

11.3.3 Lesson 11

Introduction

In this lesson, students participate in a peer review activity during which they offer constructive feedback to their classmates about the entire research-based argument paper. Students review their peers' papers for elements of the W.11-12.1 standard and supporting standards (W.11-12.1.a-e) that have been introduced in this unit. Additionally, students peer review for English grammar, usage, and writing conventions. Students are assessed via the completion of the Peer Review Accountability Tool and the quality of the implementation of the peer revisions to their own papers.

For homework, students continue to implement revisions based on peer feedback and complete the Final Decision and Explanation portion of peer feedback on the Peer Review Accountability Tool. Additionally, students read their drafts aloud (to themselves or someone else) to identify problems in syntax, grammar, or logic.

File: 11.3.3 Lesson 11 Date: 9/12/14 Classroom Use: Starting 9/2014

© 2014 Public Consulting Group. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License

Standards

File: 11.3.3 Lesson 11 Date: 9/12/14 Classroom Use: Starting 9/2014

© 2014 Public Consulting Group. This work is licensed under a

Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>



Assessed Standard(s)	
W.11-12.5	Develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting, or trying a new approach, focusing on addressing what is most significant for a specific purpose and audience.
Addressed Standard(s)	
W.11-12.1.a-e	<p>Write arguments to support claims in an analysis of substantive topics or texts, using valid reasoning and relevant and sufficient evidence. Explore and inquire into areas of interest to formulate an argument.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce precise, knowledgeable claim(s), establish the significance of the claim(s), distinguish the claim(s) from alternate or opposing claims, and create an organization that logically sequences claim(s), counterclaims, reasons, and evidence. Develop claim(s) and counterclaims fairly and thoroughly, supplying the most relevant evidence for each while pointing out the strengths and limitations of both in a manner that anticipates the audience's knowledge level, concerns, values, and possible biases. Use words, phrases, and clauses as well as varied syntax to link the major sections of the text, create cohesion, and clarify the relationships between claim(s) and reasons, between reasons and evidence, and between claim(s) and counterclaims. Establish and maintain a formal style and objective tone while attending to the norms and conventions of the discipline in which they are writing. Provide a concluding statement or section that follows from and supports the argument presented.
W.11-12.8	Gather relevant information from multiple authoritative print and digital sources, using advanced searches effectively; assess the strengths and limitations of each source in terms of the task, purpose, and audience; integrate information into the text selectively to maintain the flow of ideas, avoiding plagiarism and overreliance on any one source and following a standard format for citation.
SL.11-12.1	Initiate and participate effectively in a range of collaborative discussions (one-on-one, in groups, and teacher-led) with diverse partners on <i>grades 11-12 topics, texts, and issues</i> , building on others' ideas and expressing their own clearly and persuasively.
L.11-12.1	Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English grammar and usage when writing or speaking.

File: 11.3.3 Lesson 11 Date: 9/12/14 Classroom Use: Starting 9/2014

© 2014 Public Consulting Group. This work is licensed under a

Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License

L. 11-12.2.a, b	Demonstrate command of the conventions of standard English capitalization, punctuation, and spelling when writing. a. Observe hyphenation conventions. b. Spell correctly.
L.11-12.3.a	Apply knowledge of language to understand how language functions in different contexts, to make effective choices for meaning or style, and to comprehend more fully when reading or listening. a. Vary syntax for effect, consulting references (e.g., Tufte's <i>Artful Sentences</i>) for guidance as needed; apply an understanding of syntax to the study of complex texts when reading.

Assessment

Assessment(s)

Student learning in this lesson is assessed via:

- Implementation of peer review edits (from the Peer Review Accountability Tool) to the research-based argument paper
- Individual student responses to the peer editing on the Peer Review Accountability Tool (Final Decision and Explanation Column only)
- Student implementation of peer review edits are assessed using the relevant portion of the 11.3.3 Rubric and Checklist.

High Performance Response(s)

A High Performance Response should:

- Include thoughtful responses on the Peer Review Accountability Tool (Final Decision and Explanation Column) that describe how the student chose to address their peers' concerns and suggestions (e.g., Above it says that R2P is just a framework; I think you need to provide more clarity about what else is needed.).
- Effectively integrate at least one suggestion and/or revision, as appropriate, into the draft of the research-based argument paper (e.g., I revised this section to include "enforcing it with an international military force" to provide more clarity about what else is needed in addition to R2P.).
- See the Model Peer Review Accountability Tool for more information.

