

**POLI 4040: International Human Rights**

Spring 2018

Wednesday, 3:30-6:20

Coates, 218

**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 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

Email: csullivanlsu@gmail.com

Office: 219 Stubbs Hall

Office Hours: Weds and Fri 11am-12pm and 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.

Email “office hours”: 12:30-2, m-f

I prefer to structure my engagement with email. If you need a prompt response, please reach me during these hours.

**Teaching Assistant:**

Huan Wang

Email: hwang69@lsu.edu

Office Hours: as announced and by appointment

**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.)

Sabine Carey, Mark Gibney, and Steven Poe. *The Politics of Human Rights: The Quest for Dignity*. New York. Cambridge University Press.

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.

Matthew Desmond. 2016. *Evicted: Poverty and Profit in the American City*. New York: Crown

### **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 and Learning Outcomes:**

This course is reading, writing, and speaking intensive; we will work to build your critical thinking as well as 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 and come prepared to discuss them in class. For each class, a list of question prompts will be posted to *Moodle* page. Students should select one of these prompts and answer it in 200-300 words. Please print these paragraphs and bring them to class.
- During class, students will be expected to engage in class discussion. Each student should be prepared to write down at least one contribution to our conversation at the end of each class period.
- In addition, students will be expected to prepare 2-3 group presentations over the course of the semester.
- Several longer written assignments will provide opportunity to assess student responses to the class readings, films, and other sources of material on human rights.
- Peer grading will provide an integral part of the evaluation process. For the longer written assignments (excluding the final project), students will be randomly assigned a peer's paper to read, evaluate, and grade. By evaluating one another's work you will improve both your peer's writing and your own.

My intention is to develop a participatory environment that facilitates peer-to-peer education. Through in-depth discussion, we will debate critical issues relating to human rights. My goal as the instructor is to tether these discussions to broader political concepts (such as the state, citizens, advocacy, etc.) in order to make sense of complex

relationships. As the semester progresses, we will work to move from practice to skill, and enrich student competency in the fundamental issue areas necessary for political participation—critical thinking, coherent writing, public presentation, and collective engagement.

### **Grading:**

Students will be evaluated on the following -

- (1) Attendance, Participation, and Reading Responses (25%)
- (2) Group Presentations (20%)
- (3) Book Reflection Papers (2x 5%)
- (4) Film Analyses (3x 5%)
- (5) Group Policy Proposal Paper (30%).

#### **(1) Attendance, Participation, Reading Response Memos (30%) -**

Students are expected to actively participate in discussion each week. To encourage adequate preparation and evaluate reading comprehension, students will 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 200-300 words. Update your response to *Moodle* by noon. You will not be asked to read it in class, but it might help to motivate discussion.

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 as well as a one sentence summary of how each student contributed to the class discussion.

#### **(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 presentations should begin with a summary, acknowledging that the other class members have not completed the additional assigned presentation readings.

The group should provide a history of the case or issue, assuming that the class knows nothing in advance. The use of slides and course handouts is highly encouraged.

The presentation should not just be a summary of the materials. Rather, the presenters should outline how the case should be considered in relation to 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 for each presentation. If you have preferences for a specific week or topic, please let me know by email by January 16<sup>th</sup>.

### **(3) Book Reflection (2 x 5%) - *We Wish to Inform You..., Evicted***

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 summary of *one* of the book’s principal themes or arguments (no more than 300 words) and then respond to one or more of the following prompts: 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? Who bears the greatest responsibility for the genocide, the Rwandan people, the Rwandan government, or some other actor? How much blame should be placed on other countries for the mass killing?

Towards the end of the semester, we will consider issues of “positive human rights.” Specifically, we will consider the roll of housing as a right through Matthew Desmond’s *Evicted*. Each student will reflect upon the book, which provides a narrative account of how inequality is perpetuated through cycles of housing deprivation. You will need to write a summary of *one* of the book’s principal themes or arguments (no more than 300 words) and then respond to one or more of the following prompts: Should governments be obligated to provide housing for their citizens? What would a fair housing policy look like? What should the international human rights community do to improve access to housing in the United States and elsewhere? What rights should take priority over positive human rights, such as housing?

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 clarity of writing.

**Reflections are due by noon on January 17 and April 18.**

**Peer-to-peer grading assignments will be distributed by January 19 and April 20. Comments and grades are due back to the TA by midnight January 21 and April 22.**

**Note - Failure to complete your assigned peer-to-peer grading will automatically lead to a 0 for the student responsible for the grading. In such settings, the TA will then be assigned to grade the ungraded paper.**

**(4) Film Analyses –*The Act of Killing*, *The Battle of Algiers*, and *Granito* (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 provide your review/reflection on the movie. For the first film, you will need to reflect on the film and consider how it informs your understanding of another topic we have discussed in class. For the second film, you will need to analyze the film to consider how it relates to one of the class readings. For the third film, you will need to develop a coherent argument relating the film to a broader theme in our course and back that argument up with examples from the film.

