

PUNISHMENT AND MERCY

Political Science (POLS) 392, Section 1, CRN: 43431/44013
Fall 2012, 4 Units

Class Meetings:

MW, 3:00p-4:15p
University Hall 3316

Course Website:

<https://mylmuconnect.lmu.edu/>

Instructors:

Dr. Andrew Dilts

Email: andrew.dilts@lmu.edu

Office: University Hall 4203

Phone: (310-338-5165)

Office Hours: M/W 10:00a-12:00p

<http://dilts.org/officehours/>

Dr. John Parrish

Email: jparrish@lmu.edu

Office: University Hall 4133

Phone: (310-338-5810)

Office Hours: M/W/F 9:15a-10:45a

COURSE INFORMATION

DESCRIPTION: This course will explore the many theoretical and practical difficulties that arise in attempting to reconcile an effective and just system of social punishment with the virtue of mercy. The relationship between mercy and punishment is frequently viewed as mutually exclusive or contradictory. Can a system forego punishment (through mercy) for some and still have equality? Can a system punish offenders and still uphold the dignity of the individual? How does one mediate between impunity and vengeance? Utilizing the lenses of modern philosophical ethics (Hobbes, Locke, Bentham, Kant), contemporary political theory (Nietzsche, Durkheim, Foucault, Derrida), and theology (Scripture, Augustine, Aquinas, Luther, United States Catholic Bishops) as well as engaging contemporary case-studies, this course analyzes this relationship in terms of competing purposes of punishment and mercy, and political, philosophical, sociological and theological visions of forgiveness and mercy. The purpose of the course is not to develop an overly simplistic solution but rather to challenge and transform students' presuppositions regarding mercy and punishment.

INSTITUTIONAL MISSION: Loyola Marymount University's mission is to encourage student learning, to educate the whole person, and to serve faith and promote justice. The Department of Political Science pursues this mission by encouraging and challenging students to be perceptive observers of political life in all its variety and richness; to seek a systematic understanding of the causes and consequences of political institutions, policies, and behavior; to develop a moral and ethical perspective that allows them to critically evaluate actions, institutions, and policies; and to prepare themselves for a life of active citizenship and involvement in creating a more just and humane world. "Punishment and Mercy" serves these university and department missions by challenging students to engage with the difficult questions of morality and justice implicated in matters of public policy. The course will especially serve to deepen students' moral and ethical

perspective on the actions, institutions, and policies found in contemporary criminal justice.

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES:

Our desired course learning outcomes include the following: we would like students to acquire a sense of the complexity and difficulty of these issues as well as a theoretical toolkit for addressing these problems and working towards their resolution. Course assignments are designed to measure regular progress through the theoretical readings and case studies; to require students to engage with alternative views and conflicting values; and to achieve on an individual basis a thorough and sophisticated understanding of the relation of theory and practice in a concrete and complex instance.

More specifically:

1. **Students should be able to differentiate and critically analyze a wide range of the major theoretical approaches taken to mercy and punishment** in the disciplines of philosophy, theology, sociology, and critical theory.
2. **Students should learn to carefully examine and critically engage with classic contemporary texts** in philosophy, theology, sociology, and political theory, and should gain a greater appreciation of the possibilities of interdisciplinary conversations between these approaches.
3. **Students should understand and appreciate the enduring tensions and current practical challenges** in bringing together questions of mercy and punishment.
4. **Students should improve in their capacity for interpretive and normative argument, both written and oral**, including specifically the ability to arrive at coherent and compelling normative conclusions and the ability to express those views in speech and in writing with greater focus, clarity, force, and sophistication.
5. **Students should improve in their ability to conduct an independent research project**, including identifying researchable questions, locating and using relevant scholarly sources, and drafting and revising a major research paper.
6. **Students should grow intellectually and personally as individuals and as active citizens.**

PREREQUISITES/RECOMMENDED BACKGROUND: POLS major/minor, or have completed 100-level philosophy and theology requirements.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

There are five course requirements used in assessing the course grade:

- 1) **Attendance and Participation (20%)** – Students are expected to attend all class meetings, having carefully prepared all assigned readings, and to contribute to class discussion. Attendance will be taken at each session. More than two absences will result in the lowering

of the attendance/participation grade. In terms of participation, students' contributions will be evaluated for quality rather than frequency. Attention to the texts, thoughtfulness and preparation, and creative responses to others are the main indicators of quality. The instructors may challenge students to defend their views in the interest of deepening the examination of basic values and principles.

