International Protection of Human Rights

Despite the close of the cold war and what appears to be a growing universal acceptance of democratic and human values, people still face "gross violations" of human rights. States, regardless of their theoretical foundations (socialistic, capitalistic, communistic, monarchical, theocratic, etc.), violate the normative international order in regard to the protection of human rights. At this moment in history violations continue to be seen in a variety of states, of a variety of kinds, in a variety of regions. Unfortunately human rights violations remain a serious concern for the world community. Regrettably the realities often do not conform to the rhetoric. Events confirm that despite progress towards the universality of a rights theory, nationalism, religion and other agendas have ignited state policies and actions that are destructive of minorities, peoples and individuals.

Yet, it must also be concluded, the human rights concept has a broader acceptance than in any other time in history. While we have witnessed the appearance of creative and collective steps to address some albeit not all, human rights violations (e.g. Timor, Kosovo (1999), Afghanistan (2001…), etc.); there are many critical situations that remain unaddressed. Concomitantly we have seen a trend towards unilateralism+ (e.g., Iraq) and the appearance of systematic and gross violations of human rights that are allowed to worsen beyond reason (e.g. Darfur, Republic of the Congo, etc.). We are also facing human rights violations in failed states, where no legitimate sovereign authority can be held accountable. The human rights issues of the twenty-first century may manifest itself differently than the twentieth century, but none the less human rights violations continue to plague peoples globally. While the rape of Nanking has been replaced with the tragedy of Darfur necessitating an alteration of the global organizational response, the need to protect humans and their rights from state and their neighbors remain an imperative.

At the end of World War II (1945), in the wake of the Holocaust, the world community committed itself to a reaffirmation of humanistic goals that had, to a limited extent, previously been made part of international law. Built on lessons of the past, for example the League of Nations’ experience, states began to seriously develop international mechanisms to protect individuals from their own abuse and the abuse of others. While the record of success has been less than glorious, in fact at times disappointing, some significant steps have been made to provide a modicum of the protection of human rights. As inadequate as this system is, it has impacted the way states deal with individuals.

At the end of the last century, as a result of the events in the Former Republic of Yugoslavia, the horrific conflicts in Rwanda/Burundi and East Timor, the focus of human rights protection shifted to a global response unprecedented until that time in history. Collective military action, it was argued and demonstrated, is a legitimate response to protect peoples from gross and systematic violations of human rights. The aftermath of these events has also seen the enlargement of the use of international tribunals, (ICTY, ICTR, ICC, etc., albeit without universal acceptance) to hold individual perpetrators and not just governments accountable for human rights abuse. The beginning of this new millenium and the reaction to international terrorism (e.g. 9/11, London Tube bombings, etc.), sometimes state supported and at times not, has brought to the fore new human rights issues as to how to hold accountable those who intrude on our safety and our rights in the name of political, religious and/or other agendas. The Iraqi invasion, which is seen by many as a bilateral (USA and UK +) response to gross violations of human rights and threats to order, has put in question whether “universal” and/or “regional” organizational approval is a legal requisite to intervention in order to protect human rights.

HRA 464 /664X will explore the process of how ‘human rights’ has become increasingly internationalized. We will seek to understand how sovereignty has been in some instances limited in order to protect the individual from abuse. We will analyze the failures, as well as the successes of how international efforts, at both the universal and regional intergovernmental levels and NGO activity can monitor and control the abuse of sovereign power and at times even provide a remedy to human rights victims. Further, we will consider whether these efforts deter future violations of human rights by states or whether they are mere ineffective political promises that are meaningless. We will look at the trends, globally, regionally and the practice of individual states in order to determine whether or not the future is bright or dim for the international protection of human rights.
Readings


Human Rights Quarterly- available in the library or online (selected articles).

American Journal of International Law- available in the library or online (selected articles)

Two books related to human rights theory relevant to the research topic (likely to found in our library or in the Professor’s library).

Documentary Source Books


New York Times/Handouts

For students interested in European human rights: Send an email to newline-request@list.rferl.org with the word subscribe as the subject of the message.

Course Requirements
Students will prepare one comprehensive research paper that will explore a problem of human rights violation(s) in an area of their academic concern or explore one problem that exists in a region or a variety of states.

