Nation Building and Identity Politics: Belonging, Rights, and Justice through a Decolonial Lens
MA Human Rights Theory
Session 13, 16 November 2026

The teaching purpose

Students should distinguish nation, state, citizenship, and belonging; use Chatterjee, Said, and Lugones to question who defines a national community; connect inclusion and real freedoms with implementation; and propose safeguards that protect people within collective arrangements.

Story and evidence

The doorway story is entirely fictional. It offers no evidence about a real Bangsamoro household, dispute, or institution. Every fictional reveal is marked in the slides. The historical case discussion uses the 2014 Bangsamoro agreement. Teaching applications of the thinkers are distinguished from their own arguments. The trust discussion draws on my published 2017 CPCS learning paper about joint clearance work in the Bangsamoro.

The three hour running order

Minutes	Focus	Slides
0–15	Opening dilemma and first judgment	2–4
15–35	Concepts and Chatterjee	5–7
35–55	Second family, Said, and the three Johns	8–10
55–75	Hearing and Lugones	11–13
75–95	Bangsamoro, Rappler clip, and trust	14–16
95–105	Break	17
105–125	Everyday safety and justice	18–20
125–160	Workshop and reports	21–25
160–180	Scrutiny and final judgment	26–29

Why the story structure works

The cold opening creates a question students can answer provisionally. Later information unsettles assumptions before a theory helps them interpret the change. Short activities let them use a concept immediately. The delayed hearing creates an unresolved question before the break. The final workshop asks students to write a defensible next episode. Suspense serves inquiry: avoid sensational delivery or turning suffering into entertainment.

Five planned reveals

A returning family finds another family in its former home.
The family inside also experienced displacement.
The hearing invitation excludes a woman with relevant records.
The committee misses its promised deadline without explanation.
Residents report a suspected explosive hazard on an important route.

Slide 1 Nation building and identity politics
Timing Before class

Read aloud

Welcome. We will work through a story today, and we will keep returning to it as our understanding changes. The story is fictional. The questions it raises connect with real struggles over belonging, rights, and peace implementation. My perspective comes from Mindanao and from peacebuilding and humanitarian disarmament. I bring that experience as one perspective that we can examine together. You bring other histories and ways of seeing. By the end, I would like each of us to explain a judgment about nation building, support it with a concept, and show what it would require an institution to do.

Do in class

Display while students arrive. Begin the timed session on slide 2. Introduce yourself after the first vote if you prefer a cold opening. The complete session runs for 180 minutes, including a ten-minute break.

Slide 2 Someone else opens the door
Timing 0–4 minutes

Read aloud
Let me begin at a doorway. A family has spent years away from its village because of conflict. A peace agreement has now been signed. On the road home they see something they have long wanted: a public sign in their own language. They reach the house they remember. A family member takes out an old key. Before anyone can use it, someone opens the door from inside. Another family lives there. Pause at that doorway with me. We have a promise of peace, a public sign of recognition, and two families facing each other. What should happen next? We have very little information. That is deliberate. Notice how quickly we begin filling in the missing parts.

Do in class

Read slowly, then pause for five seconds. State aloud that this is an invented teaching case. Avoid invented accents, photographs of victims, or dramatic sound effects. Keep both families unnamed so students examine their assumptions.

Hold the reveal Pause at the doorway. If a student asks who the other family is, say: “We’ll find out. For now, notice the story you began to tell yourself.”

Slide 3 Has justice arrived?
Timing 4–10 minutes

Read aloud

Choose an answer privately before listening to your neighbor. Then write one sentence explaining why. Your answer is provisional. A person choosing yes might see the agreement and language recognition as meaningful changes. Someone choosing partly might see progress alongside unfinished claims. Someone choosing too soon might need evidence of safety or a fair hearing. We will keep these answers and return to them near the end. Our purpose is to see whether our reasoning becomes clearer. What information did your answer assume? Did you imagine who the people inside the house were? Did you assume that one family had a stronger claim?

Do in class

One minute silent vote and writing. Two minutes in pairs. Hear two reasons and one missing fact over three minutes. Record A/B/C totals on the board without grading the choices. Students retain their written reasons.

If students say… “The sign shows recognition”; “They still can’t go home”; “We need more facts.” Ask: “What did the sign change? What did it leave unresolved?” Record the reasoning before showing the next reveal.

Slide 4 One story, several questions
Timing 10–15 minutes

Read aloud

Nation building shapes shared institutions and a sense of political belonging. Identity politics organizes claims around shared identities. Either can challenge exclusion or create new boundaries. Here is our working agreement for the session. We will examine claims and institutions. Nobody needs to speak for an entire people, religion, or gender. You may use a public example rather than disclose personal experience. We will distinguish what the story tells us from what we infer. Our goals are to separate nation from state and citizenship from lived belonging, to use theory to identify exclusion, and to propose safeguards that people could actually use. Earlier sessions have already considered culture, feminism, democracy, and justice. Today brings those questions together through a peace settlement. Keep one question open: who gets to define what a just ending would be?

Do in class
Spend two minutes stating goals and discussion norms. Invite one clarification. Preview the break at minute 95 and the group workshop after it. Do not reveal later story details.

Slide 5 Four ideas that often get mixed together
Timing 15–22 minutes

Read aloud

These are working distinctions. A nation involves a claim to shared political community. A state consists of institutions that govern a territory and population. Citizenship concerns formal membership in a state. Belonging concerns attachment and acceptance in everyday life. These can overlap, but they can also pull apart. A person may hold citizenship and still experience exclusion. A state may contain several national communities. A person can belong to several communities at once. In our story, a language on a public sign may change how the family experiences recognition. It tells us much less about their access to a home or their influence over institutions. What would you need to know before describing them as equal members?

Do in class
Explain for four minutes. Ask students for a public example of citizenship without equal inclusion. Use the remaining time to correct a conceptual confusion. Treat these definitions as starting points rather than universal definitions.

Slide 6 A quick check before we continue
Timing 22–27 minutes

Read aloud

Take these questions with a partner. Give a reason for each answer. A state can contain more than one national community. Citizenship can coexist with exclusion. Autonomy can provide self-government within an existing state, so its meaning differs from independence. Self-determination concerns a people’s ability to shape its political future, and different arrangements can give it institutional expression. We also need a distinction between human rights and citizenship. Human rights protect people even when formal membership is uncertain or denied. When we later discuss collective rights, keep asking how the arrangement protects the people within a community, including those who disagree with its leaders.

