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Office Hours:
By appointment, either before or after class or by Skype, FaceTime, or WhatsApp.

Please arrange an appointment to see us during the first two weeks of the quarter to discuss your interests and possible topics for a final paper.

Course Description
Activists have pushed for more public attention to specific health problems, including AIDS, autism, cancer, sickle-cell disease, and second-hand smoke. In each case, they have adopted different political strategies, and we will ask how these varied approaches have affected the search for “cures” and the responses (or the lack of response) of government agencies and political organizations. Our goal is to understand why some of these campaigns succeeded more than others, and what lessons activists might learn from each other.

To that end, not only will we examine efforts—both of government agencies and of disease-directed foundations—to improve care, to find cures, and to advance health, but we will also consider how nonscientific factors, especially political strategies, influence both the pace and the direction of biomedical science and the priorities of existing institutions.

We will also ask what role health activism should play in health policy. Many basic scientists argue that the surest route to cures and to health is through “curiosity-driven” science, supplemented by serendipity, and followed by the integration of new knowledge into practical applications. Others argue that extra-scientific passion, financial incentives, social and political organization, and strategic planning may be still more important.
We will begin with the campaign to end public smoking (starting with the Group Against Smokers’ Pollution), the Chan-Zuckerberg Initiative (“to cure, prevent, or manage all diseases by the end of this century”), the Apollo Project (which landed humans on the moon), and the “Cancer Moonshot” (to advance cancer prevention, diagnosis, and treatment), and then proceed to consider a wide variety of cases, asking similar questions of each.

The two instructors have complementary views of these efforts. Allan Tobin, Professor Emeritus at UCLA, was Director of the Brain Research Institute and Senior Scientific Advisor to a foundation dedicated to finding a cure for a rare genetic disease. Charles Noble, Professor Emeritus at CSULB, was Chair of the CSULB Department of Political Science and Director of the International Studies Program, where he studied the strategies and tactics of social movements in the United States and Europe, as well as their impact on public policy.

Assignments:
The success of this class depends on your participation in the class discussions, based on your understanding and critical evaluation of the assignments and of other relevant information that you gather. Please plan to be in class consistently and attentively. If you need to miss a class, please let us know in advance (by email).

Workload
Since Honors 130 is a 5-unit course, we expect you to spend about 15 hours per week (in addition to class time) on reading and writing assignments, including your final paper.

Twice-weekly commentaries:
The class discussions themselves will revolve around your reactions to the readings, so it is important that you think in advance about what you have read. Before each discussion, you will each submit (electronically) a 300-600-word reaction to the assigned reading, due at noon each Tuesday and Thursday. We realize that twice-weekly essays, however informal, are demanding, but we also know that our discussions will be much deeper, and more fun, when everyone has already developed a point of view. To recognize that some weeks are more demanding than others, each of you may decide to forego this preparation three times during the quarter—once during weeks 1-3, once during weeks 4-6, and once during weeks 7-9.

Some reading assignments will be longer than others, and some will be technically challenging. Please read as much as you can, and write down your considered reactions, even if based on only part of the reading.

Final Paper
Each of you will also write a final paper on a single disease-related (or health-related) campaign. We have posted a list of the titles of previously submitted papers, to give you an
idea of the broad range of possibilities. In consultation with us, you will choose a topic
during weeks 1-2. During weeks 3-7, you will do independent research and will submit a
weekly update.

During weeks 8-10, you will write a paper of about 5000 words, analyzing the problem
facing advocates, describing and evaluating the political strategies adopted by different
groups, and analyzing the successes and failures of advocacy organizations working in the
area that you have chosen. Each of you will also present, in weeks 8 and 9, an oral progress
report on your final paper. The presentation should summarize your topic, your questions,
the conflicts among stakeholders, and your preliminary conclusions. You will each have
only eight minutes (about 800 words) for this presentation, with 10 minutes for discussion.
After discussing your paper in class, you will submit an outline or a draft of your final
paper for our comments (as your submission for week 9 or 10). The final paper is due at
noon on Friday, March 22.

Clarity
For both your sakes and ours, we want your writing to be consistently straightforward and
clear. We are therefore asking that you read Strunk & White, Elements of Style, the classic
presentation of a simple prose style. The 4th Edition (2000) is available in the UCLA
Bookstore, and we have downloaded chapters onto the course website. We will also
discuss each chapter of this book in class.

Submitting your papers:
Please submit electronic versions through the course website, with the file name
“HNRS130.your-name.assignment name.week-number.date”

Name: your last name only.