All three responses 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 clarity of writing.

**Film Analyses are due by midnight on February 25, March 18, and April 8.**

**Peer-to-peer grading assignments will be distributed by February 28, March 21, and April 11. Comments and grades are due back to the TA by midnight March 4, March 25, and April 15.**

**Note - Failure to complete your assigned peer-to-peer grading will automatically lead to a 0 for the student responsible for the grading. In such settings, the TA will then be assigned to grade the ungraded paper.**

## Notes on Peer-to-Peer Grading:

- Before you even make your first comment, read the document all the way through.
- Make sure you leave enough time for you to read through, respond, and for your peer to edit his/her document with your comments before any deadlines.
- Point out the strengths as well as the weaknesses of the document.
- Offer suggestions, not commands.
- Editorial comments should be appropriate and constructive. There is no need to be rude. Be respectful and considerate of the writer's feelings.
- Be sure that your comments are clear and text-specific so that your peer will know what you are referring to (for example, terms such as "unclear" or "vague" are too general to be helpful).
- As a reader, raise questions that cross your mind, points that may have not occurred to your peer author.
- Try not to overwhelm your peer with too much commentary.
- Be careful not to let your own opinions bias your review (for example, don't suggest that your peer completely rewrite the paper just because you don't agree with his/her point of view).
- Reread your comments before passing them on to your peer. Make sure all your comments make sense and are easy to follow.
- Avoid turning your peer's paper into your paper.
- Grade the paper in accordance with the assigned rubric.
- Upon completion, email comments and grades back to the TA.

## (5) Policy Proposal Paper (30%) –

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.

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 May 3.**

### **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). Please cite your sources in the paper.

**Extra credit papers must be completed individually and turned in by noon on April 18.**

### **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:**

<b>Highest</b>	<b>Lowest</b>	<b>Letter</b>
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 :**

- 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.
- Put your cell phones on vibrate and refrain from using them during class. I do not want to see them on your desks.
- Laptops can be used for note taking during presentations. But your attention should be directed exclusively to the subject matter being discussed in class. (This means no facebook, no email, no google, etc.)
- During discussion (i.e., the bulk of the class) please refrain from opening laptops. They impose physical barriers between students that can disturb conversation.

### **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](http://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.<sup>1[1]</sup> 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.

---

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

**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.

## **Important Dates:**

**01/17 – Book response 1 due by noon. Please upload to the course moodle.**

**02/25 – Film response 1 due by midnight. Please upload to the course moodle. Peer-to-peer grading due 02/28.**

**03/18 – Film response 2 due by midnight. Please upload to the course moodle. Peer-to-peer grading due 03/04.**

**04/08 – Film response 3 due by midnight. Please upload to the course moodle. Peer-to-peer grading due 03/21.**

**04/18 – Book response 2 due by noon. Please upload to the course moodle. Peer-to-peer grading due 04/22.**

**Extra credit due by noon. Please email me directly.**

**05/03 – Policy proposal paper due by midnight. Please have one group member upload each group's paper to the course moodle.**

## Course Outline:

Week 1 – January, 10th

- Introduction and Discussion

Week 2 – January 17<sup>th</sup>

- Human Rights and Human Wrongs
  - o **Response to Gourevitch Due By Noon**
    - Gourevitch, *We Wish to Inform You...* (1-208)

<b>01/19</b>	Final date for dropping courses without receiving a grade of “W”, 4:30 p.m. deadline
--------------	--

Week 3 – January, 24<sup>th</sup>

- What are Human Rights?
  - o **Reading Response Memo Due in Class**
    - Carey et al. Ch 1-2 (pp 7-69)
    - John McMahon – *Critical Reading*  
<http://johnmcmahon.ws.gc.cuny.edu/files/2013/10/critical-reading-workshop-handout.pdf>
  - o **Group Presentation – Case Study: Freedom of Expression**
    - Teresa Watanabe, et al. 2015. “Colleges Confront Subtler forms of Bias.” *LA Times*. <http://www.latimes.com/local/education/la-me-college-microaggression-20151112-story.html>
    - Greg Lukanoff 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/>
    - Gannon, “UChicago’s Anti-Safe Space Message,” *Vox*  
<http://www.vox.com/2016/8/26/12657684/chicago-safe-spaces-trigger-warnings-letter>
    - Arthur Lupia and Anne Norton. "Inequality is Always in the Room: Language & Power in Deliberative Democracy." *Daedalus* (2017).
  - o **Group Presentation: Negative and Positive Rights**
    - Donnelly, J. (1982). Human rights and foreign policy. *World Politics*, 34(4), 574-595.
    - Carey, 70-99

- Dylan Matthews, “Basic Income: The World’s Simplest Plan to End Poverty” *Vox* <https://www.vox.com/2014/9/8/6003359/basic-income-negative-income-tax-questions-explain>
- Owen Cass. “Why a Universal Basic Income is a Terrible Idea.” *The National Review*.  
<http://www.nationalreview.com/article/436621/universal-basic-income-ubi-terrible-idea>
- Hamm, Brigitte I. "A human rights approach to development." *Human Rights Quarterly* 23.4 (2001): 1005-1031.