Do in class
Pairs have two minutes. Debrief for three minutes. If several students conflate nation and state, revisit slide 5 before advancing. Do not ask for examples of disputed statehood unless you can keep the discussion within the timebox.

Slide 7 Chatterjee asks who can imagine the nation
Timing 27–35 minutes

Read aloud

Chatterjee asks whose imagination shapes the nation. He questions an account in which European and American nationalisms supply models that later peoples simply copy. In the colonial setting he examines, nationalist thought distinguishes an outer or material domain from an inner or spiritual domain. The outer domain includes institutions and techniques through which colonial power demonstrates strength. The inner domain becomes a claimed space of cultural sovereignty, even before political independence. This is an argument about how anticolonial nationalism works, rather than a dictionary definition of every nationalism. Culture here changes. It is a field of invention and struggle. His further question concerns the fragments: who can challenge the elite account of the national community? A claim to collective freedom leaves open the distribution of authority inside that collective.

Do in class

Explain for five minutes. Ask pairs which parts of the opening story concern cultural recognition and which concern institutional power. Debrief for three minutes. Inner and outer are historical analytical categories, not a universal binary or fixed traditional/modern split.

Slide 8 The family inside also fled violence
Timing 35–40 minutes

Read aloud

We can now open the door a little further. The family living inside also fled violence. They found the house empty years earlier and have stayed because they have nowhere secure to return. These are facts of our fictional case. We still lack the evidence needed to decide ownership or remedies. Does this change your judgment? A peaceful future must consider several claims without collapsing their different histories. What does each family need immediately? What requires investigation? What would make the hearing fair? The national story can recognize a people’s suffering while individual households still face unresolved questions. We are beginning to see why the promise of belonging needs institutions capable of hearing competing accounts.

Do in class

Give one minute silent reflection and two minutes in pairs. Hear one change of mind and one remaining question. Keep ownership unresolved. Discuss protection and fair process rather than who deserves forced removal.

If students say… “Return the house”; “That would displace the other family again”; “Hear both claims.” Ask: “What protection is needed today? What evidence would we need before deciding ownership?” If they call the claims equal, ask: “Equal in dignity, urgency, or legal entitlement?”

Slide 9 Said asks who gets to describe people
Timing 40–48 minutes

Read aloud

Said examines how influential European traditions represented the Orient as a contrasting and inferior other, and how those representations connected with imperial authority. The power to describe people could support the power to govern them. For our purposes, this opens a question about authoritative knowledge. Who defines the problem before a policy discussion begins? Which histories count as evidence? We should evaluate particular representations in context. An outsider's account can be careful and useful, while an insider can also simplify a community. Said is a foundational postcolonial thinker. His work can inform a decolonial discussion, although those traditions have distinct histories. In the doorway story, a single label could quietly decide which family we imagine as deserving a hearing.

Do in class
Five minutes explanation. Ask students to suggest a label that would bias how a public institution sees either family. Discuss for three minutes. Present the application to the fictional hearing as our teaching use of Said rather than his own case study.

Optional headline exercise Offer two headlines: "Families return to reclaim homes" and "Residents face removal after land dispute." If students say "The first headline makes them sound like intruders"; "The second makes the returnees disappear." Ask: "Rewrite it so both claims are visible. What would you still need to verify?"

Slide 10 The three Johns and the idea of neutrality
Timing 48–55 minutes

Read aloud
When people hear "identity politics," a common worry is that it puts people in boxes. If we assume everyone in a group thinks the same way, we miss disagreements inside the group and interests people share across groups. But if we ignore group identity entirely, we may miss a pattern of exclusion. Treating everyone the same can leave that pattern in place.

Ellie Anderson makes this point with a joke about three Johns: John Locke, John Stuart Mill, and John Rawls. They offer different accounts of rights, liberty, and fairness. Anderson jokes that setting identity aside comes more easily if your experience is already treated as the default, or if your first name is John. The point of the joke is to ask whose experience gets to count as neutral.

Iris Marion Young offers a practical way to ask that question. Look for the rule that puts a group at a disadvantage, while leaving room for people within that group to have different experiences. Imagine our committee sends one invitation to every household. The rule sounds equal. Who do you think the committee expects to show up? What would you need to know before calling that rule fair?

Do in class
Use 3 minutes to explain the points above and pose the hearing question. Give pairs 2 minutes to compare assumptions, then take 2 minutes to hear two responses. If students say 'every household gets the same chance,' ask who receives the invitation and who can speak for a household. If they spot a possible exclusion, ask what detail would confirm it. Hold the actual invitation rule for Slide 11.

Slide 11 A hearing with an empty chair
Timing 55–60 minutes

Read aloud

The local committee offers a hearing. Its invitation goes to male household heads. A woman who has kept records of both families' histories finds that her name is absent. Again, this is a fictional rule in our case. It makes no claim about a real Bangsamoro institution or an entire culture. What has the committee assumed about a household, property, and who can speak? Adding a chair might help. But consider whether the underlying rules would still treat her account as secondary. We have moved from the question of which community belongs to the question of how authority works within communities. Chatterjee's discussion of national culture and gender prepares us to see this tension. Lugones takes us into its colonial formation.

Do in class

Reveal that the invitation went to male household heads. Ask what looked equal about the rule and whose knowledge it excluded. Hear two responses, then ask what would give the woman meaningful influence over the decision.

If students say… "Every household got one seat"; "Give her a seat." Ask: "Who can use that invitation? If she can attend, can she submit her records, correct the minutes, or challenge the result?"

Slide 12 Lugones asks how power makes gender
Timing 60–68 minutes

Read aloud

Lugones asks us to examine the colonial formation of gender together with racial classification and sexuality. Gender is integral to how domination organizes people and their worlds. Her argument goes beyond counting disadvantages as separate items. It asks how these relations constitute one another. Applied carefully to our case, the question becomes: how did the institution come to recognize certain people as legitimate speakers, property holders, or leaders? Her work emerges from particular colonial histories. We should investigate local histories before transferring its categories to Mindanao. We should also avoid assuming that every precolonial arrangement was egalitarian. For this hearing, meaningful participation would require attention to the rule for evidence, the power to set the agenda, and the freedom to challenge the committee itself.

Do in class

Explain for five minutes. Ask for two examples of influence beyond attendance. Use the final three minutes to distinguish a gender quota from changing who can define the issue. The hearing is a pedagogical application, not Lugones's own empirical example.

