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# Article summary:

1. The international human rights regime is deeply politicized, with decisions to “name and shame” human rights violations reflecting the political interests of individual states.

2. This paper shows that politicized enforcement is not a fixed attribute of the human rights regime but rather a dynamic phenomenon that varies markedly across different norms.

3. A theory of politicization is developed which accounts for variation in the effect of geopolitics on human rights enforcement, based on how sensitive the specific norm in question is perceived to be by target authorities.

# Article rating:

Appears moderately imbalanced: The article provides some useful information, but is missing several important points or pieces of evidence that would be required to present the discussed topics in a balanced and reliable way. You are encouraged to seek a more balanced perspective on the presented issues by exploring the provided research topics and looking at different information sources.

# Article analysis:

The article provides an interesting analysis of the politicization of the international human rights regime, and offers a theory to explain why certain norms are more likely to be enforced than others. The article does a good job of providing evidence for its claims, using data from the UN Universal Periodic Review (UPR). However, there are some potential biases and missing points of consideration that should be noted.

First, there is a lack of exploration into counterarguments or alternative explanations for why certain norms are more likely to be enforced than others. For example, it could be argued that geopolitical relationships are not necessarily driving these patterns – instead, it could be due to other factors such as cultural similarities between states or shared values and beliefs about what constitutes acceptable behavior in terms of human rights violations.

Second, there is also a lack of discussion about possible risks associated with politicizing enforcement in this way – for example, if states only enforce certain norms selectively based on their geopolitical relationships, then this could lead to an erosion of trust in the international system and undermine global efforts to promote universal respect for human rights.

Finally, while the article does provide evidence for its claims using data from UPRs, it would have been useful if additional sources had been used to support its arguments – such as case studies or interviews with experts in the field – as this would have provided further insight into why certain norms are more likely to be enforced than others.

In conclusion, while this article provides an interesting analysis into the politicization of international human rights regimes and offers a compelling theory to explain why certain norms are more likely to be enforced than others, there are some potential biases and missing points of consideration that should be noted when assessing its trustworthiness and reliability.

# Topics for further research:

* Geopolitical relationships and human rights
* Cultural similarities and human rights
* Shared values and beliefs about human rights
* Risks of politicizing human rights enforcement
* International system and human rights
* Case studies of human rights enforcement
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