

POLI 4040: International Human Rights

Spring 2016

Thursdays and Thursdays, 1:30-2:50

0229 TUREAUD HALL

Course Description:

This course focuses on government-sponsored violations of human rights, such as civil liberties restrictions, torture, political killing, and genocide. The course begins with an attempt to define human rights violations from a normative as well as a positive perspective. From there, we will explore issues related to the development of international human rights standards. We will attend to why human rights violations continue in both newly emergent states and advanced democracies. The final section of the course will focus on different efforts to curb human rights abuses, examining domestic and international institutions as well as the efforts of human rights NGOs.

Instructor

Christopher Sullivan

215 Stubbs Hall

Email: csullivan@lsu.edu

Office Hours: Tuesday/Thursdays 12:00-1:00 pm, or by appointment

A note on office hours – please email me ahead of time to let me know what you would like to discuss during office hours so that I can prepare to assist in the best way possible.

Teaching Assistant

Daniel Bollich

307 Stubbs Hall

Email: dbolli4@lsu.edu

Required Books:

(note - We will be reading large portions of the following books. They are available at the campus book store and at online retailers. The books will also be made available on library reserve.)

Donnelly, Jack. 2012. *Universal Human Rights in Theory and Practice. 3rd Edition.* Ithaca. Cornell University Press. 9780801467486

Hafner-Burton, Emilie. 2013. *Making Human Rights a Reality.* Princeton. Princeton University Press. 978-1400846283

Philip Gourevitch. 1998 *We Wish to Inform You that Tomorrow We Will Be Killed with our Families: Stories from Rwanda* New York. Picador. 978-0312243357

Suggested Books:

(note – Supplemental readings can be found in the following books. Readings from these texts will be made available online or in Middleton library. They will provide additional perspective on materials discussed in the course, but are not required for the class.)

Carey, Sabine, Mark Gibney, and Steve Poe. 2010. *The Politics of Human Rights: The Quest for Dignity*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press. 978-0521725910

Simmons, Beth. 2009 *Mobilizing for Human Rights: International Law and Domestic Politics*. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Academic Articles:

Academic articles may be accessed through <https://scholar-google-com.libezp.lib.lsu.edu/> or the library's website. If you have questions about how to use scholar.google please stop by office hours or speak with a reference librarian.

Course Requirements:

This course is reading, writing and speaking intensive; we will work to build your critical thinking skills and sharpen your analytical and presentational skills.

The structure of the class will be a mix of in-class discussion, group presentation, and lectures. To help facilitate the class discussion, it is imperative that students come prepared to each class having read that week's material and having familiarized themselves with current events. Students will be expected to complete a short response to each class' reading on *Moodle* and come prepared to discuss them in class. In addition, students will be expected to prepare 2-3 group presentations over the course of the semester. Finally, several longer written assignments will provide opportunity to assess student responses to the class readings, films, and other sources of material on human rights.

Grading:

Students will be evaluated on the following: Attendance, Participation, and Reading Responses (20%), Group Presentations (20%), Gourevich Reflection Paper (5%), Film Analyses (15%), Comparative Human Rights Paper (15%), Policy Proposal Paper (25%).

(1) Attendance, Participation, Reading Response Memos (20%) -

Students are expected to actively participate in discussion each week. To encourage adequate preparation and evaluate reading comprehension, students will be asked to write a short response to the class readings. Several question prompts will be posted to the class *Moodle* page prior to the start of the week. Students should select one of the prompts and answer it in approximately 100-150 words.

Reading responses are due by noon on the assigned class periods.

In addition, emphasis will be placed on quality of in-class participation, including discussion of the readings and responses to other students' comments. Attendance will be taken, and students will be provided with opportunities to participate in class discussions.

(2) Group Presentations (20%) -

Each student will be responsible for developing two (or more) short group presentations (5-10 minutes) on one of the case studies and then leading a class discussion (10-20 minutes) connecting the case to the class materials.

Included along with the presentation topic for each week is a list of suggested readings. These readings are just that—suggested. Other readings may be incorporated at the discretion of the group. Read and discuss what interests you about the topic. (I am also open to a change in presentation topic, though this should be done in consultation with me.)

The presentation should not just be a summary of the materials. Rather, the presenters should outline how the case should be considered within the analytical approaches described in the readings assigned to the whole class and then pose a few central questions for class discussion. I encourage presenters to see me in advance to discuss their assignment and approach.