If students generalize… "This committee rule is fictional. What history or evidence would we need before attributing a real rule to colonial power? Whose account should we hear?"

Slide 13 What would meaningful voice require?
Timing 68–75 minutes

Read aloud

Work in pairs to redesign one rule for the hearing. Make it concrete enough that a person could use it. For example, who may bring a claim, what forms of evidence may they present, and how may they challenge a decision? Consider whether the rule works for someone with limited literacy, someone who speaks a different language, or someone whose account contradicts a local leader. These positions can overlap. A woman, a displaced person, and a member of a minority community may be the same person. Kabeer helps us connect formal membership with the experience of inclusion. What would show that this hearing gives people influence rather than simply collecting their presence?

Do in class

Three minutes in pairs. Three minutes sharing. One minute synthesis. Ask each proposal to name the barrier it addresses. Keep a few proposals on the board for the later workshop.

If students say… “Consult everyone.” Ask: “Who gets notice, who can put an issue on the agenda, and how will people see whether their input affected the outcome?”

Slide 14 Bangsamoro gives us a real setting
Timing 75–82 minutes

Read aloud

We’ve been working with a fictional story. Let’s turn to a real peace process. The Philippine government and the Moro Islamic Liberation Front signed the Comprehensive Agreement on the Bangsamoro in 2014. Rappler made this animation in 2015, during the debate over how to carry out the agreement. As you watch, ask: What problem would remain even if the fighting stopped?

Do in class

75–76: Introduce the historical context and give students the viewing question. 76–80: Play Rappler’s four-minute animation from the beginning. 80–82: Take two responses and use the transition question to open Slide 15.

Transition to Slide 15: “What would people need to see after an agreement is signed before they could trust that it will change their lives?”

If playback fails, ask students to name one problem a ceasefire could address and one that would still need a political or institutional response. Take two answers and use the same transition.

Watch War Came to Mindanao (Rappler, 2015)

Slide 15 How trust grows during implementation
Timing 82–90 minutes

Read aloud

The film asks what remains after the fighting stops. One answer is explosive remnants of war. My action research examined joint work by the Philippine government and the Moro Islamic Liberation Front to address that danger. I interviewed key actors and surveyed households in two affected Maguindanao communities. In this case, transparency and open communication helped establish trust. Seeing commitments carried out gave people reasons to keep cooperating despite uncertainty. That is what I call a leap of faith: acting on grounds for trust even when the outcome is still uncertain. My recommendation was to build clear responsibilities and channels for sharing information into implementation, so cooperation can survive changes in leadership.

Do in class

Spend five minutes on the case and findings, then three minutes on the fictional hearing. Ask: What one action would give either family a reason to trust the committee? Take two responses before revealing the missed deadline on Slide 16. The hearing is a teaching application; the research is a case study.

Listen for A published date, a named responsible body, or a way to raise a complaint. Ask which action residents can verify. Then reveal the missed deadline.

Slide 16 The committee misses its deadline
Timing 90–95 minutes

Read aloud

The committee promised a hearing by Friday. Friday passes. Neither family receives an explanation. Before the break, write the first response you would require from the institution. Does it need to explain the delay, identify who is responsible, provide a new date, offer interim protection, or open a complaint route? Several responses may be necessary. The precise choice depends on the situation. We should resist treating every delay as proof of bad faith. We should also ask what makes a revised promise credible. Keep your proposal. After the break, one further piece of information will test whether a fair hearing alone gives the families a usable future.

Do in class

Two minutes individual writing. Hear two responses. End with the unresolved question and keep the promised break. Do not preview the hazard yet.

If students say… “They lied”; “Maybe the delay was unavoidable”; “Give a new date.” Ask: “What do we know? What would make a revised promise credible, and what happens if it slips again?”

Slide 17 Break
Timing 95–105 minutes

Read aloud

We will resume in ten minutes. Keep your notes from the first vote and the missed deadline. We will use both when you propose an ending.

Do in class

Set a visible ten-minute timer. Keep the next reveal hidden. Re-form groups of four to six as students return. Online, announce the exact resumption time.

Slide 18 A right to return, an unsafe route
Timing 105–110 minutes

Read aloud

Here is the final reveal. Residents report suspected explosive remnants of war on the route to fields and services. We keep this as a fictional report, rather than an established contamination finding. Specialist assessment is required. The question for our discussion is how an institution responds to the report, protects people, and includes them in setting priorities. Nobody should enter or inspect a suspected hazardous area as part of this exercise. Even if the hearing resolves a claim fairly, safe access remains an institutional responsibility. What would each family actually be able to do with its rights? The doorway has led us from recognition to evidence, from voice to implementation, and now to the conditions of everyday freedom.

Do in class

State the reveal calmly. Clarify that this is an institutional planning question, not a technical clearance exercise. Ask for one immediate protection measure and one longer-term accountability measure.

If students say… “A fair ruling won’t make the route safe”; “People still need access to services.” Ask: “While qualified specialists assess the report, what can officials do to protect people and maintain access to services?”

Slide 19 Sen asks what people can actually do
Timing 110–117 minutes

Read aloud

Sen's capability approach asks about people's real opportunities to live lives they have reason to value. You have already encountered it in this course. Here we use it to test the settlement. A recognized right to return matters. So do the conditions that make return a genuine option: safety, services, and a viable livelihood. We should distinguish a real opportunity from an outcome someone must choose. A person may decide against returning even when return becomes safe and feasible. We also need to ask whose priorities shape the response. A public institution might count completed activities, while residents ask whether they can reach a field or clinic safely. Both kinds of evidence deserve scrutiny. What would you measure in this case?

Do in class

Four minutes linking with Session 11, then three minutes for students to suggest measures. If you add an authentic practice example, replace two minutes here rather than extend the block. Use accurate firsthand detail and no invented survivor dialogue.

Optional short clip If helpful, use the bicycle example (3:03–3:25) in place of part of the four-minute explanation. Ask what turns the same resource into a real opportunity. Rawls vs Sen at 3:03

Slide 20 Four tests for a proposed settlement
Timing 117–125 minutes

Read aloud

These four tests are our teaching synthesis. They help us organize the questions raised so far. Chatterjee asks whose national imagination becomes authoritative. Said draws attention to representations connected with power. Lugones prompts inquiry into the colonial formation of gender and authority. Kabeer connects citizenship with inclusion. Sen directs us to real opportunities.