- 2) **Mini-Essays (20%)** – Students must complete two mini-essays of 3-4 pages each. These mini-essays are worth 10% each of the final grade, and are due **Friday October 6th** and **October 22nd**. More specific instructions for these mini-essays will be provided in a handout.
- 3) **Group Project (20%)** – During the final weeks of the semester, we will focus on four contemporary issues related to punishment and mercy (death penalty abolition, immigration amnesty, slavery reparations, and sex offender residency restrictions). Four small groups will lead discussion of the issue as a group project. Further details of these assignments will be distributed in class. There needs to be an equitable distribution of the labor, and each member of the group needs to be an active participant in the presentation. After the formal presentation concludes, the group will facilitate class discussion. The committee report will be **due Wednesday the 24th of October**.
- 4) **Final Paper Prospectus (10%)** – On **November 16th**, the final paper prospectus will be due. It includes a thesis statement (which includes a clear articulation of the paper's central question and projected thesis), an outline (which includes a general framework for supporting your thesis as well as the subtopics and thinkers engaged), and an annotated bibliography (which includes a brief analysis of at least five academic journal articles, books, or chapters in books that you will be engaging in your paper, beyond those in the course's required readings).
- 5) **Final Paper (30%)** – The purpose of the fifteen page paper (double spaced, regular margin) is to address some aspect of the complex relationship between mercy and punishment. The instructors **will provide detailed instructions** explaining the final paper as the course proceeds. Final papers will be due **Wednesday, December 12th**, during finals week.

GRADE BREAKDOWN:

Attendance / Participation:	20%
Mini-Essays:	20%
Group Project:	20%
Final Paper Prospectus:	10%
Final Paper:	30%

****Any student who receives a failing grade for attendance and participation will receive a failing grade for the class. Any student who has not submitted all course requirements will receive a failing grade for the class.****

SPECIAL COURSE FEATURES

As a 4-unit upper-division course, this class has a set of special features that may distinguish it from other classes you have taken outside the Political Science Department at LMU. Specifically:

1. **This class will involve more intensive reading requirements and accountability for assigned reading.** In particular, the philosophical texts that constitute the majority of the reading for the course must be read (and frequently re-read) carefully and precisely prior to class. Accountability for the reading will be measured through quizzes and may also be ensured through such mechanisms as required discussion questions, required service as discussion leaders, etc., as determined to be necessary by the instructor over the course of the semester.
2. **This class will involve substantial, multi-draft writing requirements.** Prior to turning in their final paper, students will have to submit first a written prospectus (to the instructor) and later a rough draft of their paper (to peer evaluators) for feedback and subsequent revision. Further instructions on the prospectus and draft requirements will be handed out in class. Students' grades on the final paper will depend in part on the responsiveness of their final draft to feedback on previous drafts.
3. **This class includes an experiential learning component.** One of the course requirements is that students participate in an in-class debate with opportunities for substantially improving oral communication skills.
4. **This class includes an individual mentoring component.** Students will be required to meet with the instructor individually throughout the semester as specified for direct feedback on their progress in the class and on their development of their final paper.

These intensive reading, multi-draft writing, experiential learning, and individual mentoring requirements are among the reasons this course is designated as a 4-unit upper-division course.

COURSE POLICIES

ATTENDANCE: Timely, prepared, and engaged attendance is required. Absences will only be excused in the case of illness or emergency. If there is a conflict between course participation and religious observance, please contact the instructors in advance. It is not necessary to obtain prior approval from the instructor when missing a meeting is unavoidable, but note that students bear the *entire responsibility* for the decision to miss class and for whatever effect that may have on their course grade and their learning experience. Repeated absences and lateness will directly affect the participation and attendance portion of a student's grade, as detailed in the course requirements section.

RESPECT FOR OTHERS: Given the sensitive nature of the topics explored, a spirit of toleration and civility is crucial for classroom discourse. Students should respectfully listen to others' critiques and articulate responses in a thoughtful manner.

LATE PENALTIES: Assignments are accepted when they are due. Assignments must be turned in at

the designated time and place. Failure to turn in an assignment on time is unacceptable except with the prior agreement of the instructor (which will be given only in exceptional circumstances). Except in documented cases of illness or emergency, a penalty of up to a **full letter grade** may be assessed for each day (24hrs) the assignment is late.