Students will be assigned to groups of 2-3 for each presentation. If you have preferences for a specific week or topic, please let me know by email by January 21.

(3) Gourevich Reflection (5%) - *We Wish to Inform You...*

The class begins with an in-depth reflection on one of the most severe cases of human rights abuses in the past 25 years – the Rwandan Genocide. Each student will reflect upon Gourevich's book, which provides a narrative account, historical trajectory, and personal deliberation on what occurred in Rwanda. You will need to write a brief summary of *one* of the book's principal themes or arguments (no more than 200 words) and then respond. Using the book as a tool, identify the principal causes and effects of the genocide and reflect on strategies for prevention. Since the Rwandan people at one point were unified and considered the same kind of people, do you think this kind of conflict can happen anywhere? How much blame should be placed on other countries for the mass killing? In total, these should be 400-600 words (typed, double-spaced, Times New Roman, 12-point font). I will grade these for thoroughness of summary and response as well as legibility of writing.

Reflections are due by noon on January 26.

(4) Film Analyses – *Taxi to the Dark Side*, *The Act of Killing* and *Granitos* (3 x 5%) –

We will watch three films during the class. For each film, you need to write a brief summary (no more than 200 words) and your review/reflection on the movie. You need

to also relate the movie to the class readings or discussion. In total, these should be 400-600 words (typed, double-spaced, Times New Roman, 12-point font). I will grade these for thoroughness of summary and response as well as legibility of writing.

Film Analyses are due by noon on February 18, March 29, and April 26.

(5) Comparative Human Rights Paper (15%) –

Select two countries from a region of the world. Using data from Amnesty International, the US State Department, and Freedom House, (1) compare human rights reports for each country over a 2-3 year period, and (2) compare the different countries to one another. You will work on the comparative human rights paper together in groups of no more than 3 people. You should answer questions such as: What types of rights were violated? Who was being targeted? What parts of the state were involved in rights violations? Were rights improving or declining over time? Which government did better at preserving human rights? Etc. In total, this paper should be 4-5 pages (typed, double-spaced, Times New Roman, 12-point font).

Papers due by noon on March 17.

(6) Policy Proposal Paper (25%) –

A policy paper should be addressed to a specific governmental actor (e.g., president, secretary of state, members of the legislature), a specific international organization, or a human rights Non-Governmental Organization. It should propose policies for improving human rights that are feasible for that actor, and should appeal to that actor's motives and interests.

You will work on the policy proposal project together in groups of no more than 3 people. For this group research project, it is optional to select a government, IGO, or NGO that works within the region you selected above. To do so, you will need to form a group with other members of the class that share your region. This does not necessarily mean that the groups must be the same for both projects.

The policy proposal should draw heavily on research discussed in class and on empirical material documenting specific abuses committed in a particular country or region. It should connect patterns of abuse to specific proposals for improving human rights in the country or region. In total, this paper should be 8-10 pages (typed, double-spaced, Times New Roman, 12-point font).

Papers due by midnight on April 30.

Extra Credit - An exploratory paper, which takes a look at a topic of interest to you, based on published works and/or websites. I have in mind topics which are not adequately covered in the course reading, and on which you would like more information. I want to learn what information you have gathered, why you think the issue

is important, what conclusions you have provisionally drawn from the information you have gathered and, as appropriate, what you think are the biases or inadequacies of the sources that you used. Extra credit papers are worth up to 5 percentage points and should be 4-5 pages in length (typed, double-spaced, Times New Roman, 12-point font). Any extra credit papers must be completed individually and turned in by **April 26**.

Late Papers/Assignments – Late papers/assignments will not be accepted except in instances of medical necessity (with a doctor’s note) or death of an immediate relative (with an obituary or other official notice).

Grading Policy:

Highest	Lowest	Letter
100.00 %	97.00 %	A+
96.99 %	93.00 %	A
92.99 %	90.00 %	A-
89.99 %	87.00 %	B+
86.99 %	83.00 %	B
82.99 %	80.00 %	B-
79.99 %	77.00 %	C+
76.99 %	73.00 %	C
72.99 %	70.00 %	C-
69.99 %	67.00 %	D+
66.99 %	63.00 %	D
62.99 %	60.00 %	D-
59.99 %	0.00 %	F

- The letter grade A, including A+ and A-, denotes distinguished mastery of the course material.
- The letter grade B, including B+ and B-, denotes good mastery of the course material.
- The letter grade C, including C+ and C-, denotes acceptable mastery of the course material.
- The letter grade D, including D+ and D-, denotes minimally acceptable achievement.
- F denotes failure.