Vocabulary

Vocabulary to provide directly (will not include extended instruction)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None.*
Vocabulary to teach (may include direct word work and/or questions)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None.*
Additional vocabulary to support English Language Learners (to provide directly)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None.*

*Students should use their vocabulary journals to incorporate domain-specific vocabulary from Unit 11.3.2 into their argument research paper, as well as to record process-oriented vocabulary defined in the lesson.

Lesson Agenda/Overview

Student-Facing Agenda	% of Lesson
Standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standards: W.11-12.5, W.11-12.1.a-e, W.11-12.8, SL.11-12.1, L.11-12.1, L.11-12.2.a, b, L.11-12.3.a 	
Learning Sequence: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction of Lesson Agenda 2. Homework Accountability 3. Peer Review Round Robin Instruction 4. Peer Review Round Robin 5. Lesson Assessment 6. Closing 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 5% 2. 10% 3. 10% 4. 50% 5. 20% 6. 5%

Materials

- Sticky notes, colored pens or pencils, or computer-based peer review software (such as Track Changes in Microsoft Word or Google Docs editing tools)
- Copies of the Peer Review Accountability Tool for each student

File: 11.3.3 Lesson 11 Date: 9/12/14 Classroom Use: Starting 9/2014

© 2014 Public Consulting Group. This work is licensed under a

Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License

- Student copies of the 11.3.3 Rubric and Checklist (refer to 11.3.3 Lesson 3)

Learning Sequence

How to Use the Learning Sequence	
Symbol	Type of Text & Interpretation of the Symbol
10%	Percentage indicates the percentage of lesson time each activity should take.
no symbol	Plain text indicates teacher action.
	Bold text indicates questions for the teacher to ask students.
	<i>Italicized text indicates a vocabulary word.</i>
►	Indicates student action(s).
☞	Indicates possible student response(s) to teacher questions.
❗	Indicates instructional notes for the teacher.

Activity 1: Introduction of Lesson Agenda

5%

Begin by reviewing the agenda and assessed standard for this lesson: W.11-12.5. In this lesson, students participate in a peer review of the entire research-based argument paper. Students read drafts of three of their classmates' papers addressing specific elements of W.11-12.1.a-e and several language standards, and respond to their classmates using constructive criticism. Students use their classmates' constructive criticism to revise and improve their drafts.

- Students look at the agenda.

Activity 2: Homework Accountability

10%

Ask student volunteers to briefly share one or two grammatical edits they made for homework and to explain their decisions, referencing L.11-12.2 on their 11.3.3 Rubric and Checklist. (Continue to edit your research papers using L.11-12.2 on the 11.3.3 Rubric and Checklist, and be prepared to discuss one or two edits in the following lesson.)

- Students share one or two grammatical edits with their peers and explain their decisions.
- Responses will vary based on individual students' papers.

File: 11.3.3 Lesson 11 Date: 9/12/14 Classroom Use: Starting 9/2014

© 2014 Public Consulting Group. This work is licensed under a

Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License

- Students may have questions about grammar and usage, which can be addressed during Homework Accountability if there is time.

Activity 3: Peer Review Round Robin Instruction

10%

Instruct students to get into their pre-established research teams. Students remain in these teams throughout the peer review process. Instruct students to take out their research-based argument paper drafts.

- Students get into their research groups and take out their research-based argument paper draft.
- Consider placing students into new groups instead of their pre-established research teams to provide a broader range of peer review for the students.

Explain to students that in this lesson, they continue the work of collaborative discussion outlined in SL.11-12.1, to which students were previously introduced. Remind students these discussion strategies have been taught in previous modules.

- Students listen.
- Encourage students to prepare for the Module Performance Assessment by considering the skills inherent in the Speaking and Listening Standards during this discussion activity. Remind students that they will present their research orally at the end of the module and that this activity provides an opportunity to prepare for the assessment presentation.

Instruct students to number the paragraphs on their paper in the left margin. Explain that this helps student peers review one another's work.

- Students number the paragraphs.

Explain that students should provide constructive criticism to their peers during this peer review process.

Provide students with the following definition: *constructive criticism* means “criticism or advice that is useful and intended to help or improve something, often with an offer of possible solutions.” Explain to students that *constructive criticism* helps them share advice with their peers in a positive and academic manner.

- Students listen.
- Remind students that they have been progressing toward this more formal peer review by participating in mini-peer reviews in previous lessons.