The tests do different work, and the thinkers should retain their differences. We also carry the trust question across every test: what conduct, evidence, and remedy would make an institution credible? Consider a proposal that improves one dimension and leaves another weak. A language sign can matter deeply while land access remains unresolved. Our task is to see those relationships clearly and propose a defensible response.

Do in class

Explain the synthesis for three minutes. Give pairs two minutes to identify the weakest test in the current story. Discuss for three minutes. Do not attribute the four-test wording to one author or present it as a universal formula.

Slide 21 You will write the next episode
Timing 125–130 minutes

Read aloud

You now become an advisory group. You will consider every perspective in the case, rather than act out an ethnic identity or a traumatic experience. You have enough information to propose a process. You lack enough information to determine ownership. Your task is to recommend what the fictional public body should do immediately and how it should reach and review later decisions. We will assess your proposal through its reasoning, its attention to exclusion, and whether people could use its safeguards. You may disagree inside the group. Record the disagreement if it identifies a real tradeoff. One person should be ready to report a concrete action and the reason for it.

Do in class
Form groups of four to six. Assign process roles such as recorder, timekeeper, questioner, and reporter. Provide the case and worksheet in the script annex or display slides 22–24. Online use breakout rooms and a shared copy of the worksheet.

Slide 22 The case you have to work with
Timing 130–134 minutes

Read aloud
These are the established facts of our exercise. Both families experienced displacement. One has returned, and the other currently lives in the house. The committee’s invitation excludes a woman who holds relevant records. It has missed a promised hearing date without explanation. Residents have reported a possible explosive hazard on an important route. You may also identify people affected by the process who have received less attention, such as neighboring residents. Separate those possible stakeholders from facts already given. Local ethnic identities, ownership, and current legal entitlements remain unspecified. Your recommendations should protect immediate safety and fair process while competent bodies investigate. Explain what you would need to learn before deciding anything further.

Do in class

Read the brief once. Give groups one minute to clarify facts. Answer questions with “unspecified” where appropriate. Avoid adding facts ad hoc that change the case for only one group.

Slide 23 Your proposal needs usable safeguards
Timing 134–145 minutes

Read aloud

Start with the injustice each safeguard addresses. Then name a responsible body in your fictional arrangement and explain how a resident would use the safeguard. “Consult the community” needs more detail. Who receives information, who can influence the agenda, and what happens when a complaint arises? Your two signs of change should tell us something about people’s experience. They can combine institutional records with residents’ accounts. Name one tradeoff that remains and how it will receive further review. Finally, use at least one concept to explain your choices. You can disagree with an author if you state the argument fairly and give reasons. Prepare a proposal that a family at the doorway could understand.

Do in class

Eleven minutes of work. Circulate and ask: Who can challenge this? What happens during the wait? How will you know? At minute 141 remind groups that they have four minutes before new information. The worksheet gives space for all outputs.
If groups get stuck… Ask them to name one excluded person, identify the barrier, and design one safeguard that person could actually use. Then ask who is responsible and what residents can verify.

Slide 24 A constraint arrives
Timing 145–150 minutes

Read aloud

You have new information. In this invented exercise, the body can fund two major actions immediately. Other actions require a later decision. This is a teaching constraint, rather than a real budget or cost estimate. State what you count as a major action. Choose your immediate priorities, identify essential protections during the wait, and explain who can contest the sequence. A resource constraint leaves the rights questions in place. It makes the justification for sequencing more important. How will you avoid giving another promise that residents have little reason to believe? Record the deadline and evidence by which the institution’s next commitment can be assessed.

Do in class
Give groups four minutes to revise, then one minute to prepare a report. Do not require anyone to trade away equal dignity or immediate protection. Groups may explain why a minimum duty constrains their options.

If groups disagree… One may prioritize emergency shelter and safety assessment; another may prioritize immediate protection and an urgent hearing. Ask what counts as a major action, which duties cannot wait, and when the decision will be reviewed.

Slide 25 The proposals meet the public
Timing 150–160 minutes

Read aloud

Each group has ninety seconds. Tell us what your safeguard does, who is responsible, and why you chose it. Give us one sign that residents could use to judge progress. End with the tradeoff your group still needs to work through. As you listen, record a question about another proposal. Ask how it handles a person who disagrees with the public body. We are comparing the quality of the reasoning and the usability of the process. Several arrangements may be defensible. A good proposal should make its assumptions visible enough for the people affected to challenge them.

Do in class
Hear four reports of ninety seconds each, with four minutes for brief questions and transitions. With more than four groups, use paired exchanges and hear four sampled reports. Preserve the ten-minute block.

Press for specifics For “accept testimony,” ask who weighs it and gives reasons. For “create an appeal,” ask where people go and what protection they have while waiting. For “measure hearings held,” ask what residents could verify about changes in their own lives.

Slide 26 Who could still fall through the process?
Timing 160–166 minutes

Read aloud

Test your proposal with a person who finds the institution difficult to approach. A missing document might reflect displacement. Challenging a leader might carry a social cost. Absence might reflect caring work, disability, or lack of notice. These possibilities need investigation rather than assumptions about particular groups. Does your process allow alternative evidence? Can someone seek review safely? Who can correct an official record? Collective self-government can address historical exclusion while its own institutions still need accountability to members. UNDRIP helps us read self-determination and participation alongside equality and respect for others’ rights. Bring the discussion back to the person who needs to use the process.

Do in class

Ask groups to identify one failure in their own design. Hear two revisions. Emphasize scrutiny as a way to strengthen legitimate self-government, while avoiding the assumption that collective rights inevitably produce exclusion.

Probe the blind spot Ask whether the remedy still works for a displaced woman without a current address, someone who needs interpretation, or someone living away from the village. If students invoke UNDRIP, distinguish the teaching scenario from a finding about which peoples or rights are affected.

Slide 27 What would make the next promise credible?
Timing 166–170 minutes

Read aloud

Return to the missed deadline. What has your proposal changed about the next promise? Residents should know what the institution has committed to do, who carries responsibility, and when they can expect an explanation. They should also have a way to challenge failure. Trust may develop as people observe conduct over time. It can also weaken when the process dismisses concerns or hides delays. Confidence between leaders offers one kind of evidence. A resident's ability to receive a reasoned response offers another. This is how I would connect the trust question to rights and justice: ask what grounds people have for confidence, and whether institutions remain answerable when people withhold that confidence.