For the course grade, the calculated final percentage will be rounded up to the nearest integer. If you feel that an error has been made in the grading of your assignment, a written submission specifying the contested question(s) and/or issue(s) as well as the detailed reason why you feel an error has been made, including supporting documentation, should be given to the course instructor prior to scheduling a meeting to discuss the issue. Only grading issues pertaining to the substance or format of an argument or factual error on the part of the instructor will be considered eligible for review.

Cell / Internet Policy –

- Put your cell phones on vibrate and refrain from using them during class.
- Do not engage in e-communication during class. Laptops can be used for note taking. But your attention should be directed exclusively to the subject matter being discussed in class. (This means no facebook, no email, no google, etc.)
- Most of us are wired most of the time—and being wired has amazing advantages. However, being unwired also has major advantages. Your engagement in the course and opportunities for collective learning will be enhanced by maintaining focus on the classroom here and now.

Obvious courtesies

- Arrive on time
- Let me know in advance if you must leave early

A few notes on participation: (generously shared by Prof. Dan Tirone).

1. All students are expected to participate in class discussions. Students uncomfortable speaking in front of the class are encouraged to come to office hours to discuss the material.
2. Many of the issues and approaches utilized in the study of political violence are subject to debate. Students are therefore encouraged to question the material in a thoughtful and respectful manner. No student will be penalized for presenting an argument which questions the material presented; all perspectives are welcome, although they are also fair game for class discussion and debate.
3. In order to facilitate class discussion and preserve an environment in which all students are encouraged to participate, please keep your class contributions directed at the material and arguments presented and not at fellow class members. Comments of a personal nature directed against fellow students will not be tolerated.

A few notes on academic reading:

When you read an article or chapter, you should consider the following questions: What is the main claim or argument? Is it internally consistent? Is it convincing? What are the strengths and limitations of the evidence offered? Does the evidence support or refute the expectations of the argument?

A few notes on academic writing:

Written work will be graded for substance as well as for quality of writing. Students are highly encouraged to set appointments with the CxC writing center:
<https://sites01.lsu.edu/wp/cxc/writing/>

General Statement on Academic Integrity:

Louisiana State University adopted the Commitment to Community in 1995 to set forth guidelines for student behavior both inside and outside of the classroom. The Commitment to Community charges students to maintain high standards of academic and personal integrity. All students are expected to read and be familiar with the LSU Code of Student Conduct and Commitment to Community, found online at www.lsu.edu/saa. It is your responsibility as a student at LSU to know and understand the academic standards

for our community.

Students who are suspected of violating the Code of Conduct will be referred to the Office of Student Advocacy and Accountability. For undergraduate students, a first academic violation could result in a zero grade on the assignment or failing the class and disciplinary probation until graduation. For a second academic violation, the result could be suspension from LSU. For graduate students, suspension is the appropriate outcome for the first offense.

Plagiarism and Citation Method:

As a student at LSU, it is your responsibility to refrain from plagiarizing the academic property of another and to utilize appropriate citation method for all coursework. The most frequently used citation method in political science is internal citation (e.g., Sullivan 2015). I would encourage you to follow this format and include footnotes where relevant; leaving full citations for a ‘Works Referenced’ page that follows the main text.^{1[1]} Ignorance of the citation method is not an excuse for academic misconduct. Remember there is a difference between paraphrasing and quoting and how to properly cite each respectively. If you have questions regarding what is appropriate, please consult with the library’s tutorials on avoiding plagiarism and proper citation formats.

Group work and unauthorized assistance:

All work must be completed without assistance unless explicit permission for group or partner work is given by the faculty member. This is critical so that the professor can assess your performance on each assignment. If a group/partner project is assigned, the student may still have individual work to complete. Read the syllabus and assignment directions carefully. You might have a project with group work and a follow up report that is independently written. When in doubt, e-mail the faculty member or ask during a class session. Seeking clarification is your responsibility as a student. Assuming group/partner work is okay without permission constitutes a violation of the LSU Code of Student Conduct.