Assignment name: Please use the appropriate one of the following designations
“comments” for the twice-weekly comments on the reading assignments;
“progress” for the ongoing summaries of your work on your final paper;
“draft final” for the draft of your final paper; or
“final paper” for the final paper.

Week number: the number of the week starting with “1” for the week of January 7, 2019.

Date: Please give the due date of the paper in the following form: “yearmonthdate”; your
first assignment, due at our first meeting will have the date designation “20190108.”

Example: If your name were “Smith,” the file name for your first assignment would be
“HNRS130.Smith.comments.1.20190108”.
Evaluation:
Your grades will be based on the following criteria:

1. Biweekly (20, or possibly just 17) one-page written critiques (30%),
2. Class discussion and participation (30%),
3. Oral presentation of final paper (10%), and
4. Final Paper (30%).

Relevant Majors: Life Sciences, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, or anyone interested in health activism or philanthropy.
Week-by-Week Topics

WEEK 1: BOTTOM-UP AND TOP-DOWN
1/8/19 Introductions to Each Other and to Health Activism.
What tips people into activism? How do the strategies, tactics and the goals of bottom-up organizations such as GASP [Group Against Smokers’ Pollution] differ from those of top-down groups such as the Chan-Zuckerberg Initiative [CZI]? How can each group measure its success? How does it describe its limits? Have they articulated short- and mid-term goals that might help us evaluate their efforts? If not, what might those be? Is it enough to focus on process—spending lots of money, setting worthy goals, engaging outstanding talent, and encouraging collaboration – or should they be evaluated on whether they have in fact made progress towards treatments and cures?

Possible problems for final papers.

1/10/19 Humans on the Moon: The Apollo Program
Why did the US government commit itself to putting humans on the moon? How did advocates for this project enlist broad support? How important was it to have a defined enemy, that is, to know that the USSR was also committed to exploring space? Did NASA scientists and engineers know in advance that their goal was achievable? What were the payoffs—scientific, military, political, and economic? How important was political leadership, and at what level? Did it make a difference that Kennedy was assassinated, and that Johnson became president?

WEEK 2: GOVERNMENT AND BIG SCIENCE
1/15/19 AIDS: Anger, Activism, and Science
What role does anger play in politics generally? Should the anger of those suffering play a greater role in health care policy specifically? How important to the development of the movement was the anger of people with AIDS about the lack of government action? How important was their anger about anti-gay prejudice generally? How did it matter that AIDS activists—more likely to be gay, white men—did not fully represented the diversity of those affected by HIV? Did AIDS activists target the right enemies? Was their anger always justified? How did AIDS activism affect the development of AIDS therapies, including clinical-trial design? Did learning the language and following the protocols of medical science eventually lead to co-option of activists and ultimately the movement itself? Does the government’s initial refusal to take the AIDS activists’ personal experiences seriously reflect an inherent tension between democracy and expertise?

1/17/19 The Cancer Moon Shot(s)
How does the Cancer Moonshot resemble the Apollo Program? Do we know in advance that this project’s goals are achievable? How does the contemporary cancer moonshot differ from Nixon’s “War on Cancer”? What are its probable payoffs—scientific, military, political, and economic? What are the pluses and minuses of a “Blue-Ribbon commission”? How do you think the lack of secrecy will affect the effectiveness of the project? What are
the pluses and minuses of the different kinds of programs included in the Cancer Moonshot: scientific infrastructure and “big data,” prevention programs, multidisciplinary networks, and public-private partnerships.

WEEK 3: VIRTUES AND VICES OF GOVERNMENT AND CAPITAL
1/22/19 Michigan Miseries: Bureaucracy, Management, and Politics
How much can and we should expect from government? Are public or private, profit-seeking organizations better able to address our health and welfare? Why do some people mobilize while others remain passive in the face of threats to their health? How important is anger? How important are the “mobilization” resources at the activists’ disposal? Why is solidarity important, even when some activists are more influential than others? When are celebrities important? Can their efforts be counter-productive? When do facts make a difference? Whose “facts” are believable? Who gets to choose experts? What problems do activists face in gaining the attention of government agencies? What other problems may face activists who challenge the institutional status quo? Must we lower our expectations, or should we demand even more from government?

1/24/19 Praise, Profit, and Protest for Big Pharma
Gleevec [imatinib], developed to treat a rare form of cancer (CML=chronic myelogenous leukemia), was a success for patients, for biomedical scientists, and for Novartis. What lessons can we learn from the ways that each group faced the obstacles of drug development and availability? How important were patient activists in this program? How important were profit motives? How much profit is reasonable? Would Gleevec have been developed if there weren’t so much money to be made by Novartis?

