to offer to fulfill the organization's goals. While Mitchell speaks about the value of "authentic communication" between students and community partners, I would add that the design of course assignments can be such that students are put into situations where they must engage such human rights skills as "facilitation, education, communication, consciousness raising, building solidarity, inclusiveness and activism" (Ife,

2004, p. 12). As alluded to above, I ask students in my class to develop a community-based research project in addition to the work they are asked to do by the organization. One path to knowledge and critical understanding of a community's issues is through community-based research. If done well, that is, in a spirit of solidarity as in the farmers' market example, community-based research can be mutually rewarding for students and community partners.

In the ideal setting, students work on a research project already developed by the community to assess its own needs and derive action strategies from them, as based on the popular education model exemplified by the Coalition of Immokalee Workers' movement against the fast food industry in the U.S. This approach emphasizes the continuity between research and popular education through "participatory analysis of the problems facing farm workers in Immokalee":

...overcrowded housing, for example, wasn't a distinct problem to be addressed by code inspectors, political pressure and exposés in the press. Rather it was a symptom of a much more profound violation of workers' human rights, one concrete expression of a system that locked farmworkers in poverty and fundamentally failed to recognize their dignity.
(Asbed, 2007, p. 12)

In linking this work with the theory of popular education, Asbed emphasizes the goal of "obliging workers to confront the problems in their community...It is an approach...that ties complex political issues to the concrete conditions of workers' lives" (2007, pp.7-8).

Not all community-based research projects will be as "organic" as this one. Most students will have to hone their skills of communicating respectfully across difference as they develop a project in collaboration with their community partners that links their work to human rights, and fulfills a community need. This assignment challenges students to make an appointment with their supervisors or the heads of their organizations to engage in a discussion about the organization's needs and research interests. Through such conversations, students develop research questions and designs that are relevant and useful. Then, through the research process, they develop skills in active listening, observation, and collaborative work.

Sample community-based research questions:

- What obstacles prevent mothers who use WIC cards from shopping at the farmers' market (which accepts WIC)?
- What are the effects of the Secure Communities program on immigrant families in the local area?
- What are the specific needs of LGBTI refugees and how can U.S.-based organizations meet them?
- What are specific needs of refugees from violent environments?
- How will homeless people be harmed by a "no-sitting" ordinance in Berkeley?
- To what extent do girls in Berkeley suffer from human trafficking?
- How do people recently released from prison suffer from rights violations in Berkeley?

In addition to more conventional research, which may involve interviews, surveys, or media analysis, students with skills in video and their own equipment have also produced films, which can quickly reach a wide audience. For example, in fall of 2012, the city of Berkeley was poised to vote on a ballot measure that would ban people from sitting or lying on city sidewalks. Students working with the Berkeley Peace and Justice Commission decided to create a video that would convey the voices of the homeless or those working at homeless shelters, and their objections to the proposed new law. Working on the video gave students an entirely new perspective on the circumstances that lead to homelessness, as well as the many arguments against the law. Additionally, students formed a collaboration with other student organizations on campus which were contesting the measure. In the weekend before Election Day, they managed to show their film and sponsor a rally on campus, while also making the film available on YouTube, dramatically increasing general student interest in the issue. By a narrow margin, the ballot measure was defeated, giving students a sense of real accomplishment.

Another kind of research students do for this class involves the writing of human rights shadow reports¹ that are presented to various human rights commissions in Geneva. UC Berkeley students are fortunate to be able to choose from two different organizations, the Berkeley Peace and Justice Commission and Meiklejohn Civil Liberties Institute, that produce shadow reports on human rights. These reports ask students to both gather the empirical data of specific human rights violations and to make an argument about the connection between discrimination and lack of or unequal access to resources and services -- precisely the kinds of connections that are called for under the rubric of critical service-learning. While such processes—of writing and submitting reports for review by committees located in far-off Geneva—have a bureaucratic and legalistic feel to them, the process of developing these

¹ Non-governmental organizations often submit shadow reports to international human rights committees as correctives to official human rights reports submitted by states. Shadow reports may dispute information or fill in gaps in states' reporting.

reports can also create new alliances and collaborations among different kinds of actors. In class, students read about the work of the U.S. Network on Human Rights which, in the wake of Hurricane Katrina, mobilized local activists and human rights lawyers to produce a comprehensive report on the specific effects of Katrina that was submitted for the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) in 2010, entitled: "From Civil Rights to Human Rights: Implementing U.S. Obligations Under the International Convention for the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD)." This shadow report offered a very different story of the U.S. response to Katrina, emphasizing the link between discrimination against minority groups and emergency and housing policies in the affected areas (CERD Taskforce 2010; Graham 2012; Luft 2009). As part of this process, the State Department made site visits to the affected areas. Upon reading the multiple reports and shadow reports received from the U.S., the UPR committee made 228 recommendations to the United States, many of which focused on homelessness and the U.S. obligations to reduce discrimination as articulated through the CERD.