Students requiring special accommodation: Louisiana State University is committed to providing reasonable accommodations for all persons with disabilities. Any student with a documented disability needing academic adjustments is requested to speak with the Disability Services and the instructor, as early in the semester as possible. All discussions will remain confidential. This publication/material is available in alternative formats upon request. Please contact the Disability Services, 115 Johnston Hall, (225) 578-5919.

^{1[1]} <http://www.lib.umd.edu/tl/guides/citing-chicago-ad>

Course Outline:

Week 1 –

- January 14: Introduction and Discussion
 - What are human rights? How should we go about studying them? And how can respect for human rights be improved?

Week 2 –

- January 19 – Freedom of Expression (on Campus)
 - o **Reading Response Memo Due By Noon**
 - McMahon, John – Critical Reading and Note Taking
<http://johnmcmahon.ws.gc.cuny.edu/files/2013/10/critical-reading-workshop-handout.pdf>
 - Watanabe, Teresa, et al. 2015. “Colleges Confront Subtler forms of Bias.” *LA Times*.
<http://www.latimes.com/local/education/la-me-college-microaggression-20151112-story.html>
 - Lukanoff, Greg and Jonathan Haidt. 2015. “The Coddling of the American Mind.” *The Atlantic*
<http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/09/the-coddling-of-the-american-mind/399356/>
 - Anderson, Nick and Susan Svrluga. 2015. “Can Colleges Protect Free Speech While also Curbing Voices of Hate?” *Washington Post*.
https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/education/can-colleges-protect-free-speech-while-curbing-voices-of-hate/2015/11/10/daac2b8c-87ca-11e5-be39-0034bb576eee_story.html
- January 21: Human Rights and Human Wrongs I
 - o **Reading Response Memo Due By Noon**
 - Gourevitch, *We Wish to Inform You...* 1-101

Additional Suggested Materials:

- <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/ghosts/etc/cron.html>
- <http://genodynamics.weebly.com/>

Last day to drop the course without a W – 1/22

Week 3

- January 26 – Human Rights and Human Wrongs II
 - **Response to Gourevitch Due By Noon**
 - Gourevitch, *We Wish to Inform You...* 102-end

- January 28 – What are Human Rights?
 - **Reading Response Memo Due By Noon**
 - The UN *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*
<http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html>
 - Donnelly Ch 1-2 (pp 7-39)

Additional Suggested Materials:

- Carey, Gibney, Poe (2010) Ch.1 and Ch. 2
- https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6XXGF_V8_7M

- **Group Presentation - Case Study: The Philosophy of Human Rights**
 - Donnelly Ch 4-5
 - <http://www.humanrights.com/what-are-human-rights/brief-history/the-united-nations.html>
 - Shestack, Jerome J. 1998 “The Philosophic Foundation of Human Rights.” *Human Rights Quarterly*. 20(2): 2.

Week 4

- February 2 – The Universality of Human Rights
 - **Reading Response Memo Due By Noon**
 - Donnelly Ch 6-7 (pp 93-112)

 - **Group Presentation - Case Study: Women and the Veil**
 - “France defends full-face veil ban at European human rights court,” *Al-Jazeera*, 27 Nov. 2013.
 - “Freedom and the Veil,” *The New Yorker*. 29 Oct. 2015

- February 4 – The International Human Rights Regime I
 - **Reading Response Memo Due By Noon**

- Hafner-Burton, Part II, Ch 4-5, pp 41-86

Additional Suggested Materials:

- Hafner-Burton, Ch 1
- Donnelly Ch., 11 pp 161-192
- Simmons Ch 2, 7

- **Group Presentation - Case Study: America and the ICC**

- Kenneth Roth “The Court the US Doesn’t Want,” *New York Review of Books*. November 19, 1998, pp. 45-47.
- David Rieff, “Court of Dreams,” *The New Republic*. September 7, 1998, pp. 16-17.
- Lawrence Wechsler, “Exceptional Cases in Rome: The United States and the Struggle for an ICC,” in Sarah Sewell and Carl Kaysen, eds., *The United States and the International Criminal Court: National Security and International Law* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000), pp. 85-111

Week 5 –

- February 9 - No Class – Mardi Gras
- February 11 – Film and Discussion – *Taxi to the Dark Side*

Week 6 –

- February 16 – Film and Discussion – *Taxi to the Dark Side*
- February 18 – The International Human Rights Regime II
 - **Reading Response Memo Due By Noon**
 - **Film Analysis 1 Due By Noon**
 - Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. "International Norm Dynamics and Political change." *International organization* 52.04 (1998): 887-917.