Ask students to Turn-and-Talk with their small groups to discuss the following question:

File: 11.3.3 Lesson 11 Date: 9/12/14 Classroom Use: Starting 9/2014

© 2014 Public Consulting Group. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License

What are some examples of how to offer constructive criticism, specifically sentence starters for providing constructive criticism?

- Student responses may include:
 - “This could be stronger if you add...”
 - “If you move this paragraph and this paragraph, it would...”
 - “This might make more sense if you explain...”
 - “Instead of this word, why not use...?”

Lead a share out of student responses.

- Remind students that the word *construct*, which means “build,” is in *constructive criticism*. This means that students’ comments should always be intended to build a better paper. Students should add suggestions or comments that give the writer some way to fix the problem, instead of just identifying the problem. Consider providing non-examples of *constructive criticism* and showing how they can be made constructive (e.g., “This doesn’t make sense” vs. “This might make more sense if you explain...”).

Explain to students that in college or in the working world, adults often have peers or colleagues review their writing before they submit their final draft. They may get a peer’s opinion on an important e-mail draft, a business proposal, or a college thesis. Ask students:

What is the value of having someone else read a research-based argument paper draft before it is submitted?

- Student responses may include:
 - A peer review can point out whether or not ideas make sense.
 - A reviewer can help the writer find errors in convention or grammar.
 - A reviewer can tell the writer where the central or supporting claims are weak or not convincing, or where additional evidence is needed.
 - Reviewing can show the writer where more background information is needed.
 - A reviewer can provide insight on the audience’s knowledge level, concerns, values, and potential biases.
 - The reviewer can provide more precise words or specific terms to explain something.
 - A reviewer can help identify problems in formality or tone.

Inform students that this activity involves reading three papers in three rounds of peer review. For each round of feedback, students will focus on different standards that appear in the 11.3.3 Rubric and Checklist.

Display and explain the peer review process to students:

- During the first review, students read for the central claim, supporting claims, and counterclaims while also evaluating reasoning and evidence (W.11-12.1.a, W.11-12.1.b, and W.11-12.1.e).
- During the second review, students focus on transitions between sentences, paragraphs, and larger ideas and the paper's overall cohesiveness (W.11-12.1.c, W.11-12.1.d).
- During the third review, students focus on formatting and conventions, including MLA format, formal style and objective tone, and mechanical and grammatical conventions (L.11-12.1, L.11-12.2.a, b, and W.11-12.8).
- After the third and final review, writers revise their papers based on the peer feedback provided.
- Students examine the peer review process.

Activity 4: Peer Review Round Robin

50%

Instruct students to pass their research-based argument paper drafts to the student on the right. They also need sticky notes and/or colored pens or pencils to aid in their review.

- Students pass their drafts to the peer on the right and gather necessary materials.
- If students write directly on the papers, they may want to use different colored pens or colored pencils to distinguish different reviewers' feedback. Students can also use color-coded sticky notes.
- Students can peer review tracking their changes in a word processing program. Google Docs and other document sharing programs have their own protocols for tracking changes. Make sure your students know how to use these tools before they begin modifying their peers' drafts. Remind students to save their original documents with a different file name to safeguard against accidental deletions or corruption.
- If handwriting is a barrier to the peer editing process, allow students to read aloud their drafts to one another to provide clarity.

Distribute one Peer Review Accountability Tool to each student. Remind students that part of the assessed standard W.11-12.5 is to select the most significant change for revision concerning purpose and audience. Once the student reviewer completes a review, the

File: 11.3.3 Lesson 11 Date: 9/12/14 Classroom Use: Starting 9/2014

© 2014 Public Consulting Group. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License

reviewer should record the most significant revision to their peer's paper on the Peer Review Accountability Tool. Each reviewer uses one row of the tool per review.

- Students examine the Peer Review Accountability Tool.

Explain that during the first round of revision, peer reviewers focus on the strength of substandards W.11-12.1.a, W.11-12.1.b, and W.11-12.1.e. Instruct students to take out their copies of the 11.3.3 Rubric and Checklist and look at these substandards.

- Students look at substandards W.11-12.1.a, W.11-12.1.b, and W.11-12.1.e on their 11.3.3 Rubric and Checklist.

Instruct students to focus on these skills for their constructive criticism in this first round of review.