PLAGIARISM & ACADEMIC HONESTY: Academic dishonesty will be treated as an extremely serious matter. Proven plagiarism of any kind may result in automatic failure of the course, and will be referred to the University for further disciplinary action. We reserve the right to submit your electronic document to plagiarism detection websites if necessary. It is **never** permissible to turn in any work that has been copied from another student or copied from a source (including anything found on the Internet) without properly acknowledging the source. It is your responsibility to make sure that your work meets the standard of academic honesty set forth in the “LMU Honor Code and Process” which appears in the LMU Bulletin 2012-2013.

GENDER NEUTRAL & GENDER SPECIFIC LANGUAGE, NAMES & ACCENTS: Academics no longer use the pronoun “he” to apply universally to all persons, nor do we normally use the term “man,” when we are referring to humanity or people in general. In our writing, when we are making generalizations we should use gender neutral pronouns, that is, *she* and *he*, *s/he*, *him* or *her*, *they/their*, etc, or alternate between pronoun genders (first “she” then “he”). When referring to a specific person or group of people, we should use the language and pronouns *that they prefer* if we know them. Further, we should be attentive to the spelling and accents of author’s names. Finally, all authors should be referred to by their entire names, or only their last names, *not by their first names*, orally and in writing.

When it is not possible to use gender-neutral language (e.g. because the claim you are making is gendered; because you are relying on a text that uses gender-exclusive pronouns; for the sake of historical accuracy), you must explain your usage. Typically, this requires no more than a footnote (e.g. Hobbes uses “he” or “mankind” as universals). Add a footnote at your first usage of his language, directly quoted or not, and say that you are following the author’s usage here, and do not mean to endorse that usage. You are not required to solve these problems, but you should signal your awareness of them.

EMAIL COMMUNICATION: At times we will communicate with the entire class using campus email systems, so it is essential that you regularly check your lion.lmu.edu email address or forward your lion account email to your preferred email address. We encourage you to contact us via email with questions about the course, the material we cover in class, and assignments. Because there are two instructors for this class, be sure to communicate with both of us, and do not assume because you have spoken with one of us, you have also communicated with the other.

You are expected to be professional in all communication with the instructors. All email communication should be in complete sentences with a proper salutation and conclusion. Treat the email more as a letter and less like a text message. Include a comprehensible subject heading (e.g. “POLS 392 paper question”), address and sign the email, making sure to identify what class you are in (usually instructors are teaching more than one class) and explain clearly what it is that you are inquiring about. Failure to do these will make it unlikely that you will not get a response. Also, unless We generally check our faculty email only during normal business hours (more or less until 5pm).

Finally, here is a short list of things to which we **are unlikely to respond**:

- Questions that can be answered by checking the course syllabus or looking online.
- A request to know **if** you missed anything. (The answer is yes.)
- A request to know **what** you missed. (Instead of asking this through email, take the appropriate next steps to catch up: ask a classmate for notes, meet with us in office hours, etc.)

TECHNOLOGY USE DURING CLASS: You are welcome to bring a computer to class provided that it enables you to engage more in the class discussion. You may also use a computer to help you take notes. Email, Twitter, Facebook, or anything at all that is not directly related to the *conversation* we are having will not be tolerated. Using a computer in this way during a class meeting is rude and disrespectful to your classmates. If you need to use a computer in class, you will be expected to post copies of your class notes on the class website immediately following the class session to share with others. If you are not willing to do this, do not bring a computer with you.

Your phone should be turned off and put away except by express permission of the instructors (which will be given only in exceptional circumstances).

OFFICE HOURS: We look forward to meeting with you during regularly scheduled office hours, or by appointment when meeting during office hours is not possible. Students who would like to discuss issues raised in the course further than class discussions will permit, or students who encounter difficulties with the course or the assigned material, are especially encouraged to attend office hours.

ACCOMMODATION: Loyola Marymount University is committed to equality in education. Students with special needs as addressed by the Americans with Disabilities Act who need reasonable modifications, special assistance, or accommodations in this course should promptly direct their request to the Disability Support Services Office. Any student who currently has a documented disability (physical, learning, or psychological) needing academic accommodations should contact the Disability Services Office (Daum Hall Room 224, 310-338-4535) as early in the semester as possible. All discussions will remain confidential. Please visit <http://www.lmu.edu/dss> for additional information.