Additional Suggested Materials:

- Sikkink, Kathryn. "Transnational politics, international relations theory,

and human rights." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 31.03 (1998): 517-523.

□ Buergenthal, Thomas. 1997. "The Normative and Institutional Evolution of International Human Rights." *Human Rights Quarterly* 19(4): 703-723.

- **Group Presentation - Case Study: International Anti-Slavery Coalitions**

- Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink. *Activists beyond borders: Advocacy networks in international politics*. Cornell University Press, 2014, pp 39-78

- David, Huw T. "Transnational advocacy in the eighteenth century: transatlantic activism and the anti-slavery movement." *Global Networks* 7.3 (2007): 367-382.

Week 7 –

- February 23 – The International Human Rights Regime III

- **Reading Response Memo Due By Noon**

- Moravcsik, Andrew. "The origins of human rights regimes: Democratic delegation in postwar Europe." *International Organization* 54.02 (2000): 217-252.

Additional Suggested Materials:

- Hafner-Burton, Ch 6

- **Group Presentation - Universal Jurisdiction**

- Aryeh Neier, "The New Double Standard," in *Foreign Policy* (Winter 1996-1997), pp. 91-106.

- Christopher Hitchens, *The Trial of Henry Kissinger* (2001) selections

- Marc Weller, "On the Hazards of Foreign Travel for Dictators and other International Criminals" *International Affairs*, Vol. 75, No. 3 (July 1999), pp. 599-617.

- February 25 - Why do governments abuse human rights? I
 - o **Reading Response Memo Due By Noon**
 - Scott, James. 2000. *Seeing Like a State* Introduction, Chapter 1 (provided)

Additional Suggested Materials:

- Carey, Gibney, and Poe Ch 4

- o **Group Presentation - Case Study: Sudan**

- Straus, Scott. "Darfur and the genocide debate." *Foreign Affairs* 84.1 (2005): 123-133
- *ICC vs. Sudan: "The Complexities Behind the al-Bashir Case"* *Spiegel International*. 5 March 2009.

Week 8 –

- March 1 – Why do governments abuse human rights? II
 - o **Reading Response Memo Due By Noon**
 - Hafner-Burton, 19-40

Additional Suggested Materials:

- Carey, Gibney, and Poe Ch 5

- o **Group Presentation - Case Study: Abu Ghraib Prison, Iraq (2003)**

- Hersh, Seymour M. "Torture at Abu Ghraib: American Soldiers Brutalized Iraqis. How Far Up Does the Responsibility Go?" *The New Yorker*. 10 May 2004.
- Brookes, Emma. "What happens in war happens" *The Guardian*, 9 February 2009.
<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2009/jan/03/abu-ghraib-lyndie-england-interview>

- March 3 – Measuring Human Rights
 - **Reading Response Memo Due By Noon**
 - Brysk, Allison. 1994. “The Politics of Measurement: The Contested Count of the Disappearance in Argentina” *Human Rights Quarterly*, 16(4):676-692.
 - Ron, James, Howard Ramos, and Kathleen Rodgers. “Transnational Information Politics: NGO Human Rights Reporting, 1986-2000.” *International Studies Quarterly* Vol. 49, No. 3, (2005) pp. 557-587
 - **Group Presentation 1 - Amnesty International Annual Country Reports**
 - <https://www.amnesty.org/en/documents/pol10/0001/2015/en/>
 - **Group Presentation 2 - US State Department Annual Country Reports**
 - <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2009/frontmatter/135934.htm>
 - **Group Presentation 3 - Freedom House Index**
 - <http://www.freedomhouse.org/>

Note: Presentations on this date should introduce the data sources, describe its methods for data collection, discuss how these data should assist us in understanding patterns of human rights abuse, and review any potential biases in the data/methodology.