Model an example of identifying errors for substandards W.11-12.1.a, b, e, and adding constructive criticism, using the sample student paper as the example. Make the following points:

- Explain that if the central claim is not stated precisely in a peer's paper, it is a good idea to identify where in the introduction it would be most effectively stated.
- Explain to students that if, in a peer's paper, there is no counterclaim, a good suggestion would be to add a counterclaim. If possible, identify where the counterclaim would work best.
- If a claim is not strongly supported by evidence, suggest including more or diverse evidence as valuable constructive criticism.
- If the paper does not demonstrate consideration of audience knowledge level, concerns, values, and potential biases about the issue, suggest a change of tone or revision to the claims to make them more accessible to an academic audience.
- W.11-12.1.a was taught in 11.3.3 Lessons 1 and 4; W.11-12.1.b was taught in 11.3.3 Lesson 2 and reviewed in 11.3.3 Lesson 8; W.11-12.1.e was taught in 11.3.3 Lessons 6 and 9.

Ask students to name other suggestions, based on the W.11-12.1.a, b, e skills listed in the 11.3.3 Rubric and Checklist.

- Student responses may include:
 - Suggest a peer remove evidence that does not effectively support a claim.
 - Propose that a peer rearrange claims or pieces of evidence to better support the argument.
 - Suggest limitations that might be included in the development of a claim, if the writer has not included any limitations.

File: 11.3.3 Lesson 11 Date: 9/12/14 Classroom Use: Starting 9/2014

© 2014 Public Consulting Group. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License

- Suggest ways to address possible audience knowledge level, concerns, values, and potential biases.
- Suggest that the concluding statement tie more closely to the arguments presented.

Instruct students to complete the first round of review, adding constructive feedback regarding substandards W.11-12.1.a, b, e. Circulate and support students, as necessary.

- Students review peer papers, adding constructive criticism in the margin, on sticky notes, or electronically.
-

Display the Model Peer Review Accountability Tool for all students to see. Model where Reviewers 1, 2, and 3 enter their most significant revision for the writer.

- Students listen, following along with the modeling.

Point to the first column, labeled Original. Explain that in this section, students write the paragraph number and a few words from the sentence to indicate where in the paper the revision needs to be made.

Point to the second column, labeled Peer Suggestion. Explain that students make a suggestion for how to revise the paper in this section. Student reviewers should think about how they would revise the paper as if it were their own, and give constructive criticism accordingly. For example, if the writer did not include a counterclaim, it is not enough to just write, “Add a counterclaim.” Instead, students should provide some suggestions of possible counterclaims.

- Students listen.

Instruct peer reviewers to determine the most significant revision regarding the standards analyzed in this first round of review. Allow peer reviewers time to select the most significant revision from this first round of review, and add it to the first row of the Peer Review Accountability Tool. Students should complete both the Original and the Peer Suggestion columns of the first row of the tool.

- Peer reviewers select the most significant revision and add it to the first row of the Peer Review Accountability Tool by completing the Original and Peer Suggestion columns of the first row of the tool.
-

Instruct students to pass the research-based argument papers to the right again, so each student has a new draft to peer review for the second round of review.

- Students pass papers to the right.

Inform students that during this second round of review, peer reviewers focus on the strength of substandards W.11-12.1.c and W.11-12.1.d.

- Students examine substandards W.11-12.1.c and W.11-12.1.d on the 11.3.3 Rubric and Checklist.

Remind students to focus their constructive criticism of their peer's papers on these skills.

- Students listen.
- W.11-12.1.c was taught in 11.3.3 Lessons 6 and 9, W.11-12.1.d was taught in 11.3.3 Lessons 7 and 8.
- Remind students to refer to the Connecting Ideas Handout in Lesson 5 of this unit for more support if needed.

Ask students:

What are some examples of constructive criticism that would focus on the skills in substandards W.11-12.1.c and W.11-12.1.d?

- Student responses may include:
 - Suggest a different transition word than what is provided to clarify the relationship between two ideas.
 - Suggest a phrase be added to clarify the relationship between a claim and evidence.
 - Identify portions of the text where the tone is less formal and suggest revisions.
 - Suggest varied syntax to create cohesion and link ideas together in the paper.

Instruct students to review their peers' papers, adding constructive feedback based on substandards W.11-12.1.c and W.11-12.1.d. Allow students time to select the most significant revision and add it to the Peer Review Accountability Tool.

- Students review their peers' papers and add constructive feedback for substandards W.11-12.1.c and W.11-12.1.d, select the most significant revision, and add it to the second row of the Peer Review Accountability Tool.