Graduate Students will provide a literature review for their prospective research topic at midterm.

Graduate Students will prepare three reviews with analysis of journal articles relevant to their research topic by midterm. Some of the possible choices are presented in the syllabus, but the choice is not limited by the syllabus choice.

Graduate Students will prepare two short book reviews in preparation of their research project.

Tentative Class Schedule (*subject to change*)
*Students are expected to read assignments prior to class session and be prepared to discuss the pertinent material.*
Week 1. Thursday Jan. 19  Introduction
1. Introduction of participants–Review of Syllabus
2. The meaning of human rights law-a lecture: The State, Law and the Individual
3. Need for a comparative approach. ORS:Chapter 1
4. Preliminary statement in research interest

Additional Readings: Students are to go to one country report of the US State Department and review for class discussion 2004(5) Country Report: http://www.state.gov/g/drl/hr/c1470.htm

Week 2. Thursday Jan. 26  Historical and Theoretical Background
1. The meaning of human rights- historical, philosophical and theological approaches- See for additional understandings– Ishay and Laurens and Morsink’s Books in Library or T. Orlin’s office library.
2. Historical Antecedents to human rights law
   a) Reprisals b) Minimum Standard of Justice UN Charter Chs.: VI, VII, VII
   c) Mandate System d) Minority treaties
   e) Humanitarian Law f) Humanitarian Intervention Example: Darfur

All Students-Read: (Choose one of the first two) –all to read UN Doc.
Ch. VI and VII –UN Charter

Graduate Students Choose One:
Recently received is: My Neighbor, My Enemy, Stover and Weinstein, Cambridge University Press, 2004- Note: contains many good chapters on human rights in the aftermath of mass atrocities- I ordered it for the library, but there is a copy available in my office (TSO).

Week 3. Thursday Feb. 2
UN Charter Based System to Protect the Individual
The NGO and the Role of the Civil Society
1. Review-The UN Charter (Arts. 1, 2, 55, 56, 62, 71, 86, 102,103) and the Universal Declaration

Documents- BG: pp.2-13, 18-24
WP: [http://www.3itu.int./udhr/](http://www.3itu.int./udhr/)
B: Chapter 2, I., II, III {till p. 43}

2. The NGO and the role of Civil Society in Human Rights Protection
B: Chapter 8, I and II pp. 402-413
HO: Orlin- The Local Non-Governmental Organization: The Human Rights Gatekeeper

Additional Readings: Students are to go to Amnesty International’s web page [http://www.amnesty.org](http://www.amnesty.org) and Human Rights Watch [http://hrw.org](http://hrw.org) and review for class discussion.

Graduate Students Choose One:

HRQ Vol.26, No.1 (Feb. 2004) - Sierra Leone’s Peace Process: The Role of the Human Rights Community, M. O’Flaherty (pp. 29-63)

Parker- Victims and Volunteers- New Yorker 26 Jan 04


HRQ Vol. 25, No4, (November 2003), Origins and Universality in Human Rights Debates…, Michael Goodhart, (pp. 935-965)

Week 4. Thursday Feb. 9

UN System –Charter –Based Institutions

   B: Chapter 2 V pp. 96-126

2. Human Rights Complaint System
   WP: Read and review for Class: [http://www.bayefsky.com/complain/1](http://www.bayefsky.com/complain/1)

3. Proposed Changes-Reform of the Commission and the Creations of a Council

4. Specialized Agencies  B: Chapter 2 VI pp.126-132


Week 4 Con’t.

Graduate Students: Due date for journal review #1

Week 5. Thursday Feb. 16

UN Treaties, Treaty Bodies and State Reporting

1. Ratification and Implementation of Treaties
**Documents: HO -WS.** Vienna Convention pp. 122-146- BG: Not available although in Brownlie’s Documents for International Law (p.270) or online.