TENTATIVE NATURE OF THE SYLLABUS: If necessary, this syllabus and its contents are subject to revision; students are responsible for any changes or modifications distributed in class or posted on MYLMU Connect.

REQUIRED TEXTS

These texts will all be available for purchase from the bookstore. You are welcome to purchase them wherever you please or borrow them from the library, but *please use these editions of the texts* so that we are all literally on the same page during class. You will be expected to come to class with the text in hand. Some readings will be made available via electronic reserve in PDF format. We prefer that you **print** hard copies of these readings.

- Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*. Vintage Press.

TENTATIVE COURSE SCHEDULE

APPROX. NUMBER OF PAGES FOR EACH READING ARE LISTED IN PARENTHESES

I. Introduction and Approaches to the Study of Punishment and Mercy

Week 1: (67)

M Aug. 27: Course Introduction (4)

- Bible: Leviticus 24:13-22 (handout) (1)
- Beccaria, selection from ch. 12 (handout) (1)
- Machiavelli, *The Prince*, selection from ch. 17 (handout) (1)

W Aug. 29: Approaches: Theological (63)

- Bible: Leviticus 24:13-22; Matthew 5-7 (6)
- Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* II-II, q. 95, aa 1-2, 4, q. 96, aa. 2, 4-6 (4)
- Martin Luther, “The Sermon on the Mount” (7)
- Paul Ramsey, *Basic Christian Ethics*, pp. 1-24 (24)

Recommended:

- Augustine, *City of God*, Book XIX, Chs. 6, 12-17 (15)
- Pope John Paul XXIII, *Pacem in Terris* (1963), selections (7)

Week 2: (56)

M Sep. 3: NO CLASS, *Labor Day*

W Sep. 5: Approaches: Utilitarian (56)

- Jeremy Bentham, *The Principles and Morals of Legislation*, Chs. 1 and 4 (11)
- J.S. Mill, *Utilitarianism*, selections (26)
- Ross Harrison, “The Equality of Mercy” (19)

Week 3:

M Sep. 10: Approaches: Deontological (72)

- Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, Selections (48)
- John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, Selections (10)
- Jeffrie Murphy, “Mercy and Legal Justice” (14)

W Sep. 12: Approaches: Sociological (81)

- David Garland, “Sociological Perspectives on Punishment” (52)
- Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, Ch. 1 (29)

II. Punishment: Its Rationales

Week 4: Punishment as Deterrence/Incapacitation (120)

M Sep. 17: (79)

- Augustine, *On the Free Choice of the Will*, selections (4)
- Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* II-II, q. 64, aa. 2-3 (3)
- Thomas More, *Utopia*, selections (17)
- Jeremy Bentham, *The Principles of Morals and Legislation*, Chs. 7.1-6, 13-15 (36)
- John Locke, *Second Treatise of Civil Government*, Chs. 1-4 (19)

Case: Deadly force and “looting” in post-Katrina New Orleans

Recommended:

- Augustine, Letter 91 (6)
- Martin Luther, “Temporal Authority” (11)
- Beccaria *On Crime and Punishment* (12)
- Andrew Dilts, “To Catch a Thief: Punishment, Proportionality, and Criminal Subjectivity in Locke’s *Second Treatise*.” (14)

W Sep. 19: (41)

- R.A. Duff, “Critique of Deterrence Theory” (36)
- John Rawls, “A Defense of the Utilitarian View” (5)

Recommended:

- HLA Hart, “Prolegomenon to the Principles of Punishment” in *Punishment and Responsibility*.

Week 5: Punishment as Retribution

M Sep. 24: (62)

- St. Anselm, *Why God Became Man*, Selections (29)
- Immanuel Kant, *The Metaphysics of Morals*, Selections (6)
- Jean Hampton, “The Retributive Idea,” in *Forgiveness and Mercy*, eds. Jeffrie Murphy and Jean Hampton, 122-143, 157-161. (27)

Case: Adolf Eichmann

Recommended:

- Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, Conclusion.