Circulate and support students as necessary.

Instruct students to pass the papers to the right again, so each peer reviewer has a new draft to read for the third round of review.

- Students pass papers to the right.

File: 11.3.3 Lesson 11 Date: 9/12/14 Classroom Use: Starting 9/2014

© 2014 Public Consulting Group. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License

Explain to students that during this third round of review, peer reviewers focus on the skills in substandards L.11-12.2.a, b, L.11-12.1, L.11-12.3.a, and standard W.11-12.8.

- Students examine substandards L.11-12.2.a, b, L.11-12.1, L.11-12.3.a, and standard W.11-12.8 and on their 11.3.3 Rubric and Checklist.

Remind students to focus on these skills as they add constructive criticism to their peers' drafts.

- Students listen.
- Consider displaying the student model paper to show criticism focused on these skills.
- L.11-12.1 was taught in 11.3.3 Lesson 5 and L.11-12.3.a was taught in 11.3.3 Lesson 9; L.11-12.2.a, b were taught in 11.3.3 Lesson 10; W.11-12.8 was taught in 11.3.3 Lesson 3.

Ask students:

What types of *constructive criticism* would focus on the skills in substandards L.11-12.2.a-b, L.11-12.1, L.11-12.3.a, and standard W.11-12.8?

- Student responses may include:
 - Identify grammatical errors and suggest a revision.
 - Identify misspelled words and provide the correct spellings.
 - Suggest the use of specific or precise terms relevant to the topic rather than general terms.
 - Identify misuse of hyphens and suggest a correction.
 - Identify an overreliance on one source in the claims and evidence and suggest a broader scope of evidence.
 - Identify varied syntax for effect and make suggestions about the effectiveness of this choice, consulting references as needed.
 - Identify places where MLA format is improperly applied and suggest corrections.

Instruct students to review their peers' papers, adding constructive feedback based on the focus standard L.11-12.1, and substandards L.11-12.2.a, b, L.11-12.3.a and W.11-12.8. Allow students time to select the most significant revision and add it to the Peer Review Accountability Tool in the third row.

- Students review their peers' papers, adding constructive feedback, and select the most significant revision and add it to the third row of the Peer Review Accountability Tool.

Circulate and support students as necessary.

- Consider having students share out about the peer review process, identifying ways in which the process strengthens their writing and reading skills, and naming challenges inherent in the process.

Activity 5: Lesson Assessment

20%

Instruct students to collect the draft paper and the Peer Review Accountability Tool from their peers.

- Students retrieve their draft papers and the Peer Review Accountability Tools that contain significant revisions from their peers.

Explain to students that when they receive the feedback from their peers, they do not have to accept all the suggestions, but they should consider each suggestion carefully before revising their papers.

Remind students that they have three revisions that their peers have identified as the most significant on the Peer Review Accountability Tool. Explain that in this section, students decide whether to implement the feedback or not and explain why.

- Students examine the Peer Review Accountability Tools.

Instruct students to read through all the constructive criticism carefully, and complete one row of the Peer Review Accountability Tool (Final Decision and Explanation) for a revision they plan to implement. Instruct students to make that revision in the paper. Remind students that their responses will be assessed.

- Students complete one row of the Peer Review Accountability Tool individually, and implement the selected feedback into their papers.
- Consider modeling a completed Final Decision and Explanation section of the Peer Review Accountability Tool if students need support.

Consider circulating and checking students' revision work to hold them accountable for this lesson assessment.

Collect Peer Review Accountability Tools and research paper drafts from each student for assessment.

- See the High Performance Response at the beginning of this lesson.

Activity 6: Closing

5%

File: 11.3.3 Lesson 11 Date: 9/12/14 Classroom Use: Starting 9/2014

© 2014 Public Consulting Group. This work is licensed under a

Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License

Display and distribute the homework assignment. For homework, instruct students to continue to implement revisions based on peer feedback. Additionally, instruct students to read their drafts aloud (to themselves or someone else) to identify problems in syntax, grammar, or logic in order to prepare for the following lesson's End-of-Unit Assessment.

- Students follow along.

Homework

Continue to implement revisions based on peer feedback. Additionally, read your drafts aloud (to yourself or someone else) to identify problems in syntax, grammar, or logic in order to prepare for the following lesson's End-of-Unit Assessment.