Most recently, students working on shadow reports focused on unequal access to education in California. While the work is highly analytical, and involves combing through other reports and media articles rather than working directly with communities, the students felt they were indirectly working toward greater school equality in California, by gathering the evidence of inequity in a detailed report that would be read at the levels of the state department and the CERD Committee in Geneva. In addition, one student in particular experienced a complete change in perspective, when he discovered the discrepancy between the kinds of resources his school had offered, and those that other California students faced. In his final presentation, he noted that where he had always assumed that his acceptance to Berkeley was based purely on merit and his hard work, he now realized that access to resources was also a major factor.

As legal approaches of litigation and reporting to International Human Rights Committees are gaining new visibility in the U.S., local organizations are also taking inspiration from the new engagement and activism that reporting inspires. At the state and local level, this activity offers new opportunities for students to engage with community partnerships working directly on human rights issues. The Columbia Law School report presents case studies of recently created Human Rights bodies, such as Human Rights Commissions in Portland and Eugene, Oregon; Washington State's Human Rights Commission; and San Francisco's Commission on the Status of Women, all of which link to International Human Rights Treaty Bodies and use the language and discourse of human rights to address local issues (Columbia Law School Report, 2009, p. 8). Such organizations create excellent opportunities for engaged scholarship partnerships.

Regarding the importance of developing skills in community engagement and human rights action, two caveats are in order. First, it should be noted that UC Berkeley students are highly motivated, and many come into the class with advanced skills in research, organizing and communication. Yet, despite these backgrounds, not all are able to enter into the kinds of unstructured or even chaotic situations of community partnerships. It is my belief that working in less structured settings forces students to take responsibility for defining and then achieving

their own version of success. Moreover, they can experience significant personal growth by working through a situation where, for example, a volunteer coordinator quits partway through the semester, or the community partner demands too much, requiring students to create their own boundaries.

Some students resent “the messenger” who challenges them to achieve this level of self-awareness and accountability, which is why reflection about questions of what success means is imperative after students’ first days at their sites, and then throughout the rest of the semester. In most cases, students learn from and emulate their peers as they make their way through this process.

Second, not all community partnerships are set up to allow students to produce a community-based research project. For this reason, I present an advocacy spectrum which identifies the various steps and stages of human rights action and advocacy. This allows students to develop an appropriate project, depending on the community-partners’ needs. Perhaps the research has already been done, and now the objective is to disseminate it to the public or to government officials. Or, perhaps an organization is just getting started and seeks partners with similar interests. The course therefore presents several skill-building workshops that relate to human rights, which may be taught by a variety of campus or community experts:

Further Skill-building workshops in Human Rights:

- Developing popular education programs for human rights
- Collecting testimonials
- Concept mapping and flow-charting
- Strategies for disseminating information (fact sheets; letters to the editor; websites and social networking)
- Lobbying and other forms of advocacy.

In past years, students have produced testimonials on Secure Communities to present at the Berkeley City Council and lobbied the city council on particular issues; they have made concept maps of service providers for Spanish-speaking domestic violence victims for a local domestic violence organization; engaged in social networking activities for the climate change organization 350.org; and engaged in popular education on foreclosure policies with a local housing rights organization.

Much of the preparation work with community partners is aimed at helping those partners think about what students can do for them. Since many of the organizations we work with are under capacity and are merely trying to keep up with everyday crises, it is imperative for the community partner to take a moment to imagine that extra piece that the student can provide. Typically, a community partner will think about what a student *cannot* do for them, because of privacy issues, or because further training would be required, so I come with a list of skills students have, for example in video, social media, data entry, writing, researching, even more

unique skills like massage or dance therapy, knitting, translation, construction, and so on. As mentioned previously, sometimes it takes several calls, emails and meetings to develop a plan that is beneficial for all parties. At the beginning of the semester, community partners come to the class to discuss their organizations, the work they do, and their specific needs. Students can connect with the partners immediately to make an appointment to set up the partnerships. At the same time, they can gauge, based on the community partners' presentation styles, how organized or structured the experience might be. Once they are partnered, the onus is on students to take the next steps, so they begin with a strong foundation to build on.