W Sep. 26: (90)

- Bentham on retaliation (3)
- Friedrich Nietzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morality*, selections (24)
- Timothy Gorringer, “The Gospel and Retribution” in *God’s Just Vengeance*, 223-247 (25)

Recommended:

- Friedrich Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*, selections (14)

Week 6: Punishment as Discipline and Social Control

M Oct. 1:

- Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, Part 2: selections (73-75, 101-103, 130-131) and Part 3: Discipline (pp. 135-141, 167-228) (77)

Recommended:

- Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, Part 2: Punishment (pp. 73-131). (59)
- Emile Durkheim, *The Division of Labor in Society*, Ch. 2, “Mechanical Solidarity, or Solidarity by Similarities” (20)

Case: LMU Student Conduct Code

W Oct. 3:

- Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, Part 4: Prison (pp. 231-308). (78)

Recommended:

- Michel Foucault, “What is this thing called Punishing?”
- David Garland, “Review: Foucault’s ‘Discipline and Punish’--An Exposition and Critique” *American Bar Foundation Research Journal*, Vol. 11, No. 4. (Autumn, 1986), pp. 847-880. (34)

F Oct. 5: First Mini-Essay Due

III. Mercy: Its Rationales

Week 7: Mercy as Equitable Judgment (114)

M Oct. 8: (72)

- Aristotle, “On Equity” (NE V.10) (2)
- Seneca, “On Mercy,” selections (23)
- Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, II-II, q.30, aa. 1, 3-4 (4)
- Martha Nussbaum, “Equity and Mercy” (43)

Case: Mandatory Sentencing

W Oct. 10: (42)

- Beccaria, selections on pardons (4)
- Bentham, selections on pardons (5)
- Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *On the Social Contract*, Book II, Ch. 5 (3)
- Mary Sigler, “The Story of Justice: Retribution, Mercy, and the Role of Emotions in the Capital Sentencing Process” *Law and Philosophy* 19: 339-367 (29)

Week 8: Mercy as Forgiveness

M Oct. 15: (74)

- Parables and Teachings on Forgiveness: Mt. 6:12-15; 9:2-13; 18:21-35; Lk. 7:36-50; 15:1-16:13 (8)
- Joseph Butler, Sermon 9, “On Forgiveness” (10)
- Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition*, Chapter 33 (8)
- Charles Griswold, *Forgiveness: A Philosophical Exploration*, pp. 37-72, 134-146 (48)

Case: Executive Clemency

Recommended:

- Joseph Butler, Sermon 8, “On Resentment” (8)
- Nicholas Wolterstorff, “Does Forgiveness Violate Justice?” (16)

W Oct. 17:

- Jeffrie Murphy, “Forgiveness and Resentment,” in *Forgiveness and Mercy*, eds. Jeffrie Murphy and Jean Hampton, 14-34. (21)
- Derrida, “On Forgiveness” in *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*. (34)

Recommended:

- Friedrich Nietzsche, *On the Genealogy of Morality*, Second Essay, Selections

Week 9: Mercy as Restorative Justice (81)

M Oct. 22: (49)

- Andrew Skotnicki, “How is Justice Restored?” *Studies in Christian Ethics*, 187-204. (18)
- Elizabeth Kiss, “Moral Ambition Within and Beyond Political Constraints: Reflections on Restorative Justice.” (31)

Recommended

- Book of Micah, Chapters 6-7 (3)
- Aristotle, on rectificatory justice (NE V.4-5) (4)
- U.S. Catholic Bishops, “Responsibility, Rehabilitation, and Restoration.” (25)

Second Mini-Essay Due

W Oct. 24: (32)

- Annalise Acorn, *Compulsory Compassion: A Critique of Restorative Justice*, 46-77. (32)

Committee Report Due

Case: Truth and Reconciliation Commissions

IV. Current Issues

Week 10: Death Penalty Replacement with Life Without the Possibility of Parole

M Oct. 29: Public Committee Hearing

W Oct. 31: Floor Debate

Readings: (54)

- Appleton, C., & Grøver, B. (2007). The pros and cons of life without parole. *British Journal of Criminology*, 47, 597-615. (19)
- Marie Gottschalk, “The Long Shadow of the Death Penalty” in *Is the Death Penalty Dying?* (31)
- Michel Foucault, “Against Replacement Penalties” and “To Punish is the Most Difficult Thing There Is.” (4)

Recommended:

- Ashley Nellis and Ryan S. King, “No Exit: The Expanding Use of Life Sentences in America,” *The Sentencing Project*. (49)
- Ashley Nellis, “Throwing Away the Key: The Expansion of Life Without Parole Sentences in the United States.” (7)
- Kevin Cooper, Donald Ray Young, and Correll Thomas, “[Death row debate: Yes or no on the SAFE California Act?](#).” (5)
- Roger Hood and Carolyn Hoyle, “The Challenge of a Suitable Replacement” in *The Death Penalty: A Worldwide Perspective*. (21)
- Andrew Coyle, “Replacing the death penalty: the vexed issue of alternative sanctions” in *Capital Punishment: Strategies for Abolition*. (24)
- A matter of life and death: The effect of life-without-parole statutes on capital punishment. (2006). *Harvard Law Review*, 119, 1838-1854. (17)