File: 11.3.3 Lesson 11 Date: 9/12/14 Classroom Use: Starting 9/2014

© 2014 Public Consulting Group. This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License

Peer Review Accountability Tool

Name:		Class:		Date:	
--------------	--	---------------	--	--------------	--

Directions: Use this tool to record suggestions for revisions from your peers review. Provide the original text, peer suggestion, and explanation of your decision about the final revision.

Original	Peer Suggestion	Final Decision and Explanation

File: 11.3.3 Lesson 11 Date: 9/12/14 Classroom Use: Starting 9/2014

© 2014 Public Consulting Group. This work is licensed under a

Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License

--	--	--

File: 11.3.3 Lesson 11 **Date:** 9/12/14 **Classroom Use:** Starting 9/2014

© 2014 Public Consulting Group. This work is licensed under a

Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License



Model Peer Review Accountability Tool

Name:		Class:		Date :	
--------------	--	---------------	--	------------------	--

Directions: Use this tool to record suggestions for revisions from your peers review. Provide the original text, peer suggestion, and explanation of your decision about the final revision.

Original	Peer Suggestion	Final Decision and Explanation
Paragraph 2 “The term genocide was approved by the United Nations the 9th of December 1948 in the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.” (Schabas)	The origin of the definition of genocide should be stated here in case the audience does not know where the definition came from.	I went back to the Schabas text and found out who first defined the term genocide and added it to the paper to make sure the audience knows where the term came from.
Paragraph 5 “In order to address these concerns, a principle, the Responsibility to Protect, has been created to determine when it is necessary for the international community to get involved in possible genocide cases.”	In order to meet audience knowledge level concerns I think you should include more information about the Responsibility to Protect here. When was it developed? Who developed it?	I went back to the my sources and looked for more evidence about who developed the Responsibility to Protect and when it was first introduced in order to accurately inform my audience.

File: 11.3.3 Lesson 11 Date: 9/12/14 Classroom Use: Starting 9/2014

© 2014 Public Consulting Group. This work is licensed under a

Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License

Paragraph 6 “Following R2P would also help avoid potential U.N. Security Council deadlocks.”	Above it says that R2P is just a framework; I think you need to provide more clarity about what else is needed.	I revised this section to include “enforcing it with an international military force” to provide more clarity about what else is needed in addition to R2P.
--	---	---

File: 11.3.3 Lesson 11 Date: 9/12/14 Classroom Use: Starting 9/2014

© 2014 Public Consulting Group. This work is licensed under a

Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 Unported License

Model Sample Paper with Revisions

Throughout history, genocide has raged on every continent, ravaging peoples by the thousands, hundreds of thousands, millions. While the international response to preventing genocide has grown stronger over the years, there is still much work to be done to stop genocide before it starts. The United Nations has played a major role both in introducing the concept of genocide to the world, and in helping to set up criminal tribunals to punish those who commit acts of genocide. However, the role of the U.N. is a complex one, and the international governing body has at times shown itself incapable of intervening and responding to mass acts of killing. Recent history has showed that what is most needed is a task force independent of the U.N. charged with preventing genocide—one equipped with the means to effectively intervene before mass catastrophes develop. The international community needs to be unified in the fight against genocide and needs to ensure that they have the power and resources to prevent future genocides.

The term *genocide* was approved by the United Nations on the 9th of December 1948 in the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (Schabas). Article II of the Convention defines genocide as the following:

... Genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

- (a) Killing members of the group;
- (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
- (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
- (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
- (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

Despite this broad definition many critics consider it inadequate. In order to effectively prevent genocide, the scope of the definition needs to be comprehensive and adopted by all countries. Schabas notes, “The definition of genocide set out in article II is a much-reduced

version” of the original. For example, the terms “ethnic cleansing” and “cultural genocide” were both excluded from the final wording of the Convention. Some believe the exclusion of the latter term, which includes political and social groups, was made in an effort to satisfy Joseph Stalin, then the leader of the Soviet Union. As Rothstein explains, the authors of the Convention “did not want to upset Stalin who, despite brutally exterminating political groups in the Soviet Union, was vital to the Allied war effort against Hitler.” The Soviets continue to oppose a permanent U.N. tribunal (Rothstein). Even though it was a chief architect of the Convention, The United States Senate failed to ratify the Convention for the next 40 years. Historians attribute this delay to several different reasons, among them threats to U.S. sovereignty, fear of accusations of genocide from civil rights lawmakers (specifically in relation to lynching and Ku Klux Klan activity), and retroactive accusations of Native American genocide. Even though the Convention makes clear that prosecution of genocide cannot be retroactively enforced, American lawmakers continued to fear adoption for decades after its drafting (unhumanrights.org).

