SELECTION 2 (Set 1)

Analysis: History - Uganda

ABSTRACT/SUMMARY:

The evidence selected scores a 2 overall because of the weakness of the evidence in the first body paragraph. There is a leap in logic about the 4% detail that prevents it from "strongly and accurately" supporting the assertion. While this paper perhaps gets docked particularly low because of the nuance of the complex argument, this is the nature of writing with increasingly complex ideas (for example, a middle school student might have a piece of evidence that is compelling and convincing-- an 8 on our rubric-- but for a much simpler subject).

CRITERION 1: CHOICE

The amount of evidence in this paper is adequate in amount. However, a better paper would parse out the language of the bill more and use the same source (article 19, for example) for *more* evidence. This is a paper that analyzes the precise language of the law and the UNDHR; it cries out for a detailed analysis of specific words or phrases within the bill and law, not just a broad analysis of entire sentences. (This is both a choice and presentation issue.)

Most importantly, however, the evidence is in the first paragraph does not strongly support the assertion. There is faulty logic here:

- The assertion argues that the bill "restricts the freedom of homosexuals"
- However, the evidence does not prove that the bill is inherently wrong; rather, that limiting opinions is wrong
- People who support homosexuality are not necessarily people who are homosexual. In this way, the author makes a number of faulty logical leaps.
- Because of this fact, the evidence is merely "connected" to the assertion - it does not strongly support the assertion.

In a higher grade, the paper would be better served by more evidence. There is a clear opportunity to provide more evidence from the bill itself that the writer does not take.

CRITERION 2: PRESENTATION

The first sentence of the paper doesn't blend well into the UNDHR quotation. The author should have taken out "whereas." Stronger presentation would have looked like this:

- As stated in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights (UNDH**R), the** "recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world."

However, most, if not nearly all, evidence is clearly presented.

Essay: History - Uganda

February 8, 2011

Composition- Mr. Melvin CHPRIDE

Anchor Paper PBA # 6

As stated in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights (UNDHR), "Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world." The purpose of the UNDHR is to outline the rights that all humans are entitled to. The proposed Anti-Homosexual bill in Uganda, which is a bill to eradicate homosexuals, is a violation of the UNDHR because it infringes on the freedom of expression of homosexuals. However, the proposed bill abides by the will of the majority of citizens in Uganda. Although that may be the case, the proposed bill is ultimately a violation of the UNDHR.

To begin, the Anti- homosexual bill proposed in Uganda violates the Universal Declaration of Human Rights because it restricts the freedom of homosexuals. In Uganda, 4% of the population approve of homosexuality. If the bill is passed, that 4% will be prosecuted and imprisoned along with homosexuals. Article 19 of the UDHR states, "Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference…" This right is repressed by the bill, thus labeling it a violation of the UDHR. Without the Anti- homosexual bill, opponents to homosexuality have the right to voice their outcries against the practice while proponents for it have the right to voice their support. The use of the phrase, "freedom of opinion" proposes the idea that no one can be forced to have a certain opinion. The government or members of the majority in a society cannot compel an individual to think the same as them. Also, the use of the phrase "freedom of expression" reveals that people have the right to express themselves in a homosexual manner without fearing persecution. To conclude, the purpose of the bill is to eradicate the homosexual expression.

Many proponents of the Anti-homosexuality bill claim that it does not violate the Universal Declaration of Human Rights because the law meets the rule of the majority. In Uganda, 96% of the population disprove of the practice of homosexuality, therefore the government must abide by the democratic vote of the majority. In article 21 of the UNDHR it states, "The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of the government; this will shall be expressed in patriotic and genuine elections which shall be universal…" The Declaration specifies that the majority vote shall elect a government by the "will of the people". The use of this phrase suggests that the will of the people is related to the majority vote which would be 96% of Uganda in support for the bill. The use of the phrase "genuine elections" reveals that if the people of Uganda vote on the Bill, it should be passed into a law. To disregard the vote of the majority in order to appease the acts of the minority is undemocratic. To conclude, the Anti-Homosexuality Bill is not a violation of the UNDHR since it was proposed by the will of the people.

Ultimately, the proposed Anti-Homosexuality bill is a violation of the UNDHR. Although it offers an election by a democratic process, the subject of the Anti-Homosexual bill, which is the persecution of homosexuals, cannot be voted on. In article 2 of the UNDHR it states, "Everyone is entitles to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind…Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country…" This statement reveals that the Anti-Homosexuality bill in Uganda is in fact a violation of the UNDHR because

it revokes the rights of homosexuals living in Uganda. The use of the phrase "Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms…" reveals that even if 96% of Uganda is against homosexuality, the 4% are still protected by this declaration. If the bill passes and the 4% are persecuted, that will render the bill/law as a violation of the UNDHR. Also, the use of the phrase "…no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional, or international status of the economy…" reveals that even if Uganda is seeking national sovereignty, their proposed bill is still a violation of the UNDHR. To conclude, the Anti-Homosexual bill proposed in Uganda is ultimately a violation of the UNDHR.

To conclude, the proposed Anti-Homosexual bill in Uganda, is a violation of the UNDHR because it infringes on the freedom of expression of homosexuals. However, the proposed bill abides by the will of the majority of citizens in Uganda. Although that may be the case, the proposed bill is ultimately a violation of the UNDHR.