Do in class

Ask two groups for a verifiable commitment. Use their examples to distinguish a promise from evidence of performance. This is a reflective synthesis of the lecturer's teaching notes, not a report of a new research finding.

If students say… "Publish the timetable." Ask: "Who will check it? What will the institution publish if it misses another date, and where can a resident challenge its explanation?"

Slide 28 Back at the doorway
Timing 170–175 minutes

Read aloud

Take out your first answer. Vote again using the same options. You may keep your original choice. Then explain the answer using a concept and one condition that would need to hold in practice. We have learned more about the families and the institutions around them. We have also learned to question the labels through which we first saw them. The story leaves ownership unresolved because that judgment requires evidence and a competent, fair process. We can still judge whether people have protection, meaningful voice, and an accountable route toward a decision. Which reveal changed your reasoning most? Which author helped you understand why it mattered?

Do in class

One minute to vote and compare notes. Hear three brief explanations over three minutes. Use the last minute to connect the opening and closing reasons. Do not equate a changed vote with learning or choose a winning answer.

Listen for changed reasoning "I still say partly, but now I also ask whether either family can challenge the committee." The vote can stay the same even when the reasoning improves.

Slide 29 Your closing judgment
Timing 175–180 minutes

Read aloud

Write a short closing judgment. Complete the sentence, identify one principle, and connect it to a safeguard that people could use. Then explain what evidence would help them judge the result. Name a thinker or the trust discussion that shaped your reasoning. You can finish with a question you still carry. For me, the doorway remains useful because it brings a large claim about collective freedom into a situation where institutions must answer to particular people. The public sign matters. So does the person whose account receives a hearing, the family waiting for an explanation, and the freedom to choose a safe future. Thank you for taking the story seriously and for examining the choices it asks us to make.

Do in class

Three minutes writing. Invite one volunteer to read a sentence, then close within two minutes. Collect responses for formative feedback. Assess conceptual clarity, application, and awareness of a limitation.

Slide 30 Readings for the central questions
Timing Reference

Read aloud

These readings offer different ways into our central question. Read Chatterjee for who imagines the nation, Said for the authority to represent others, Lugones for the colonial formation of gender, and Kabeer for citizenship as experienced inclusion. For preparation, choose one and bring an idea, a question, and an example. For a deeper follow-up, read the others in conversation with the story.

Do in class

Outside the timed presentation. Full citations and links are in the script reading guide. Some texts require university-library access.

Slide 31 Readings for rights and implementation
Timing Reference

Read aloud

Sen connects rights with real opportunities. Read UNDRIP's self-determination and participation provisions together with equality and rights safeguards. The Bangsamoro agreement gives a primary political text for considering commitments and implementation. My 2017 CPCS learning paper examines how open communication and follow-through sustain cooperation during implementation.

Do in class

Outside the timed presentation. See the reading guide for the published CPCS study and suggested pages.

Slide 32 Further reading from Global South thinkers
Timing Reference

Read aloud
These optional readings extend the questions of social hierarchy, feminist solidarity, enduring colonial power, territorial nationhood, and state formation in Mindanao. Choose the theme that most unsettled your first judgment. The reading guide explains what to look for rather than treating these writers as a single school.

Do in class
Outside the timed presentation. Full bibliographic details and reading prompts appear in the script.

Workshop sheet

Fictional case | Slides 21 to 25 | One sheet per group

Two families displaced by conflict claim a secure future connected to the same home. One has returned, while the other currently occupies it. A committee invites male household heads to a hearing and excludes a woman with relevant records. It misses its promised hearing date without explanation. Residents report a possible explosive hazard on a route to fields and services.

Ownership and legal entitlements remain unresolved. The case gives no ethnic identities or real institutional rules.

Your task

Propose a fair process and immediate protections. Consider every perspective. Identify what further evidence competent bodies would need. Do not decide ownership from this brief.

Safeguard	Responsible body and how residents use it	Barrier it addresses

Two signs of change residents can assess
1. _____
2. _____

One concept that explains your choices

_____

One unresolved tradeoff and a way to review it

_____

_____

Midway update

Pause and wait for the instructor to reveal the new constraint on Slide 24. Then revisit the order of your proposed actions, essential protections during the wait, and who can challenge the sequence. Your ninety second report State one concrete safeguard, the reason and responsible body, one verifiable sign of change, and the tradeoff still open.

Reading guide

For preparation, choose one central reading and bring an idea, a question, and an example. Use the other texts for follow-up. Some texts may require library access.

Chatterjee on national imagination

Chatterjee, P. (1993). The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories. Princeton University Press. Chapter 1, Whose Imagined Community?, pp. 3–13. Assigned chapter supplied by lecturer.
Read Chapter 1, pp. 3–13. Draw out his challenge to a European model of national imagination, cultural sovereignty before state independence, and tensions within the national community. Inner and outer domains are historical analytical categories. Ask who can shape national culture and who can contest its elite forms.

Said on representation
Said, E. W. (1978). Orientalism. Pantheon Books. Introduction.
https://www.penguinrandomhouse.com/books/159783/orientalism-by-edward-w-said/
Read the Introduction. Examine how authoritative representations of the Orient connected knowledge with imperial power. Ask whose account defines a problem and whether people described can correct it. Said is a postcolonial thinker whose work can inform decolonial inquiry. Avoid treating every outsider account as equally suspect.

Lugones on colonial gender
Lugones, M. (2010). Toward a decolonial feminism. Hypatia, 25(4), 742–759.
https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2010.01137.x
Read the article. Focus on how gender, race, and sexuality constitute relations of colonial domination together. Ask which histories shape legitimate leadership, evidence, and voice. A numerical balance in attendance leaves questions about influence open. Investigate local histories before transferring the analysis to another setting.

Kabeer on inclusive citizenship
Kabeer, N. (Ed.). (2005). Inclusive Citizenship: Meanings and Expressions. Zed Books. Introduction.
https://archive.ids.ac.uk/drccitizen/system/assets/1052734474/original/1052734474-kabeer.2005-introduction.pdf
Read the opening sections of the Introduction. Draw out the relationship between formal citizenship and experienced inclusion. Consider justice, recognition, self-determination, and solidarity. Ask how someone can hold formal membership and still struggle to influence public decisions.