The role of the international tribunals has been just as problematic as the Convention. International tribunals are a type of international court of law created through treaties between nations; the primary responsibility of the international tribunals is to prosecute perpetrators of genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity. In recent years, tribunals have played an increasingly important role in prosecuting genocide. However, prosecution is not enough. Not only does the international community need to come to a broad consensus of what it means to commit genocide, it also needs to reinforce the power of institutions like the U.N.-founded International Criminal Court (ICC) and other international tribunals. To be fully unified in the fight against genocide means giving these tribunals the resources to administer justice appropriately independent of the U.N. and the international community.

International tribunals must be empowered to respond to and prevent genocide in its early stages, as well as to punish groups and leaders who commit genocide. The ICC and the World Court are two important international tribunals dedicated to pursuing global justice. The ICC, the most well known, has had some success prosecuting leaders of genocide. In addition to sentencing Jean Kambanda to life in prison “for genocide and related crimes committed while he was prime minister of Rwanda in 1994,” the ICC also prosecuted over 70 cases of genocide-related crimes in addition to the tens of thousands prosecuted by the Rwandan government (Edwards; “After Rwanda’s Genocide”). However, the ICC is in desperate need of additional support. Because its job is to legally prosecute genocide, the ICC is not capable of preventing genocide—the very thing the world needs it to do most. Some critics of the ICC believe the idea of stopping genocide by putting perpetrators on trial is problematic. As Lindberg explains, “If ... there is a legal finding of genocide, then it is too late for prevention. ... If ‘genocide’ is the trigger for action, then the bar is rather high.” To say that a different way is that once crimes reach the ICC, irreversible damage and killing has already been done. Stanton explains that in the Darfur region of Sudan, President Omar al-Bashir’s reaction to being referred to the ICC for crimes against humanity and genocide has been to “just laugh[]” (Stanton, “Why Do We Look the Other Way?”). Slobodan Milosevic, the former president of Serbia, who was also charged with crimes against humanity and genocide, died before his four-year ICC trial was completed because of drawn-out delays (Edwards). These examples illustrate the futility of prosecuting genocidal leaders—how can bringing several men to justice make up for the thousands of murders and atrocities they already committed? While prosecuting genocidal leaders is important, it is not nearly as important as saving tens if not hundreds of thousands of lives by preventing genocide from occurring in the first place.

In addition to legal action, direct military intervention is necessary in situations that pose a threat of or early stage execution of genocide. In order to quickly stop genocide in the critical stages of “persecution and extermination” it is necessary to use military force (Stanton, “The Ten Stages of Genocide”). If citizens are being segregated, starved, or forced to live in ghettos, then it is only a matter of time before the killing begins (Stanton, “The Ten Stages”). Murderers who commit genocide are not ragtag bunches of individuals but organized groups who carry out planned violence against those they oppress. In Rwanda, the Hutus who were in power were able to hunt down and murder over 800,000 men, women, and children over the course of just 100 days (“After Rwanda’s Genocide”). U.N. Peacekeepers stood by unable to help because countries would not approve a force robust enough to engage in combat: “Belgian peacekeepers ... watched as the carnage unfolded” (Zakaria). However, if the U.N. had an active military force on the ground, those lives could have been saved, as was the case in Kosovo: “In 1998, the NATO alliance—led, of course, by the United States—went to war against Serbia to stop ethnic cleansing and atrocities in Kosovo, preventing a potential genocide in close proximity to NATO territory” (Lindberg). Given the regularity of recent genocides, it is clear that the international community “need(s) to set up international contingency plans to deal with mass atrocities” (“After Rwanda’s Genocide”). This means giving an international body like the U.N. more resources to fight genocide. Access to weapons and troops will require the participation of major global players like the United States: “If we [the USA] are serious, we have to be willing to take upon ourselves the burden of providing the leadership, the arms, the troops, and the resources” (Lindberg). However, there are still some who believe that if the U.N. has troops, they may be used improperly and ignore a country’s right to govern their own affairs. In order to address these concerns, a principle, the Responsibility to Protect, has been created to determine when it is necessary

for the international community to get involved in possible genocide cases. The purpose of this framework is to clarify the international community's responsibility to intervene in possible cases of genocide.