Week 4 – January 31<sup>st</sup>

- Why do governments abuse human rights?
  - **Reading Response Memo Due in Class**
    - Hafner-Burton, 19-40
    - Carey, 104-144
  - **Group Presentation: Case Study: Drones & Global Counter-Insurgency**
    - □ Coll, Steve. 2014. “The Unblinking Stare” *The New Yorker* (provided)
    - 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.  
<http://www.nytimes.com/2016/02/21/opinion/sunday/drone-warfare-precise-effective-imperfect.htm>
    - Danilee Achigburg, “Targeted Killings through drones are War Crimes,” *openDemocracy*  
<https://www.opendemocracy.net/daniele-archibugi/targeted-killings-through-drones-are-war-crimes>
    - “Spies in the Skies,” *Buzzfeed*.  
<https://www.buzzfeed.com/peteraldhous/spies-in-the-skies>
  - **Group Presentation – Civil Liberties**
    - □ Connor Gearty “Human Rights, Civil Liberties And Democracy: ideas in conflict or in partnership?” Lecture (provided)
    - □ Neil M Richards. "The dangers of surveillance." *Harvard Law Review* 126.7 (2013): 1934-1965.
    - □ Starr, Amory, et al. "The impacts of state surveillance on political assembly and association: A socio-legal analysis." *Qualitative Sociology* 31.3 (2008): 251-270.
    - □ Schwartz, “The Whole Haystack” *The New Yorker* (provided)

Week 5 – February 7<sup>th</sup>

- Democracy and Human Rights

○ **Reading Response Memo Due in Class**

- Christian Davenport. 2007b. *State repression and the domestic democratic peace*. Cambridge University Press. Ch 2 (provided)
- Will Moore. 2010. "Incarceration, Interrogation, and Counterterrorism: Do (Liberal) Democratic Institutions Constrain Leviathan?" *PS: Political Science and Politics*. 43(2): 421-424.

○ **Group Presentation: Torture and Democracy**

- Darius Rejali. 2007. *Torture and Democracy*, Princeton University Press, pp. 8-25 (provided)
- David Cole "The Torture Memos: The Case Against Lawyers" *New York Review of Books*.  
<http://www.nybooks.com/articles/2009/10/08/the-torture-memos-the-case-against-the-lawyers/>
- Atul Gwande "Hellhole: Is Solitary Confinement Torture" *The New Yorker*. 9 March 2009. (provided)
- 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>

○ **Group Presentation – International Obligations**

- Carey et al. Ch 3 pp 71-99
- Hathaway, Oona A., Philip Levitz, Elizabeth Nielsen, and Aileen Nowlan. "Human Rights Abroad: When Do Human Rights Treaty Obligations Apply Extraterritorially." *Ariz. St. LJ* 43 (2011): 389.
- Scott Straus. "Darfur and the genocide debate." *Foreign Affairs* 84.1 (2005): 123-133
- IRC, "The Refugee Crisis in Europe and the Middle East." <https://www.rescue.org/sites/default/files/document/911/ircrisisappealcompositerevaugust.pdf>

Week 6 – February 14<sup>th</sup>

- Class Cancelled – Mardi Gras

Week 7 – February 21<sup>st</sup>

- Film and Discussion – *The Act of Killing*
  - o **Film Analysis 1 Due By Midnight Sunday**

Week 8 – February 28<sup>st</sup>

- The Responsibility to Protect
  - o **Reading Response Memo Due in Class**
    - Carey et al. Ch 6 p 166-192
    - David Rieff, 2008. “Humanitarian Vanities,” *The New York Times*
  - o **Group Presentation – Decision-making and the R2P**
    - Ivo Daalder 1998 “Decisions to Intervene” *Brookings*  
<https://www.brookings.edu/articles/decision-to-intervene-how-the-war-in-bosnia-ended/>
    - Taylor Seybolt. *Humanitarian Intervention* Ch 1, 2, 8. Provided.
  - o **Group Presentation – Case Studies: Myanmar & Chad**
    - Ben Taub, “The Emergency on Lake Chad” *The New Yorker* 12/4/2017 (provided)
    - Sarah Wildman, “The World’s Fastest Growing Refugee Crisis.” *Vox*.  
<https://www.vox.com/world/2017/9/18/16312054/rohingya-muslims-myanmar-refugees-violence>
    - John Feffer, “The Rohingya and the Responsibility to Ignore.” *Huffington Post* [https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/the-rohingya-and-the-responsibility-to-ignore\\_us\\_59c52ca0e4b0b7022a6469f0](https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/the-rohingya-and-the-responsibility-to-ignore_us_59c52ca0e4b0b7022a6469f0)
    - Amanda Taub, “Myanmar and Ethnic Cleansing.” *New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/09/18/world/asia/myanmar-rohingya-ethnic-cleansing.html>