Connecting Local/Global Human Rights Strategies and Networks

Through the process of designing and/or working on community-based research projects in local communities, students gain a sense of the challenges that human rights actors face around the world. Whereas in the U.S., freedom of speech and movement are guaranteed, for researchers in countries where that is not the case, such projects are much more difficult and dangerous. Yet, a great deal of human rights research is produced around the world, demonstrating the commitment to these human rights principles in different contexts. To make the connections between issues in the U.S. and efforts to address them and similar cases in other communities, students are asked to first link their issues to the relevant human rights instruments and treaties, and then compare their case with a similar case in another country, with special emphasis on the strategies that human rights actors deploy to generate change.

To ensure that students have a strong understanding of human rights regimes, a good amount of reading and discussion is required to introduce the six main treaties and conventions that make up the International Bill of Rights, and to recognize the range of strategies that International Human Rights actors deploy, from litigation to reporting to advocacy and activism and the delivery of services (Advocate for Human Rights Minneapolis, 2011). It is also imperative to explore the historical and contemporary terrain of human rights in the U.S., in particular, the challenges of addressing economic and social rights in the U.S. Because few of the community partnerships will themselves use the language of rights or human rights, this exercise may feel like the application of a constructed framework that has little to do with the daily practice at community partnerships. Despite these inherent contradictions, however, students gain experience working and thinking within a framework whose power is in its interconnectedness, both among the various human rights that are articulated, whether civil and political or economic and social, and between themselves, their community partners and human rights actors everywhere.

As mentioned throughout this paper, there are signs that suggest not only that a nascent human rights movement is increasing its visibility in the U.S., but also, that this movement is developing in large part through the work of communities that have been the victims of human rights violations and denied a hearing by the U.S. government. In the 1990s, the main focus of this movement was on the death penalty and abuses in the vast U.S. prison system,

both of which showed the U.S. out of alignment with the norms of most of the rest of the world, and the developed world in particular (Maran, 1999). More recently, the cases have grown more diverse, as indicated by such recent publications as *Close to Home: Case Studies of Human Rights Work* (2004), which is available on the internet;² *Bringing Human Rights Home* (2007), a comprehensive three-volume set of essays on the historical and current circumstances of human rights in the U.S.; *Human Rights in the United States: Beyond Exceptionalism* (2011); and *Human Rights in our own Backyard: Injustice and Resistance in the United States* (2011).

What emerges from these studies is the fact that human right movements, rather than being imposed from the top down, are being generated at grassroots levels, in particular among communities of color and immigrants who do not feel that their issues are sufficiently recognized within the U.S. context. In addition, several studies of state and local agencies emphasize the role of municipalities and state-level commissions in recognizing human rights as a structure for promoting equality and addressing issues of discrimination (Hertel & Libal 2011; Columbia Law School 2009). This work is being supported and enhanced through the efforts of international human rights NGOs, like Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, which have established U.S.-focused sectors and websites, and by law school human rights clinics that forge legal connections with International Human Rights institutions and, most critically, the Inter-American Human Rights Court (Albisa & Soohoo 2007, vol. 3; Maran, 1999). To assess their ability to link practice in the field with the analytical and legal frameworks of human rights, students must locate issues they are encountering within the matrix of human rights as articulated through multiple declarations, conventions and treaties. They then trace action that has been taken on these issues both in the U.S. and internationally. This establishes students' understanding of the local/global human rights principles and networks, and demonstrates the global scope of the issues they are addressing in U.S. communities.

As a culminating activity at the end of the semester, students give major presentations that explain the work of their community partners, what they did, the findings of the community projects and personal reflections. These presentations allow everyone in the class to gain awareness of the kinds of issues communities are facing, and strategies for addressing those issues. Throughout the presentation, students are asked to both use the language and discourse of human rights, and to recognize the transformative aspect of both engaged scholarship and human rights education by discussing the changes they personally experienced. Usually, students are quite open about the assumptions and stereotypes they started their work with, anxieties overcome and most importantly, insights gained about the real work of social and political change. One common insight regards the ways in which a student's efforts, which seem so insignificant, form a critical piece in a much larger structure.