WEEK 4: BREAST CANCER: PHILANTHROPY, IDEOLOGY, AND ACCOUNTABILITY
1/29/19 Motivation and Organization
Why do so many people give to breast-cancer organizations? Do the different ways that breast-cancer patients and AIDS patients are framed (both by activists and the media), affect public attitudes and government actions? Have the pink ribbons of the Susan Komen Foundation contributed to cancer care and cure? How did Angela Jolie’s decision to have a double mastectomy and a hysterectomy contribute to breast-cancer awareness? Why is there so little consensus about mammograms? How should we evaluate the effectiveness of activist organizations—by the money they raise, how much they spend on research, their impact on research, their impact on mortality?

1/31/19 Pink Problems: “Sheroes” and the Environment
Why is there little apparent concern among breast-cancer activists about possible environmental causes of cancer? What can we learn about how politics shapes environmental policies from studies of breast cancer and of asthma?

WEEK 5: AUTISM: MOBILIZING GRIEVANCES, STIGMA, AND CHOICE OF BATTLES
Autism: Status, Stigma, and Spectrum
The recorded incidence of autism increased 30-fold in the last 30 years, but autism advocates may spend more time fighting with each other than with an indifferent public. Who has the right to speak for people autism? Is autism a disease or is it an example of the “medicalization” of individual differences.

Even among those who see autism as a medical problem, people differ on whether its source is principally genetic or environmental. How do the challenges of people with autism differ from those with cancer? What is the role of stigma and social rejection in each case? Why do health professionals now speak about an “autism spectrum” rather than a single disorder? Does this language make it more or less likely that a movement will succeed in mobilizing support for treatments and even a “cure”? What would a cure even look like?

Complexity and Controversy: The Anti-Vaccine Movement
Why has the anti-vaccine movement been so successful, despite the repeated debunking of the report that linked vaccines and autism? How can activists who are neither scientists nor physicians most usefully contribute to scientific and medical progress? Does the media’s tendency to frame any issue as a debate, and to give “both sides” equal time undermine efforts to educate the public about complex scientific issues? Do social media selectively amplify the angriest voices, making it even harder to reach a consensus?

WEEK 6: PHILANTHROPY AND MUTUAL AID: EXPERTS, DESPERADOS, AND COWBOYS (RARE DISEASES AND PROSTATE CANCER)
2/12/19 Desperation and Rare Diseases
Do treating and curing rare diseases pose special challenges? Do they also offer unusual opportunities to biomedical scientists, drug developers, and activists? How would you evaluate the effectiveness of the Odones and the Heywoods? Do you think that their efforts to master science themselves were well spent, compared to the efforts to mobilize others? Were they heroes or fools?

2/14/19 Prostate Cancer: Billionaire Interventions; Unintended Consequences of Predictive Testing
Does prostate-cancer activism differ from breast-cancer activism? What differences, positive and negative, arise when powerful, rich, and dedicated supporters like Michael Milken play particularly active roles in disease-directed organizations? What roles should non-scientists and non-physicians play in determining funding strategies and recommending treatments? What should be the role of drug companies in determining best practices for developing and evaluating diagnoses and therapies?

WEEK 7: HOW CAN ACTIVIST GROUPS CONTRIBUTE TO DRUG DEVELOPMENT?
2/19/19 Collaborations or Go-It-Alone? Huntington’s Disease and Spinal Muscular Atrophy
Activists devoted to a single rare disease often see little advantage in collaborating with groups dedicated to other diseases. Yet certain cooperative efforts have paved the way for broad approaches to rare diseases, culminating in the Orphan Drug Act and in the creation of the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences (NCATS). Is a parochial attitude realistic or flawed? How would you decide?

2/21/19 Cystic Fibrosis
The activists and professionals of the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation have contributed to the dramatic improvement in the prospects of children with cystic fibrosis, first by asking why affected children in some centers did so much better than others. They also worked with a drug company (Vertex) to develop a drug (Kalydeco [ivacaftor]) to treat one form of cystic fibrosis. How does the Kalydeco story resemble that of Gleevec? How does it differ?