Week 9 –

- March 8 - Surveillance and Civil Liberties Restrictions
 - **Reading Response Memo Due By Noon**
 - Schwartz, “The Whole Haystack” *The New Yorker* (provided)
 - Jouval, Justin. 2015. “The New Way Police are Surveilling You: Calculating your Threat Score.” *Washington Post*.
https://www.washingtonpost.com/local/public-safety/the-new-way-police-are-surveilling-you-calculating-your-threat-score/2016/01/10/e42bccac-8e15-11e5-baf4-bdf37355da0c_story.html

- **Group Presentation: Case Study: Edward Snowden**
 - Scheurman, William. 2014. “Edward Snowden and the Ethic of Whistleblowing.” *Boston Review*
<http://www.bostonreview.net/books-ideas/scheurman-snowden-greenwald-harding-sagar>
 - Greenwald, Glenn. *No place to hide: Edward Snowden, the NSA, and the US surveillance state*. Macmillan, 2014.

- March 10 - Drone Warfare and Targeted Assassinations
 - **Reading Response Memo Due By Noon**
 - Coll, Steve. 2014. “The Unblinking Stare” *The New Yorker* (provided)

 - **Group Presentation – Drones & Global Counter-Insurgency**
 - Michael Hastings, “The Rise of the Killer Drones: How America Goes to War in Secret,” *Rolling Stone*, April 16, 2012
 - Mary Ellen O’Connell, “When Are Drone Killings Illegal?” *CNN*, Aug. 12, 2012.
 - Scott Shane, “The Moral Case for Drones,” *New York Times*, July 14, 2012.
 - Kilkullen, David 2006. *The Accidental Guerrilla*. Oxford, Oxford University Press (selections)

Week 10 –

- March 15 - Film and Discussion – *The Act of Killing*

- March 17 - Film and Discussion – *The Act of Killing*
 - **Human Rights Data Review Due**

Week 11 –

- March 22
 - No Class – Spring Break

- March 24
 - No Class – Spring Break

Week 12 –

- March 29 – The Responsibility to Protect and International Intervention
 - o **Film Analysis 2 Due by Noon**
 - o **In Class Simulation – Humanitarian Intervention**

Additional Suggested Materials:

- Donnelly Ch 15 (p 254-271)
- Carey, Gibney, and Poe Ch 6

- March 31 - Genocide
 - o **Reading Response Memo Due By Noon**
 - Benjamin Valentino, 2000. “Final Solutions: The Causes of Mass Killing and Genocide,” *Security Studies* 9 (3), 1-59
 - o **Group Presentation - Individual Participation in Genocide**
 - Daniel Goldhagen, 1997. *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust* (New York: Vintage, 1997), selections.
 - Browning, Christopher R. *Ordinary men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the final solution in Poland*. Vol. 1998. New York: HarperCollins, 1992. selections
 - Straus, Scott. *The order of genocide: Race, power, and war in Rwanda*. Cornell University Press, 2013. Selections.

Last day to drop the course with a W – 4/4

Week 13 –

- April 5 - Improving Human Rights, Democracy
 - o **Reading Response Memo Due By Noon**
 - Davenport, Christian 2007b. *State repression and the domestic democratic peace*. Cambridge University Press. Ch 1, 2 (provided)
 - Moore, Will. 2010. “Incarceration, Interrogation, and Counterterrorism: Do (Liberal) Democratic Institutions Constrain Leviathan?” *PS: Political Science and Politics*. 43(2): 421-424.

Additional Suggested Materials:

□ Davenport, Christian. "When democracies kill: Reflections from the US, India, and Northern Ireland." *International Area Studies Review* 15.1 (2012): 3-20.

○ **Group Presentation – Case Study: Torture and Democracy**

- Rejali, Darius. 2007. *Torture and Democracy*, Princeton University Press, pp. 8-25 and pp. 35-63
- Levinson, Sanford. (ed.) 2006. *Torture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (selections)
- Greenberg, Karen (ed). 2006. *The Torture Debate*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (selections)
- Cohen, Andrew. 2012. "The Torture Memos, 10 Years Later." *The Atlantic*. 6 February 2012.