² Retrieved at www.fordfoundation.org/pdfs/library/close_to_home.pdf

While reflection is considered central to the engaged scholarship experience, it also raises concerns regarding its subjective aspect. Bringle and Hatcher's (1999) work on reflection counters concerns about the lack of intellectual rigor in reflection. As they put it, well-crafted reflection exercises and assignments demand that students "turn a subject over in the mind...giving it serious and consecutive consideration" (Bringle & Hatcher, 1999, p. 114, quoting John Dewey), and that the purpose of reflection is ultimately to test or generate theories based on those students' experiences in the field. Moreover, reflective activities can be carefully designed to "ask learners to confront ambiguity and critically examine existing beliefs" while also gaining an appreciation of the "prospective relevance" of "retrospective analysis" (Bringle & Hatcher, 1999, pp. 114-115). With such a broad mission, reflection writing may span from personal journals to extensive papers that take experience as a starting point for further research and analysis.

By broadening the scope of reflection, Bringle and Hatcher (1999) demonstrate how engaged scholarship/human rights courses can develop critical thinking skills through a scaffolded experience. As mentioned previously, students in my class are first introduced to human rights through a subjective exercise of choosing a right that is important to them and explaining this to the rest of the class. Then, as they begin their work with community partners, students are asked to directly apply concepts of human rights action and advocacy by developing a project that involves research, popular education, the collection of testimonials, and/or creation of fact sheets or other relevant work for their organization. Ideally, when students develop such projects in collaboration with their community partners, they experience reciprocity, by learning about the problems of the community and adding their knowledge of human rights paradigms to the discussion. Throughout, students are asked to reflect on these experiences in writing or collectively, allowing them to recognize their impact while acknowledging and learning from mistakes, clarifying misconceptions and revising preconceptions of the other. Finally, students link their field experiences to an analytical framework which locates them in a local/global continuum. Bringle and Hatcher's piece reinforces the idea that all course assignments--from the most subjective and personal to the most academically rigorous--are linked together in a reflection process that both emphasizes and continually tests the relationship between theory and practice. The result is a holistic learning experience that aligns with the overall mission of human rights pedagogy, which integrates the following: development of understanding, empathy and tolerance for difference; values clarification (critical exploration of values and their articulation in contemporary society); knowledge acquisition of the "substantive provisions of the UDHR and other human rights instruments [and] promotion of attitudes of solidarity through which information, strategies and tools for advocacy and change are shared among communities" (Meintjes, 1997, pp. 69-70).

Conclusion

The goal of integrating engaged scholarship and human rights pedagogy as laid out in this paper is to link human rights with everyday life by recognizing the abstract concepts laid out in

such documents as the UDHR, putting them into practice through collective action, and analyzing how they transform everyday lived experience. Through activities framed by human rights principles and practices, students and their community partners link up, directly or indirectly, with fellow human rights actors worldwide in common, yet diverse missions. By comparing their work with efforts in other contexts, students can gain a deep understanding of how foundational principles of human rights allow for unique negotiations of rights and obligations among people and their governments to match the circumstances of local contexts.

The service-learning or engaged scholarship context offers a unique opportunity to bring together, in more meaningful dialog, local social justice and human rights principles, analytical frames and strategies for change. In this paper, I have aimed to promote further dialog between these fields, as well as to present resources and ideas for people interested in developing courses that focus on human rights in the U.S. Peeling back the historical layers, it becomes clear that these two movements are intertwined on multiple levels, and can benefit in the future from increased integration. In the academic setting, the pedagogies of engaged scholarship and human rights education likewise share both content and common goals in terms of developing students' abilities to critically analyze social issues and move between theory and application while consistently interrogating both. Both fields are also met with some skepticism because of their openly political perspectives, even as they are based on principles that few people would reject on moral grounds at least. It is thus in their interests to be mutually supportive, beyond exclusive disciplinary enclaves.

The author would like to thank Ineko Tsuchida the Shinnyo-en Foundation of San Francisco and Victoria Robinson of UC Berkeley's American Cultures Engaged Scholarship program for supporting the research that resulted in this paper.