Week 9 – March 7<sup>th</sup>

- Are Human Rights Improving?
  - o **Reading Response Memo Due in Class**
    - Steven Pinker, *The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined*, chapter 4, “The Humanitarian Revolution,” pp. 129-188. (provided)
    - Carey, 102-125

- **Group Presentation –Human Rights Advocacy I**
  - Alexander Cooley and James Ron, “NGO Scramble: Organizational Insecurity and the Political Economy of Transnational Activism,” *International Security*, 2002, 27(1): 5-39
  - Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink. "Transnational advocacy networks in international and regional politics." *International Social Science Journal* 51.159 (1999): 89-101.
  - James Ron , David Crow and Shannon Golden. “The Struggle for a Truly Grassroots Human Rights Movement.” *Open Democracy*. 18 June 2013 <https://www.opendemocracy.net/openglobalrights/james-ron-david-crow-shannon-golden/struggle-for-truly-grassroots-human-rights-move>
  - Brysk, Alison. "From above and below: Social movements, the international system, and human rights in Argentina." *Comparative Political Studies* 26.3 (1993): 259-285.
  
- **Group Presentation –Human Rights Advocacy II**
  - Adam Branch. “Dangerous ignorance: The hysteria of Kony 2012” Aljazerra. 12 March 2012.
  - Emilie M Hafner-Burton., and James Ron. "Seeing double: Human rights impact through qualitative and quantitative eyes." *World Politics* 61.2 (2009): 360-401.
  - Clifford Bob 2002 “Merchants of Morality” *Foreign Affairs*.
  - Lyal Sunga. 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>

Week 10 – March 14<sup>th</sup>

- Film and Discussion – *Battle of Algiers*
  - **Film Analysis 2 Due By Midnight Sunday**

Week 11 – March 21<sup>st</sup>

- The International Human Rights Regime
  - **Reading Response Memo Due in Class**
    - Hafner-Burton, pp 41-116
  
  - **Group Presentation – Human Rights Prosecutions**
    - 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.
- Max Pensky, "Amnesty on Trial" *Ethics and Global Politics* <http://www.ethicsandglobalpolitics.net/index.php/egp/article/view/1816>
- David Rieff, "Court of Dreams," *The New Republic*. September 7, 1998, pp. 16-17.

- **Group Presentation – Efforts to Improve International Law**
  - Hafner-Burton, Ch 7
  - 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.
  - Ryan Goodman and Derek Jinks. "How to influence states: Socialization and international human rights law." *Duke Law Journal* (2004): 621-703.
  - Jacob Mchangama and Guglielmo Verdirame, 2013. "The Danger of Human Rights Proliferation: When Defending Liberty, Less Is More" *Foreign Affairs*

<b>03/23</b>	Final date for dropping courses, 4:30 p.m. deadline
--------------	---

Week 12 – March 28<sup>th</sup>

- No Class – Spring Break

Week 13 – April 4<sup>th</sup>

- Film and Discussion –Granito
  - **Film Analysis 3 Due By Midnight Sunday**

Week 14 – April 11<sup>th</sup>

- Evicted
  - **Response to Desmond Due By Noon**
    - Desmond, *Evicted* (all)

Week 15 – April 18<sup>th</sup>

- Improving Human Rights
  - **Reading Response Memo Due in Class**
    - Hafner-Burton, pp 135-176

- **Group Presentation – Case Studies on the Effects of International Law**
  - Simmons – Japan and CEDAW, pp 237-255. (provided)
  - Simmons – Israel, Chile, and ICAT, pp 284-306 (provided)
  - Menand, Louis. “What Happens When War is Outlawed.” *The New Yorker*. (provided)
  
- **Group Presentation – The Future of Human Rights**
  - Jennifer Earl. "Tanks, tear gas, and taxes: Toward a theory of movement repression." *Sociological Theory* 21.1 (2003): 44-68.
  - Hafner-Burton, pp 176-199
  - Carey, pp 196-228

Week 16 – April 25<sup>th</sup>

- Class Research Workshop
  - Details to be announced

**Group Policy Proposal Papers due by midnight on May 3<sup>rd</sup>.**