Week 11: Amnesty for Undocumented Workers

M Nov. 5: Public Committee Hearing

W Nov. 7: Floor Debate

Readings:

- Joseph Carens, “The Case for Amnesty.” (7)
- Responses to Carens by Eamonn Callan, Jean Bethke Elshtain, Gerald Neuman, Marc Rosenblum, Carol Swain, Rogers Smith, Roberto Suro, plus Carens’ reply. (16)

Recommended:

- Javier Hidalgo, “The Political Theory of Amnesty.” (48)
- Ryan Pevnick, *Immigration and the Constraints of Justice*, esp. chs. 2, 7. (57)
- Ruth Rubio-Mar[i]n, *Immigration as a Democratic Challenge*, esp. chs. 2, 5. (40)
- Joseph Carens, “The Rights of Irregular Migrants.” (23)
- David Miller, “Irregular Migrants: An Alternative Perspective.” (5) (E&IA 22: 193-197)
- Christina Boswell, “The Elusive Rights of an Invisible Population.” (5) (E&IA 22: 187-192).
- Michael Walzer, “On Membership.” (33)
- Lakeisha Porter, “Illegal Immigrants Should Not Receive Social Services.” (6)

Week 12: Reparations for African-Americans

M Nov. 12: Public Committee Hearing

W Nov. 14: Floor Debate

Readings:

- Roy Brooks, “The Atonement Model” (40) especially 141-171.
- Iris Marion Young, “Responsibility and Historic Injustice” in *Responsibility for Justice*. (18)

Recommended:

- J. Miller and R. Kumar, eds., *Reparations*, Intro, chs. 4-6 (86)
- Roy Brooks, *Atonement and Forgiveness* (entire) (210)
- Donald Shriver, *Honest Patriots*, pp. 127-205 (79)
- John M. Parrish, “Collective Responsibility and the State” (33)
- Roy Brooks (ed.), *When Sorry Isn't Enough: The Controversy over Apologies and Reparations for Human Injustice*, Parts 6 and 7 (125).
- Eric Posner and Adrian Vermeule, “Reparations for Slavery and Other Historical Injustices” (61)

F Nov. 16: Paper Prospectus Due

Week 13:

M Nov. 19: *NO CLASS* – Individual Meetings with Instructors will be scheduled for Monday the 19th and Tuesday the 20th.

W Nov. 21: *NO CLASS, Thanksgiving Break*

Week 14: Sex Offender Residency Restrictions

M Nov. 26: Public Committee Hearing

W Nov. 28: Floor Debate

Readings:

- Jill Levenson, “Sex Offender Residence Restrictions” in *Sex Offender Laws: Failed Policies, New Directions* (19)
- Corey Yung, “Banishment by a Thousand Laws: Residency Restrictions on Sex Offenders,” Read Parts I and IV, skim the rest (60)
- Jeffery T. Walker, “Eliminate Residency Restrictions for Sex Offenders” (8)

Recommended:

- Mark Loudon-Brown, “They set him on a path where he’s bound to get ill: Why Sex Offender Residency Restrictions Should be Abandoned.” (52)
- Loic Wacquant, “Moralism and Punitive Panopticism: Hunting Down Sex Offenders” in *Punishing the Poor*. (17)
- Jonathan Simon, “Megan's Law: Crime and Democracy in Late Modern America.” (40)
- Rose Corrigan, “Making Meaning of Megan’s Law.” (46)
- Joseph Fischel, “Transcendent Homosexuals and Dangerous Sex Offenders: Sexual Harm and Freedom in the Judicial Imaginary.” (35)
- David A. Singleton, “Sex Offender Residency Statutes and the Culture of Fear: The Case for More Meaningful Rational Basis Review of Fear-Driven Public Safety Laws.” (30)
- Marcus Nieto and David Jung, “The Impact of Residency Restrictions on Sex Offenders and Correction Management Practices: A Literature Review” California Research Bureau.

V. Conclusions

Week 15:

M Dec. 3: Conclusions

W Dec. 5: Final Paper Workshop

Week 16:

W Dec. 12: Final Papers Due