Rights and implementation readings

Sen on real opportunities
Sen, A. (1999). Development as Freedom. Alfred A. Knopf. Introduction. https://sen.scholars.harvard.edu/publications/development-freedom
Read the Introduction. Distinguish formal rights, real opportunities, and chosen outcomes. Ask what would make return a genuine option and how people should assess changes in their lives.

Collective rights and safeguards
United Nations. (2007). United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Articles 3–4, 18–19, 44–46. https://mandates.un.org/mandate/A/RES/61/295
Read Articles 3–4 and 18–19 alongside 44–46. Consider self-determination, autonomy, participation, equality, and respect for others' rights. UNDRIP is a declaration. These articles support discussion rather than settle the fictional property dispute.

The Bangsamoro agreement
Government of the Philippines and Moro Islamic Liberation Front. (2014). Comprehensive Agreement on the Bangsamoro and annexes. https://peace.gov.ph/signed-agreements/ Historical normalization reference: Executive Order No. 79 (2019). https://elibrary.judiciary.gov.ph/thebookshelf/showdocs/5/88179
Read selected provisions on political arrangements and normalization. Identify the commitments and the mechanisms through which they can be implemented and reviewed. The session uses a historical anchor rather than a current progress assessment.

Lubang on trust
Lubang, A. F. (2017). The Role of Trust in Peace Accord Implementation: A Case Study in the Bangsamoro. Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, CPCS Learning Paper. Read pp. 17–19 for the research approach and pp. 29–35 for the findings and recommendations. Read the study
Ask how transparency, open communication, and keeping commitments give people reasons to cooperate despite uncertainty. What would let cooperation continue if a trusted leader left?

Further reading

Ambedkar, B. R. (2014). Annihilation of Caste: The Annotated Critical Edition. Verso. Original text published 1936.
Ask whether political freedom changes entrenched social hierarchy. Use the question comparatively without equating caste with every form of exclusion.
Mohanty, C. T. (2003). Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity. Duke University Press.
Examine differences among women and the risks of a single universal account of their experience. Connect careful contextual analysis with solidarity.
Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America. Nepantla: Views from South, 1(3), 533–580.
Explore how racialized patterns of labor, knowledge, and power can persist after colonial rule. Read as a historically situated argument.
Thongchai Winichakul. (1994). Siam Mapped: A History of the Geo-Body of a Nation. University of Hawai‘i Press.
Explore how mapping and territorial knowledge helped shape national identity. Ask how a boundary becomes an apparently natural image of belonging.
Abinales, P. N. (2000). Making Mindanao: Cotabato and Davao in the Formation of the Philippine Nation-State. Ateneo de Manila University Press.
Connect state formation with local power and historical accommodation. Use the book to resist reducing Mindanao politics to a single identity conflict.
Abu-Nimer, M. (2003). Nonviolence and Peace Building in Islam: Theory and Practice. University Press of Florida.
Explore locally grounded religious and cultural resources for nonviolent peacebuilding while respecting differences among communities.

Lecturer Q&A

Use these answers when questions arise. The Westphalia entry supports Slides 5–7; the rights and autonomy entries are useful during the Bangsamoro discussion or the workshop.

Nation and belonging

1. What is the difference between a nation and a state?

A state governs a territory and population through public institutions. A nation is a community that understands itself as sharing a political identity or future. A nation-state claims to govern in the name of a nation. That claim can coexist with several peoples, languages, and identities within the same borders.

2. Did the Peace of Westphalia create the nation-state?

The 1648 treaties of Münster and Osnabrück ended the Thirty Years' War. Westphalia is often used as a landmark in the history of territorial sovereignty, although historians dispute the claim that it created the modern system of sovereign states. The idea that authority should come from a nation or people gained force much later, especially from the French Revolution onward. In the twentieth century, anticolonial movements used self-determination to challenge empire and build independent states. For Bangsamoro, the question is what self-government can mean within an existing state.

3. Is identity politics always divisive?

Organizing around an identity can make discrimination visible. It can also flatten differences among people who share that identity. Iris Marion Young gives us a practical question: Which rule or practice puts a group at a disadvantage? That helps us address the barrier without assuming the group has a single voice.

4. What is the point of the three Johns joke?

Ellie Anderson puts Locke, Mill, and Rawls together to ask whose experience gets treated as the neutral starting point. Their theories differ. The joke gives us a way into our hearing: one invitation per household sounds even-handed. Who does the committee picture using it?

Fairness and voice

5. How would Rawls and Sen judge the hearing?

Rawls gives us a question about fair rules: What procedure would we choose if we did not know which family we belonged to? Sen asks about real opportunities: Can both families reach the hearing, understand the language, present evidence, and challenge the outcome? A fair rule matters, and we can still ask what people are able to do under it.

6. When is treating people differently fair?

Kabeer asks us to look at what the same treatment achieves. Giving both families the same written notice may work if both can understand and act on it. If one needs interpretation or an accessible venue, that support can give them a more equal chance to participate. The test is whether the response addresses a real barrier.

7. What does a decolonial lens add?

It asks how certain rules and forms of knowledge came to carry authority. Chatterjee asks who gets to imagine the nation. Said helps us ask whose descriptions are treated as authoritative. Lugones examines how colonial power shaped gender together with race and sexuality. At the hearing, ask why the committee trusts some documents or speakers and whose knowledge it discounts.

8. Can we respect community institutions and still question gender exclusion?

Yes. Listen to people within the community who are already debating the rule. In our story, a woman has records that could affect the decision. Her exclusion affects her rights and the committee's ability to judge the case. If she gets a seat, can she also present evidence, influence the agenda, or seek review? UNDRIP Article 44 gives students a benchmark for equality.

9. Does Indigenous self-determination mean independence?

Autonomy is one expression of self-determination. UNDRIP Article 3 recognizes the broader right to shape political status and development. Article 4 recognizes autonomy or self-government in internal and local affairs, with ways to finance it. Article 46 sets safeguards concerning territorial integrity and human rights. Ask what authority people can exercise and whether they have the resources to exercise it.

Autonomy and implementation

10. Is consultation the same as consent?

Under UNDRIP Article 18, Indigenous peoples participate through representatives they choose. Article 19 calls for good-faith consultation and cooperation through their own representative institutions to seek free, prior, and informed consent before adopting and implementing measures that may affect them. A sign-in sheet records attendance. It tells us little about what people knew, how they deliberated, or what they decided.