The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) is a principle that helps to make clear when to intervene in the affairs of sovereign nations. The U.N. and the international community must make sure this principle is embraced and supported. R2P is a way for the international community to identify negligence, outright aggression, or failure of government to protect one's population. R2P defines the circumstances that give the international community cause to assume responsibility for the safety of a population:

- A. Large-scale loss of life, actual or apprehended, with genocidal intent or not, which is the product either of deliberate state action, or state neglect or inability to act, or a failed state situation; or
- B. Large-scale "ethnic cleansing," actual or apprehended, whether carried out by killing, forced expulsion, acts of terror or rape. (Edwards)

R2P provides a framework, but in order for the framework to successfully prevent genocide, an international force is necessary. R2P should outweigh individual countries' interests; the document is founded on the belief that the international community is responsible for the well-being and safety of mankind: "the principle of noninterference gives way in circumstances of mass atrocities" (Lindberg). Following R2P would also help avoid potential U.N. Security Council deadlocks. During "persecution," the eighth stage of genocide, Dr. Gregory Stanton says, "If the political will of the great powers, regional alliances, or the U.N. Security Council can be mobilized, armed international intervention should be prepared" ("The Ten Stages"). Adhering to R2P and enforcing it with an international military force would also help avoid potential U.N. Security Council deadlocks. If R2P were the guiding mandate of the U.N., response to potential genocide would be automatic and not subject to

potential vetoes (Stanton, “The Ten Stages”). In the case of Kosovo, where ethnic cleansing had begun, Russia decided to veto involvement (due to political reasons) but NATO still went ahead with the operation because they recognized the threat of genocide to hundreds of thousands of Kosovars (Lindberg). The U.N. needs a force like NATO along with guiding humanitarian goals, like R2P, in order to prevent genocide.

In ignorant opposition, some critics believe boosting the power and resources of the international community—including bolstering R2P—would endanger the sovereignty of the United States and its allies. The argument is that if the international community enforced and expected resources to prevent genocide, the United States would be subject to their desires about when and where to use military intervention (Lindberg). In other words, the U.S. might be compelled to engage in international conflicts in which it does not want to get involved, which infringes on our right to act as a sovereign nation. However, this hypothetical should not outweigh our (and the world’s) responsibility to ensure the global safety of mankind. Unfortunately, politics often gets in the way of moral responsibility: “halting or failing to halt a genocide has come down to whether the political will exists within the United States to act” (Lindberg). As a global leader, it is the responsibility of the U.S. to set the example for early genocide intervention and prevention, whether or not genocide is occurring in countries where we do not have economic or political interest.

Critics also believe that R2P would create conflict for our allies or be used negatively by our enemies. Libya and Iran have brought charges of genocide against Israel’s actions in the Gaza Strip (Rothstein) and an international mandate of R2P could, “simply be used against Israel” (Lindberg), forcing the U.S. to act against a strategic partner. Because the U.S. and Israel are such close allies, this presents a potentially challenging situation for both countries. Adopting R2P might force the U.S. to act against an ally like Israel because of potential Israeli

human rights violations like the annexation of Palestinian land. However, these concerns are not sufficient to abandon R2P. The U.S. and its allies should be held to the same standards as the rest of the international community. Increasing international scrutiny on countries like the U.S. and Israel may even be a good thing; it may help enforce a more rigorous standard for all countries of the world to follow.

What the global community needs is an international body that has the resources and strength necessary to effectively intervene in countries that are at risk, before power is abused or lives are lost (Stanton, “Why Do We”). It is also important that all nations are subject to review by an international organization to ensure atrocities large and small are avoided wherever possible and prosecuted when necessary.

The U.N. definition of genocide born out of the atrocities of the Holocaust was designed both to prevent future genocide and to hold accountable those nations and groups that commit genocide (Schabas). While prosecution has improved in recent years, prevention has not. It is of vital importance that the international community provides resources and support to the U.N., the ICC, and other international coalitions focused on preventing genocide. Certainly the task of providing an international body with these resources is not without its challenges, but it is essential that the global community makes genocide prevention an urgent priority. The international community must take immediate action by empowering the U.N. and intervening in places such as Syria and the Sudan to prevent mass atrocities (“After Rwanda’s Genocide”). The opportunity for peace and safety must extend to all peoples of the world and the U.N. is the institution that can write the final chapter in the history of genocide.