References

- Advocates for Human Rights Minneapolis. (2011). *Discover human rights: A human rights approach to social justice training manual*. Minneapolis, MN: The Advocates for Human Rights.
- Albisa, C., Davis, M., & Soohoo, C. (2007). *Bringing human rights home: A history of human rights in the United States* (Vols. 1-3). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Anderson, C. (2007). 'A hollow mockery': African Americans, White supremacy, and the development of human rights in the United States. In C. Soohoo, C. Albisa and M. Davis (Eds.), *Bringing human rights home* (Vol. 1, pp. 75-102). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Anderson, C. (2003). *Eyes off the prize: The United Nations and the African American struggle for human rights, 1944-1955*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.
- Armaline, W., Glasberg, D & Purkayastha, B. (2011). *Human rights in our own backyard: Injustice and resistance in the United States*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania.
- Asbed, G. (2007). Coalition of Immokalee workers: '*Golpear a uno es golpear a todos!*' To beat one of us is to beat us all. In C. Soohoo, C. Albisa and M. Davis (Eds.), *Bringing human rights home*, (Vol. 3, pp. 1-23). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Avila-Linn, C., Rice, K., & Akin, S. (2012). *Designing community-based courses: A guide for instructors to develop community partnerships and create engaged public scholarship courses*. Produced by Cal Corps Public Service Center, University of California at Berkeley.
- Balakrishnan, R. & Elson, D. (2008). *The U.S. financial crisis is a human rights issue*. Retrieved from <http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-u-s-financial-crisis-is-a-human-rights-issue/10736>
- Bingle, R. & Hatcher, J. (1999). Reflection in service learning: Making meaning of experience. In Campus Compact (Ed.), *Introduction to service-learning toolkit*, (pp. 113-119). Boston, MA: Campus Compact.
- Brown, W. (1997). Rights and identity in late modernity: revisiting the 'Jewish Question.' In A. Sarat and T. Kearns (Eds), *Identity, politics and rights* (pp. 85-130). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.
- Butin, D. (2010). *Service-learning in theory and practice: The future of community engagement in higher education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

- CERD Taskforce, et al. (2010, November). From civil rights to human rights. In *Universal Periodic Review: Joint Reports, United States of America* submitted to the United Nations Universal Periodic Review. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Human Rights Network.
- Cleveland, S. & Powell, C. (2008). Foreword: Human rights in the United States. *Columbia Human Rights Law Review*, 40(1), 1-6.
- Columbia Law School, Human Rights Institute. (2009). *State and local human rights agencies: Recommendations for advancing opportunity and equality through an international human rights framework*. New York, NY: Colombia Law School Human Rights Institute.
- Davis, M. (2007). Thinking globally, acting locally. In C. Soohoo, C. Albisa and M. Davis (Eds.), *Bringing human rights home* (Vol. 2, pp. 127-152). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Donnelly, J. (2003). *Universal human rights in theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.
- Eagleton, T. (1993). Deconstruction and human rights. In B. Barbara Johnson, (Ed.), *The Oxford Amnesty Lectures* (pp. 121-146). New York: Basic Books.
- Falcón, S. & Jacob, M. (2011). Human Rights pedagogies in the classroom: Social justice, U.S. indigenous communities and CSL projects. *Societies Without Borders*, 6(2), 23-50.
- Fisher, E. & Benson, P. (2006). *Broccoli and desire: Global connections and Maya struggles in postwar Guatemala*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University.
- Ford Foundation. (2004). *Close to home: Case studies of human rights work in the United States*. New York, NY: Ford Foundation.
- Gandhi, M.K. (1993). *An autobiography: The story of my experiments with truth*. Boston, MA: Beacon.
- Gordon, C. (2013, May). Community-engaged scholarship. Workshop presented at *American Cultures Engaged Scholarship* conference at the University of California at Berkeley.
- Graham, L. (2012). Advancing the human right to housing in post-Katrina New Orleans: Discursive opportunity structures in community housing and development. *Housing Policy Debate*, 22(1), 5-27.
- Hertel, S & Libal, K. (2011). Paradoxes and possibilities: Domestic human rights policy in context. In S. Hertel and K. Libal (Eds.), *Human rights in the United States: Beyond exceptionalism* (pp. 1-22). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.
- Hesford, W. (2011). *Spectacular rhetorics: Human rights visions, recognitions, feminisms*. Durham, NC: Duke University.