11. Can autonomy address historical exclusion and create new exclusions?

Yes. Self-government can respond to a long struggle against exclusion, while people within the region can still have unequal influence. In the Bangsamoro discussion, ask what injustice autonomy seeks to address and what safeguards let people within the region challenge unfair treatment.

12. Can a peace accord be implemented while distrust persists?

Implementation can start with commitments people can observe and verify. After our fictional committee misses its deadline, both families can judge whether it gives a clear explanation, sets a realistic new date, and offers a way to challenge further delay. This is also a question I bring to my Bangsamoro research: Whose trust are we talking about? Confidence among negotiators can coexist with uncertainty among residents.

13. Who should get the house?

We have too little evidence to decide ownership. We can still ask who needs immediate protection, what evidence the hearing should consider, and how either family could challenge a ruling. What process would you accept if you did not know which family you belonged to?

14. Has justice arrived?

Return to your first vote. You can keep your answer. Tell us what evidence now supports it, what changed in your reasoning, and what you would still need to see.

Source notes

Westphalia: Andreas Osiander, “Sovereignty, International Relations, and the Westphalian Myth” (2001); UN, “United Nations and Decolonization.” Equality and participation: Naila Kabeer, Inclusive Citizenship (2005), Introduction; UN General Assembly resolution 61/295, arts. 3–4, 18–19, 44–46. Slide 10: Iris Marion Young, Justice and the Politics of Difference (1990), ch. 6, “Social Movements and the Politics of Difference”; Ellie Anderson’s three Johns illustration in Identity Politics: The Good, the Bad, and the… Hotly Contested (2024). Optional Slide 19 clip: The Idea Architect, “Rawls vs Sen: Is Fairness Enough for Justice?”

Human rights theory matrix

Private reference for the lecturer. Use the dates as landmarks and the final column to bring the theory back to the case.

Identity and political community

Concept	Development and thinkers	Decolonial lens and current debate	Ask in class
1. Identity	Locke (1690; personal identity chapter added 1694) links continuity of the person to consciousness. Fanon (1952) examines how colonial racism shapes lived identity. Hall (1990) treats cultural identity as continually formed through history and representation.	Quijano (2000) examines racial classification as a way of organizing power. Lugones (2007, 2010) asks how colonial power constituted race, gender, and sexuality together. Today, examine who controls official categories and what follows from being placed in one.	Who can name themselves, and what changes when an institution uses a different name for them?
2. Community and belonging	Aristotle's Politics sees the polis as a community for living well, with restricted membership. Tönnies (1887) distinguishes customary ties from more impersonal relations. Young (1990) questions unity premised on sameness. Yuval-Davis (2011) distinguishes felt belonging from the politics of deciding who belongs.	Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999) asks who controls research about Indigenous peoples. A community can be publicly recognized while its institutions, histories, and accounts carry less authority. Ask who can correct an official account.	Who gets to tell this community's history, and can the people described correct it?
3. Nation and state	Westphalia (1648) ended the Thirty Years' War and became a reference point for territorial sovereignty; it did not create modern nation-states. Hobbes (1651) links sovereign authority to protection. Renan (1882) emphasizes shared memory and political will; Anderson (1983) explains how strangers imagine shared membership.	Chatterjee (1993) shows how anticolonial nationalists imagined their own political and cultural futures. Read European state formation alongside empire and anticolonial struggle. Today, ask how one state can accommodate more than one people's claim to self-government.	Who governs, in whose name, and what authority can different peoples exercise within the same state?

Citizenship rights and equality

Concept	Development and thinkers	Decolonial lens and current debate	Ask in class
4. Citizenship	The Greek polis emphasized participation; Roman citizenship could extend beyond a single city. Marshall (1950) distinguishes civil, political, and social citizenship in Britain. Arendt (1951) uses statelessness to ask what happens when people lack a political community where their claims count.	Kabeer (2005) starts from the experience of excluded people, highlighting justice, recognition, self-determination, and solidarity. Ask whose histories the state recorded, and whose membership is harder to prove or exercise.	If both families have the same formal standing, whose documents or testimony will the committee accept?
5. Human rights	Locke places natural rights prior to government. Eighteenth-century American and French declarations advanced rights amid slavery and gender exclusion. The 1948 UDHR sets a common standard; the 1966 Covenants give treaty form to civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights.	Bandung (1955) shows Asian and African actors connecting rights with self-determination and opposition to colonial rule. UNDRIP (2007) brings individual and collective rights together. Contemporary debates also include the Inter-American Court's 2025 advisory opinion on care, a regional development.	What does a right to participate mean when someone else chooses who represents you?
6. Equality and discrimination	Wollstonecraft (1792) challenges women's exclusion from education and equal standing. Ambedkar (1936) examines how institutions reproduce caste hierarchy. Rawls (1971) asks what rules people would choose from a fair starting position. Crenshaw (1989) shows how single-category analysis can miss discrimination.	Formal equality asks whether a rule applies equally. Substantive equality asks whether people can participate on equal terms. Sen (2009) tests what people can actually do; Lugones adds a question about the colonial formation of the categories that organize exclusion.	If the woman gets a seat, can she challenge what the hearing accepts as evidence?

Power nation building and identity politics

Concept	Development and thinkers	Decolonial lens and current debate	Ask in class
7. Power and representation	Weber (1922) distinguishes power and legitimate authority. Pitkin (1967) distinguishes resembling those represented from acting for them. Said (1978) shows how authoritative portrayals of other peoples can support imperial power.	Spivak (1988) draws attention to speaking for people and portraying them. Both can filter what people are trying to say. Examine who sets the agenda, whose knowledge counts, and how representatives can be held answerable.	If the committee names someone to speak for both families, who can correct that person's account?
8. Nation building	Fanon (1961) warns about national elites inheriting colonial institutions. Gellner (1983) links nationalism to standardized education and industrial society; Anderson (1983) explains imagined membership. Chatterjee (1993) shows how anticolonial nationalism asserted cultural authority before gaining state power.	A flag or a new administration can coexist with inherited inequalities. Ask how a shared political future can accommodate distinct histories, institutions, and claims to self-government. Distinguish building belonging from building the state's capacity to govern.	Can a shared political community make room for several histories of how it came to be?
9. Identity politics	The Combahee River Collective (1977) described Black feminist organizing grounded in its members' experiences and connected to wider struggles. Young (1990, 2000) locates group disadvantage in social structures without assuming members are alike.	Ask how conquest, classification, or state policy made an identity politically consequential. Then examine whose concerns a movement advances or overlooks within its own ranks. Shared identity can support solidarity across groups.	What injustice becomes visible when people organize under this name? Whose experience might still be missing?