2. Treaties- International Covenants- ICCPR, IESCR
   **B:** Chapter 2 III-pp-43-45

For Background see Novak’s book in Library-

**Documents: BG:** pp.172-199

**WP:** 1. Check States who have ratified the Covenants:

2. Review: [http://www.bayefsky.com/complain/1](http://www.bayefsky.com/complain/1)

3. Reservations

   **HO- WS:** Reservations pp. 281-287

   **Additional Readings: (Choose one)**


   *98AJIL3 (July 2004), Justiciability of Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights: Should there be a International Complaints Mechanism…, Dennis and Stewart, (pp.462-515)*


   *96AJIL3 (July 2002), Human Rights Treaties, Invalid Reservations and State Consent, Ryan Goodman, (pp.531-561).*

   *HRQ Vol. 25, No.4 (November 2003), UN Human Rights Treaty Bodies and Special Procedure of the Commission on Human Rights, Sir Nigel Rodley, (pp.882-909)*

**Week 6. Thursday February 23**

Treaty Bodies Operation Continued

1. ICCPR- First Optional Protocol- Human Rights Committee (HRC) **B:** Chapter 2 III –pp. 46-71
   **Documents- BG:** pp.199-206

2. Examples: Human Rights Committee/Committee on Economics Social and Cultural Rights

   **Assignment:** Students are to read one case of the HRC or a report of the ESCR Committee depending on research interests- Available in the Library or online- be prepared to discuss in class.

HRC Cases- students are to choose a case from Hanski and Scheinin or seek a report of the ESCR committee.

3. The UN as a human rights violator

   **Assignment:** HO- *HRQ, Vol.25, No.2 (May 2003), The UN as a Human Rights Violator?…, Megret, Hoffman, (pp.314- 343)*

   *HO- Orlin, et al- Report on UN Prisons in Kosovo-2001*

   *BG- Minimum Standards-pp.50-52, 52-59, 59-63, etc.*

   **Graduate Students: Due date for Journal review #2**

**Week 7. Thursday March 2**

Other Human Rights Treaties

1. Substantive Provisions **B:** Chapter 2 IV pp.71-96
Documents- Genocide, Torture, CEDAW, CERD
BG: 108-122  229-241  241-272,  224-229  160-172
3 Examples of Treaty Bodies Activities
Assignment: Students are to read one case or a report from a Treaty Body- Available in
the Library or online- be prepared to discuss in class

Additional Readings (choose one):
98 AJIL 2 (April 2004), Prosecutor v. Nahimana, Barayagwiza, & Ngeze (C. MacKinnon) ICTR Judgment on crimes against Humanity – incitement to genocide through broadcast and press. (pp.325-330)
HRQ, Vol.25, No.3, Role of NGOs…Optional Protocol CR of Child
HRQ, Vol.25, No.3, August 2003, CR of Child: A Catalyst for Innovative Child Care Policies, Davis- Powell, (pp.689-720)
HRQ Vol. 25 No.1, Feb 2003, Harris-Short-Cultural Relativism and the UNCR Child…

New Material
AJIL, VOL. 99, NO. 4 October 2005
Applying the Death Penalty to Crimes of Genocide Jens David Ohlin
This article critically examines early feminist debates over the treatment of rape in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and traces their resonances in the structure and jurisprudence of the ICTY. Observing that problematic assumptions about ethnic identity and women’s sexual and political agency emerged in the debate and ultimately wove their way into the ICTY’s legal treatment of rape, the article argues that the international criminalization of rape might be neither as pathbreaking nor as progressive as the doctrinal recognition might suggest.

Feminism and Its (Dis)contents: Criminalizing Wartime Rape in Bosnia and Herzegovina Karen Engle
When Rwanda reserved the right to execute genocidal criminals, many international lawyers objected, believing that the emerging norm of customary international law generally prohibiting the death penalty is categorical. Linking the death penalty’s role in national reconciliation with the UN Charter’s primary goal of restoring peace and security, this article argues that if this prohibition hardens into customary law, it should be sensitive to extreme circumstances such as genocide by not denying justice by local standards to its victims.

March 6th – Monday
Graduate Students: Due Date Book Review #1
Graduates and Undergraduate Students: One page paper statement- annotated with readings (footnoted)- First Outline for paper.