- Ife, J. (2004, April). *Linking community development with human rights*. Paper presented at the Human Rights and the Grassroots Conference, Deakin University, Melbourne, AU.
- Ife, J. (2003, April). *Community development and human rights*. Keynote address, delivered at the Strengthening Communities Conference: People, Place, Partnerships. Sydney, AU.
- Kahn, I. & Petrusek, D. (2009). *The unheard truth: Poverty and human rights*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Karyn K. (2009). *Human rights documentation and advocacy: A guide for organizations of people who use drugs*. Harm Reduction Field Guide 1, International Harm Reduction Development Program. New York, NY: Open Society Institute Public Health Program.
- Lewis, H. (1997). Lionheart gals**facing the dragon: The human rights of inter/national black women in the United States." *Oregon Law Review*, 76, 567-632.
- Luft, R. (2009). Beyond disaster exceptionalism: Social movement developments in New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina." *American Quarterly*, 61(3), 499-527.
- Luna, Z. (2009). From rights to justice: Women of color changing the face of U.S. reproductive rights organizing. *Societies Without Borders*, 4(3), 343-365.
- Mamdani, M. (2009). *Saviors and survivors: Darfur, politics and the war on terror*. New York, NY: Three Rivers.
- Maran, R. (1999). International human rights in the U.S.: A critique. *Social Justice*, 26(1), 49-71.
- Marullo, S. & Edwards, B (2000). From charity to justice: The potential of university-community collaboration for social change. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43, 895-912.
- Meintjes, G. (1997). Human rights education as empowerment: Reflections on pedagogy. In G. Andreopoulos and R. P. Claude (Eds.), *Human rights education for the twenty-first century* (pp. 64-79). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania.
- Mertus, J. (2009). *Human Rights matters: local politics and national Human Rights institutions*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.
- Miller, D., Rivera, J., & Gonzalez, C. (2001). The deliberative school approach to human rights. *Society Without Borders*, 6(2), 68-91.
- Mitchell, T (2008). Traditional vs. critical service-learning: Engaging the literature to differentiate two models. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 14(2), 50-65.
- *Modrowski, K. (2006). Paolo Freire and popular education in the 20th Century. *Human Rights Learning: A People's Report*, retrieved from www.PDHRE.org/report/

- Mutua, M. (2001). Savages, victims and saviours: The metaphors of human rights. *Harvard International Law Journal*, 2(1), 201-209.
- Neier, A. (2012). *The international human rights movement: A history*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.
- Robinson, T (2000). Service-learning as justice advocacy: Can political scientists do politics? *PS: Political Science and Politics*, 33(3), 605-612.
- Segal, Y. (2006). The death penalty and the debate over the U.S. Supreme Court's citation of foreign and international law. *Fordham Urban Law Journal*, 33(5), 101-130.
- Soohee, C (2007). Human rights and the transformation of the 'civil rights' and 'civil liberties' lawyer. In C. Soohoo, C. Albisa and M.Davis (Eds.), *Bringing human rights home* (Vol 2, pp. 71-104). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Souter, J. (2008). Emancipation and domination: Human Rights and power relations. *In-spire: Journal of Law, Politics and Societies*, 3(2), 140-150.
- Smith, J. (2007). *Social movements for global democracy*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.
- Steinke, P, Fitch, P., Johnson, C., & Waldstein, F. (2002). An interdisciplinary study of service-learning predictors and outcomes among college students. In S. H. Billig and A. Furco (Eds.), *Service-learning through a multidisciplinary lens*, (pp. 73-102). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.
- Sunstein, C. (2004). *The second bill of rights: FDR's unfinished revolution and why we need it more than ever*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Tibbetts, F. (2002). Understanding what we do: Emerging models for human rights education. *International Review of Education*. 48(3-4), 159-171.
- Tomlinson, B. & Lipsitz, G. (2013). Insubordinate spaces for intemperate times: Countering the pedagogies of neoliberalism. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*. 35, 3-26.
- Ward, K. & Wolf-Wendel, L (2000). Community-centered service-learning: Moving from doing for to doing with. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 43, 767-780.
- Westheimer, J. & Kahne, J (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2), 237-269.