WEEK 8: HOW CAN ACTIVIST GROUPS CONTRIBUTE TO IMPROVING QUALITY OF LIFE?
2/26/19 Sickle Cell Disease and Cystic Fibrosis
While many activists devote their efforts and their money to finding “a cure,” others passionately insist that their organizations devote themselves primarily to improving the lives of people already affected by the diseases. What can we learn about the effectiveness of advocacy from the changes in life expectancy for Sickle Cell Disease—a dramatic increase in the 1980s followed by a gradual decline? What can we learn from the quality-improvement program of the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, which has emphasized the search for best clinical practices. Are these lessons generalizable to other diseases that we’ve studied?

2/28/19 Alzheimer’s Disease: Cooperation with Government Efforts, or Cooption?
To what extent do the interests of patients and families align with their political and commercial allies? What are the advantages and dangers of close collaboration among people with different experiences, motivations, and even interests. Alzheimer’s Disease is a broad diagnoses. How has formulating the condition in this way affected patient and family activism, and the search for treatments, care, and cures?

WEEK 9: MEDICALIZATION, MEDICATION, AND NORMALITY, CONTINUED; HAVE SOCIAL MEDIA CHANGED ACTIVISM?
3/5/19 ADHD, Depression, and Trauma
ADHD [Attention Deficit and Hyperactivity Disorder], depression, and trauma are also broad diagnoses. What are the positive and negative aspects of framing these issues in this way? What is the role of culture in defining and medicalizing these disorders? How might big-data analyses alter our view of normal development and aging? How might such analyses change the mix of support for care versus cures?

3/7/19: Have social media changed activism? Mad Mothers and Ice-Buckets
In 2014, the ALS Association unexpectedly raised $115 million as the result of a campaign— “The Ice-Bucket Challenge”—started by a young man with ALS. Does this
success suggest that the traditional tactics and strategies of all patient advocates must change in the 21st century? What can we learn by comparing what the Ice-Bucket Challenge accomplished with the record of older successful organizations, such as Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD)?

**WEEK 10: LESSONS FROM PAST SUCCESSES AND FAILURES; PRESENT AND FUTURE APPLICATIONS**

**3/12/19 Why was AIDS Activism so Successful?**

Is the case of HIV/AIDS activism unique? Can other “disease activists” follow the same movement strategy? Did AIDS activists reject the “rules of the game” as played in medicine in the 1980s? Given the diminishing commitment of the American government to social welfare and to basic biomedical research, are there risks in focusing too much on lobbying for government involvement in activist causes? Should activist organizations interact with other, non-health related political movements, such as civil-rights organizations or environmental activists? When must organizations compete for scarce resources, and when might they usefully ally and even combine? Who should define an organization’s goals, strategy, and tactics—patients, scientists, doctors, government officials, or others? How much effort should organizations expend in increasing expertise among activists? How important is educating the public about the cause? Should activist organizations accept any money from drug companies or the health-care industry? Should such groups use the prospect of financial gain to encourage potential donors to engage in “venture philanthropy”? How might social media expand or replace face-to-face interactions in promoting activist agendas?

**3/14/19 Organizing Against Gun Violence**

Our last set of readings will deal with the responses to last year’s gun violence in Parkland, Florida (2/14/18). In your last biweekly essay, propose a letter to the gun-control activists (e.g., the Brady Campaign [http://www.bradycampaign.org](http://www.bradycampaign.org)), suggesting what they might consider doing to build their movement and to advance their goals. Among the questions your letter might address: Is there any reason for optimism that meaningful gun control might be achieved in the U.S.? How much time should these movements spend lobbying rather than demonstrating and building a mass movement? What are the barriers to building a mass movement? What is the best way to frame the movement—safety of young people? Detection and treatment of mental instability? Head-on denunciation of the NRA and gun manufacturers? Something else? How much effort should activists make to become experts in guns, gun laws, and the epidemiology of violence? Where are the possible sources of funds for such a movement? How should it measure its success in the intermediate and long terms? How much of the movement’s efforts should go to social media, and how much to face-to-face interactions? Who should be the “experts” for this new movement?
READINGS

Required Reading:

WEEK 1: GRASSROOTS & GOVERNMENT

A. 1/8/19 War on Smoking; the Chan-Zuckerberg Initiative [16 pages]

War on Smoking


Chan-Zuckerberg Initiative

B. 1/10/19 The Real Moonshot [66 pages]

Strunk & White

The Real Moonshot

   http://history.nasa.gov/ap11-35ann/legacy.html

3. [optional] The excitement around the Space Program and the other struggles of that time (racism and sexism) are wonderfully captured in “Hidden Figures” (2016, 2h 6min). [“Three brilliant African-American women overcome bigotry and sexism to become the brains behind the launch of the first American astronaut into
space.”]. The personal and technical challenges of the moon landing are nicely portrayed in the new film, “First Man,” (2018, 2h 21 min).