Week 8 Thursday March 9 European System of Human Rights
1. Substance

B: Chapter 3 1, II pp.133- 144
Documents : BG: pp.398 -423
2. Enforcement B: Chapter 3 III, pp. 144-180

Additional Readings: (choose one)
HRQ Vol.25, No.3 August 2003, *Does Membership have its Privileges...* Pamela Jordon, (pp.660-689).
97AJIL3, (July 2003)-Goodwin v. UK...(pp. 659-664)
*Podkozina v. Latvia* (pp.664-669)

Made available will be Summary Sheets from the ECHR enabling you to pick a case relevant to your research

**Spring Break – March 11-19**

*Professor will be in the Balkans and Moldova until the 11th April (March 23, 30 and April 6 sessions will be missed, made up by two Tuesdays and an extra exam date)*

Week 9. Thursday April 13  ECHR Case Examples

Cases/Examples

Each Student is to choose one case from the European Court relevant to their research.

http://www.echr.coe.int/Eng/Judgments.htm

Additional Readings (Possible Choices):
94AJIL.4 (October 2000), *Beylev v. Italy* (p.736)
*Cyprus v. Turkey (ECHR cite)* 96AJIL2 (April 2002) pp.445-453
*Badeck...*(ECHR cite)* 96AJIL2 pp. 453-461

New Material – AJIL, VOL. 99, No. 4 October 2005

*Khashiyev & Akayeva v. Russia; Isayeva, Yusupova & Basayeva v. Russia; Isayeva v. Russia* (David Kaye) ECHR decision on human rights violations during Chechen conflict

Monday April 17

Graduate Students: Due Date for Journal Review #3
Graduate Students: Due Date Book Review #2
Graduates and Undergraduates: Review of Revised outline

Week 10. Tuesday April 18 European Social Charter, Torture Convention, etc., European Union and OSCE

1. European Social Charter

B:Chapter 3 IV pp. 181-191

Documents: WS: pp. 268-281 BG: pp.423- 480 ,

2. Torture Convention, etc. B: Chapter 3 IV pp.191- 199

BG: 493- 504

3. European Union

B: Chapter 3 IV pp. 199-205

WP: http://www.curia.eu.int

Documents: BG pp.547- 557

4. OSCE

B: Chapter 3 VII pp. 205- 221

OSCE Documents (see www.osce.org) –Helsinki Accords BG: pp.557 to 657

Week 11. Thursday April 20  Inter-American System
1. Substance
   B: Chapter 4

2. Commission/ Court Systems
   WP: http://www.oas.org/

Additional Readings:
Rights System, Moir, (pp.182-213)
AJIL, Vol.95, No.1, Jan. 2001, Inter-American Court-PreTrial Detentions, etc. (p.171
AJIL, Vol.96, No.3, July 2002 (p.730-731)

Week 12. Tuesday April 25  Other Systems
1. African System
   B: Chapter 5 pp. 282-313

the Missing Agenda, B. Manby, (pp.983-1028)

2. Status in Asia of regional protection, Islam
3. US Ratifications and Status
   B: Chapter 7

Additional Reading:
HO- HRQ Vol. 27, No.4, (Nov. 2006),Who’s Watching Big Brother?Globalization and
the Protection of Cultural Rights in Present Day Africa, J. Oloka-Onyango, pp.1245-
1274.

HRQ Vol.25, No.1, (February 2001), Groups and the African Charter on Human and
Peoples Rights, Murray- Wheatley.

Week 13 Thursday April 27  Comparative Jurisprudence
Students will be do one of these three topic -
1. Indigenous Rights

ORS. (Scheinin) Ch. 7

Additional Reading:
HRQ Vol.26, No.1 Indigenous Rights in the Russian Federation:… A. Xanthaki,
(pp.74-106).
HRQ Vol.24, No. 1 Indigenous Peoples and Multi Citizenship-Holder and Corntassel
(pp. 126-152)

2. Death Penalty
   ORS Chs. 2 (Novak), 3 (Schmidt)
   Orlin- The Burdens of the Death Penalty
   Orlin- Excerpts- The Prohibition of the Death Penalty

3. The Right to Die-
   ECHR case (Pretty)
   ORS. Ch. 4 (Orlin)
   2006 Supreme court decision–Gonzalez V. Oregon

Week 14. Thursday April 27  Presentations

   Name  Title

1. 
There will be two dates when students will make presentations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date I-</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date II-</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>