Historical injustice and collective rights

Concept	Development and thinkers	Decolonial lens and current debate	Ask in class
10. Historical injustice	Fanon (1961) makes land and material conditions central to colonial domination. Teitel (2000) examines how political transitions address past abuses. UN principles (2005) distinguish restitution, compensation, rehabilitation, satisfaction, and guarantees of non-repetition for specified grave violations.	Trace the connection between a past harm and present control over land, resources, or authority. Acknowledgment can matter alongside institutional repair. Ask how to address historic dispossession while protecting people displaced later.	What past harm still shapes this dispute? What kind of repair would address it?
11. Individual and collective rights	The UDHR (1948) affirms each person's dignity and rights. Kymlicka (1995) distinguishes protections against external pressures from restrictions that group authorities may impose on members. UNDRIP (2007) recognizes rights of Indigenous peoples and individuals.	Language, land, and institutions can sustain a people's ability to exercise rights. Read collective protections alongside UNDRIP Article 44 on equal guarantees for Indigenous women and men and Article 46 on human rights safeguards.	How would you protect a community's authority and a member's right to challenge a decision?
12. Self-determination and autonomy	Bandung (1955) connects self-determination to anticolonial struggle. Common Article 1 of the 1966 Covenants affirms peoples' self-determination. UNDRIP Articles 3–4 distinguish the broader right from autonomy or self-government in internal and local affairs, including means of financing it.	Independence was one response to empire. Within a state, test autonomy against actual authority, resources, and revenue, and ask how institutions protect distinct peoples within the region.	If a region has an elected government but little control over the resources it needs, what can it govern?

Justice and participation

Concept	Development and thinkers	Decolonial lens and current debate	Ask in class
13. Recognition, redistribution, and representation	Fraser (1990s–2000s) distinguishes recognition as equal standing, redistribution as fair access to resources and opportunities, and representation as who can participate and who counts in setting the boundaries of a decision.	Ask who drew the boundary around the decision. A hearing may recognize a language and fund interpretation yet exclude displaced residents by requiring a current village address. Each remedy reaches a different part of the injustice.	Which proposal changes standing, which changes access to resources, and which changes who has a say?
14. Capabilities and substantive freedom	Rawls (1971) uses primary goods to assess what people generally need. Sen (1980, 1999, 2009) asks what real opportunities people can turn resources into. Nussbaum (2000, 2011) proposes central capabilities and minimum thresholds; Sen leaves more open to public reasoning.	Ask who defines a valuable life or a successful return. Residents may judge progress by practical access to fields, schools, or clinics. A capability is a genuine option, even when a person chooses a different course.	If both families have a recognized right to return, what would make return a genuine option for each?
15. Intersectionality and diversity within groups	Combahee (1977) describes interlocking oppression. Crenshaw (1989, 1991) shows how separating race and sex can hide Black women's experiences. Lugones (2007, 2010) asks how colonial power helped constitute the categories themselves.	Examine how rules work together and how their categories gained authority. Removing one rule may leave another barrier intact. Avoid treating any group as internally uniform.	Who remains excluded if the hearing drops the male household head rule but keeps its language and documentation requirements?

Coloniality security and peacebuilding

Concept	Development and thinkers	Decolonial lens and current debate	Ask in class
16. Coloniality and decoloniality	Fanon (1952, 1961) examines colonial domination's psychological and material effects. Said (1978) studies imperial knowledge. Quijano (2000) traces enduring racial hierarchy and Eurocentric knowledge. Smith (1999) and Lugones (2007, 2010) bring distinct Indigenous and feminist critiques.	Decolonization includes ending colonial rule and reclaiming self-determination. Coloniality names hierarchies that can outlast colonial rule. Decoloniality asks how to challenge them: who sets priorities, controls knowledge, and makes decisions?	What would the institution have to give people authority over for this change to count as decolonial?
17. State security and human security	Hobbes (1651) links political authority to protection. State security approaches emphasize sovereignty, territory, and threats to the state. UNDP's 1994 Human Development Report shifts attention toward people and the conditions that make their lives secure.	Ask who defines the threat and whose safety receives resources. A ceasefire and civilian safety can reinforce each other, but a ceasefire can hold while people still face unsafe routes or inaccessible livelihoods.	If the ceasefire holds but families cannot safely reach their fields, whose security improved?
18. Peacebuilding, trust, and implementation	Galtung (1969) distinguishes the absence of direct violence from addressing structural violence. Boutros-Ghali (1992) places post-conflict peacebuilding in UN policy. Lubang (2017) examines how transparency, communication, and visible follow-through sustain trust amid uncertainty in joint clearance work in Maguindanao.	The study offers a case of how trust develops. A further decolonial teaching question is who defines and verifies progress: negotiators, agencies, or affected residents. Keep this application distinct from the study's findings.	What could the committee do after missing its deadline, and could either family challenge its account of progress?

Teaching sequence: At the doorway, ask whose history counts. At the hearing, ask who can speak and challenge a ruling. At the missed deadline, ask what evidence would show the institution kept its promise.

Distinctions to keep handy

Nation building concerns shared political belonging; state building concerns institutions and capacity to govern. Identity politics asks how people organize; intersectionality asks whose experience that organizing may overlook.

Historical injustice asks what repair is owed; coloniality examines how a hierarchy persists. Capabilities ask what people can actually do; trust asks what grounds they have for relying on an institution.

Selected reading anchors

Chatterjee, Partha. The Nation and Its Fragments (1993), ch. 1.

Kabeer, Naila. Inclusive Citizenship: Meanings and Expressions (2005), introduction.

Quijano, Aníbal. “Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America” (2000); Lugones, María. “Toward a Decolonial Feminism” (2010).

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. “Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex” (1989); Fraser, Nancy. “Reframing Justice in a Globalizing World” (2005); Sen, Amartya. The Idea of Justice (2009).

UN General Assembly: UDHR (1948); reparation principles, A/RES/60/147 (2005); UNDRIP, A/RES/61/295 (2007).

Lubang, Alfredo Ferrariz. The Role of Trust in Peace Accord Implementation: A Case Study in the Bangsamoro (CPCS, 2017), pp. 17–19, 29–35.