WEEK 2: GOVERNMENT AND BIG SCIENCE
A. 1/15/19 AIDS: Anger, Activism, and Science [83 pages + 109-minute film]

Strunk & White

AIDS: Anger, Activism, and Science


We have arranged for free online access through the UCLA Instructional Media Library. Here are the instructions for access:

Look for a tab called "Media Resources" on the left-hand side of the course webpage. You need to click on that tab for the media titles to appear. You should use Firefox, Safari, Internet Explorer or Microsoft Edge (Google Chrome is currently not supporting our streaming) as your web browser, and you must be logged into the UCLA Virtual Private Network (VPN).

The VPN serves as a proxy server to authenticate UCLA students and grant them access to restricted material. Dependent on your computer, the correct VPN and directions to download and install are available at BruinOnline ([https://www.it.ucla.edu/bol/services/virtual-private-network-vpn-clients](https://www.it.ucla.edu/bol/services/virtual-private-network-vpn-clients)). Please select the appropriate Cisco Client (SSL version) for your operating system. You should be logged into the VPN, whether on or off campus, for ultimate streaming capabilities. The VPN does disconnect if an internet connection drops, if the computer falls asleep, or if it is shut down. Please ensure that the VPN window gives you a connected status each time you will stream a title.

A physical copy will be available in the Instructional Media Lab, Powell 270, to view on-site during Lab hours: Monday through Thursday 10am to 9pm, Fridays 10am to 9pm, and Sundays 1pm to 10pm.
The Cancer Moonshot(s)


WEEK 3: VIRTUES AND VICES OF GOVERNMENT AND CAPITAL

A. 1/22/19 Michigan Miseries: Bureaucracy, Management, and Politics [72 pages + 37-minute video]

Strunk & White
1. Strunk & White, Chapter 4, “Words and Expressions Commonly Misused.” [20 pages]

Roles of Government

Mobilizing Grievances

Michigan 2015

5. Goff, V., “The Real Heroes of the Flint Water Crisis,” In These Times 4/27/16, 


https://www.democracynow.org/2016/1/8/gov_snyder_should_be_arrested_flint

LA, 1986  

LA, 2016  

B. 1/24/19 Praise, Profit, and Protest for Big Pharma [84 pages]  
Strunk & White  
Strunk & White, Chapter 5, “An Approach to Style.” [12 pages]

Gleevec  
http://www.empowher.com/chronic-myelogenous-leukemia/content/cml-patients-survivors-changing-language-cancer?page=0,1

2. Sucher, S.J., & McManus, S. (2003), “Novartis: The Challenge of Success (Parts A, B, C, & D)” Harvard Business School. To access these documents, please link to http://eb.hbsp.harvard.edu/cbmp/access/72219099. UCLA has already paid for this access, and you should be able to download the case studies, for reading or printing. [45 pages]


http://www.nature.com/scitable/topicpage/Gleevec-the-Breakthrough-in-Cancer-Treatment-565

http://www.fiercepharma.com/special-report/gleevec

   http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424127887323296504578395672582230106


WEEK 4: BREAST CANCER: PHILANTHROPY, IDEOLOGY, AND ACCOUNTABILITY
   A. 1/29/19 Motivations and Results [73 pages]
   Motivations and Results
      http://www.indiana.edu/~p374/Mengzi3.pdf

      http://www.press.uchicago.edu/Misc/Chicago/805328.html

      Also please explore the Komen website: http://ww5.komen.org

      http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/14/opinion/my-medical-choice.html

      http://www.nytimes.com/2015/03/24/opinion/angelina-jolie-pitt-diary-of-a-surgery.html?_r=0
   https://www.charitynavigator.org/index.cfm?bay=search.history.detail&orgid=4509&print=1
   Please also explore the Charity Navigator data, including US IRS Forms 990, for Komen and other foundations of interest https://www.charitynavigator.org.


    http://stm.sciencemag.org/content/8/336/336ps11.full

    https://www.statnews.com/2017/01/17/patient-advocacy-groups-donors/

    https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamainternalmedicine/fullarticle/2598094