- April 7 - Improving Human Rights, International Law

○ **Reading Response Memo Due By Noon**

- Hafner-Burton, Ch 7-8

Additional Suggested Materials:

- Simmons, Ch 7

○ **Group Presentation - Case Study: Human Rights in Syria**

- Sunga, Lyal. 2015. "Can International Law Meet the Challenges of Today's Conflicts?" *The Guardian*.
<http://www.theguardian.com/global-development-professionals-network/2015/nov/14/international-law-yemen-syria-isis-conflict>
- Scaturro, Michael. 2013. "Why Human Rights Groups Don't Agree About Syria." *The Atlantic*.
<http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2013/09/why-human-rights-groups-dont-agree-on-what-to-do-about-syria/279360/>
- Zenko, Micah. 2015. "Counting the dead in Syria." *The Atlantic*.
<http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2015/09/syria-civil-war-civilian-deaths/405496/>

Week 14 –

- April 12 - Improving Human Rights, NGOs

○ **Reading Response Memo Due By Noon**

- Hafner-Burton, Ch 9

- **Group Presentation - Social Media and Social Movements**

- Naoum, Nichole. "Social Media And Human Rights: Empowering The Voiceless." *San Diego News.com*, 14 March, 201.
- Revolution 2.0: *How Social Network Sites can Move Social Mountains*, Department of Internet Studies, Curtin University, 23 April, 2011
- Branch, Adam. "Dangerous ignorance: The hysteria of Kony 2012" Aljazerra. 12 March 2012.

- April 14 - Film and Discussion – PBS *Granitos*

Week 15 –

- April 19 - Film and Discussion – PBS *Granitos*

- April 21 - Improving Human Rights, Domestic Human Rights Institutions

- **Reading Response Memo Due By Noon**

- Hafner-Burton Ch 10

Additional Suggested Materials:

- Carey, Gibney, and Poe Ch

7

- **Group Presentation - Human Rights Prosecutions**

- Kathryn Sikkink, *The Justice Cascade: How Human Rights Prosecutions are Changing World Politics*. New York: Norton, 2011. (selections)
- Melissa Nobles, "The Prosecution of Human Rights Violations," *The Annual Review of Political Science*, (2010) 13:165-82
- Jack Snyder and Leslie Vinjamuri, "Trials and Errors: Principle and Pragmatism in Strategies of International Justice," *International Security*, vol. 28, no.3 (Winter 2003/04) 5-44.
- Owen Fiss, "Within Reach of the State: Prosecuting Atrocities in Africa," *Human Rights Quarterly*, (2009): 59 -69
- David Pion-Berlin, "To Prosecute or to Pardon? Human Rights Decisions in the Latin American Southern Cone," *Human Rights Quarterly* 15 (1993) 105-130.

□ Kathryn Sikkink and Carrie Booth Walling, “The Impact of Human Rights Trials in Latin America,” *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol.44, no.4 (Jul 2007): 427–445

Week 16 –

- April 26 - In-Class Research Workshop
 - **Film Analysis 3 Due by Noon**

- April 28, Reflections and Final Discussion
 - **Reading Response Memo Due By Noon**
 - Hafner-Burton, Ch 11-12

 - **Group Presentation – Advocacy**
 - Rieff, David. “The Precarious Triumph of Human Rights.” *New York Times Magazine*. 8 August 1999.
 - Ron, James, David Crow and Shannon Golden. “The Struggle for a Truly Grassroots Human Rights Movement.” *Open Democracy*. 18 June 2013
 - Michael Ignatieff, “Is History Still on the Side of Human Rights?,” International Center for Transitional Justice Debate, March 2, 2015.

Policy Proposal Paper Due by Midnight on April 30

Group Presentations:

January 28 - Case Study: The Philosophy of Human Rights

February 2 - Case Study: Women and the Veil

February 4 - Case Study: America and the ICC

February 18 - Case Study: International Anti-Slavery Coalitions

February 23 - Universal Jurisdiction

February 25 - Case Study: Sudan

March 1 - Case Study: Abu Ghraib Prison, Iraq (2003)

March 3 - Group Presentation 1 - Amnesty International Annual Country Reports

March 3 - Group Presentation 2 - US State Department Annual Country Reports

March 3 - Group Presentation 3 - Freedom House Index

March 8 - Case Study: Edward Snowden

March 10 - Drones & Global Counter-Insurgency

March 31 - Individual Participation in Genocide

April 5 - Case Study: Torture and Democracy

April 7 - Case Study: Human Rights in Syria

April 12 - Social Media and Social Movements

April 21 - Human Rights Prosecutions

April 26 - Advocacy