1/31/19 Pink Problems: Sheroes and Environmental Distractions [102 pages]


   https://www.huffingtonpost.com/molly-rauch/breasts_b_2019179.html


WEEK 5: AUTISM: MOBILIZING GRIEVANCES, STIGMA, AND CHOICE OF BATTLES

A. 2/5/19 Autism: Status, Stigma, and Spectrum [58 pages]

Stigma of Neurological Differences

Hello

   https://www.statnews.com/2016/03/31/vaxxed-vaccine-autism-movie/


WEEK 6: PHILANTHROPY AND MUTUAL AID: EXPERTS, DESPERADOS, AND COWBOYS

A. 2/12/19 *Desperation and Rare Diseases* [87 pages and 135-minute film]


2. Lorenzo’s Oil (1993 film). [2 hours, 15 min]
   We have arranged for free online access through the UCLA Instructional Media Library. Here are the instructions for access:

   Look for a tab called "Media Resources" on the left-hand side of the course webpage. You need to click on that tab for the media titles to appear. You should use Firefox, Safari, Internet Explorer or Microsoft Edge (Google Chrome is currently not supporting our streaming) as your web browser, and you must be logged into the UCLA Virtual Private Network (VPN).

   The VPN serves as a proxy server to authenticate UCLA students and grant them access to restricted material. Dependent on your computer, the correct VPN and directions to download and install are available at BruinOnline (https://www.it.ucla.edu/bol/services/virtual-private-network-vpn-clients). Please select the appropriate Cisco Client (SSL version) for your operating system. You should be logged into the VPN, whether on or off campus, for ultimate streaming capabilities. The VPN does disconnect if an internet connection drops, if the computer falls asleep, or if it is shut down. Please ensure that the VPN window
gives you a connected status each time you will stream a title.

A physical copy will be available in the Instructional Media Lab, Powell 270, to view on-site during Lab hours: Monday through Thursday 10am to 9pm, Fridays 10am to 9pm, and Sundays 1pm to 10pm.


B. 2/14/19 Prostate Cancer: The Power and Unintended Consequences of Predictive Testing [59 pages]


   http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/04/business/prostate-screening-guidelines-are-loosened.html


5. Charity Navigator, Prostate Cancer Foundation, “Historical Data.” [2 pages]
   https://www.charitynavigator.org/index.cfm?bay=search.history.detail&orgid=3326&print=1


WEEK 7: HOW CAN ACTIVIST GROUPS CONTRIBUTE TO DRUG DEVELOPMENT?
A. 2/19/19 Collaborations or Go-It- Alone?[90 pages]


B. 2/21/19 Cystic Fibrosis Treatments and Cures [29 pages]

http://blogs.wsj.com/health/2012/01/31/fda-approves-vertexs-kalydeco-but-it-wont-come-cheap/?KEYWORDS=kalydeco


http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052970203752604576641142993831036

http://www.wsj.com/articles/cystic-fibrosis-foundation-sells-drugs-rights-for-3-3-billion-1416414300?KEYWORDS=kalydeco


http://ebm.bmj.com/content/21/3/83.full.pdf+html

https://www.statnews.com/2017/07/18/vertex-cystic-fibrosis-results/


WEEK 8: HOW CAN ACTIVIST GROUPS CONTRIBUTE TO IMPROVING QUALITY OF LIFE?
A. 2/26/19 Sickle Cell Disease and Cystic Fibrosis [71 pages]


http://qualitysafety.bmj.com/content/23/Suppl_1/i95.full.pdf+html


B. 2/28/19 Alzheimer’s Disease: Cooperation with Government Efforts, or Cooption?[68 pages]


WEEK 9: MEDICALIZATION, MEDICATION, AND NORMALITY, CONTINUED; HAVE SOCIAL MEDIA CHANGED ACTIVISM?

A. 3/5/19 ADHD, Depression, and Trauma [36 pages]


B. 3/7/19: Have social media changed activism? Mad Mothers and Ice-Buckets [90 pages]


https://doi.org/10.1080/15389580600727705

https://doi.org/10.1080/00036849000000041


WEEK 10: LESSONS FROM PAST SUCCESSES AND FAILURES; PRESENT AND FUTURE APPLICATIONS

A. 3/12/19 Why was AIDS Activism so Successful?[48 pages]


B. 3/14/19 Mobilizing Against Gun Violence [119 pages]


5. Strauss, V. (2018), “This Parkland student quickly amassed more Twitter followers than the NRA. Here’s what she’s been writing, Washington Post 3/1/18. [7 pages]


8. Wikipedia on Assault Weapon [8 pages]
   https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Assault_weapon


https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2012/04/23/battleground-america