

Human Rights

Contents

I. Introduction: What are Human Rights?	3
Origins of Human Rights.....	3
Three Generations of Human Rights	6
Major Ideological Tensions within Human Rights Doctrine	8
Negative vs. Positive Rights.....	8
Rights vs. Duties	9
Universality and Western Imperialism	10
The Universal Declaration of Human Rights	13
The Document.....	14
Key International Documents	18
The International Bill of Rights.....	18
International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights	20
Extension of Human Rights Beyond the International Bill of Rights	22
Monitoring and Enforcement	23
UN Architecture.....	24
Human Rights and Violence	26
Torture and Inhuman Treatment	27
The Geneva Conventions	27
UN Efforts to Secure Freedom from Torture.....	28
Non-Derogability and State Sanctions: Unlawful Combatants?	29
Non-Refoulement: Extraordinary Renditions and Outsourcing Torture	32
Genocide	35
Criminalizing Genocide in International Law	36
Courts and Justice in International Law: The Post-World War II Military Tribunals	39
The Persistence of Genocide and Subsequent UN Tribunals.....	40
International Criminal Court (ICC).....	42
Interventions	46
The Problem of Humanitarian Intervention	46
Peacekeeping in Bosnia.....	47
Intervention in Kosovo.....	49
Humanitarian Intervention in Perspective.....	50
Responsibility to Protect (R2P)	51
Impact of Globalization	52
Indigenous Rights.....	52

Globalization 101



A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

- Individual Rights or Group Rights 53
- Land and Environment..... 54
- Cultural Rights 56
- Self-Determination..... 57
- Women’s Rights..... 58
- Reproductive Rights and Sexual Autonomy 60
- Human Trafficking 62
- Children’s Rights..... 65
- Child Labor 66
- Child Soldiers 69
- Juvenile Justice..... 71
- Changing Players: Abusers and Guarantors of Human Rights..... 72**
- State Actors 73
- Transnational Corporate Actors..... 73
- Social Movements and NGOs 74
- Works Cited..... 88**

I. Introduction: What are Human Rights?

The era of globalization is also the era of the individual. Revolutionary innovations in technology and telecommunications have empowered the individual, for better or worse, to exercise a previously unthinkable degree of self-expression. The same age that has seen the advent of the threat of global terror networks is also the one that has given birth to YouTube.

This focus on the individual is part of a broader trend that has been underway for centuries and has only intensified since the end of the Second World War. One of its most important manifestations in the twentieth – and now twenty-first – century has been the development of a conceptual and legal framework for human rights as well as a new dimension of civil society dedicated to ensuring that these rights are protected.

Human rights recognize the dignity inherent in every person as a human being, regardless of his or her particular nationality, race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexuality, class or any other group affiliation or characteristic. As a result, they assert the moral and legal primacy of the individual over other entities that have “rights,” such as the family and the state.

Though human rights are purportedly universal and self-evident, scholars struggle to justify their existence, enumeration, and international enforcement. What are the metaphysical and epistemological foundations for the existence of human rights? Which rights, if any, are truly fundamental and universal? If particular human rights -- or indeed even the concept of human rights in itself -- are not recognized universally, can the nations that do subscribe to human rights legitimately involve themselves in the human rights abuses of nations that don't? Is it plausible to suppose we can reach a truly universal agreement on what human rights are?

This Issue will examine the history of human rights and survey some of the key debates about how these rights should be applied in current real-world situations.

Origins of Human Rights

The emergence of rights in political thought is generally regarded as relatively recent, though any historical study of rights reveals how indeterminate the philosophical charting of the evolution of rights has been (Renteln, 1988). Human rights are considered the offspring of natural rights, which themselves evolved from the concept of natural law. Natural law, which has played a dominant role in Western political theory for centuries, is that standard of higher-order morality against which all other laws are adjudged. To contest the injustice of human-made law, one was to appeal to the greater authority of God or natural law.

Eventually this concept of natural law evolved into natural rights; this change reflected a shift in emphasis from society to the individual. Whereas natural law provided a basis for curbing excessive state power over society, natural rights gave individuals the ability to press claims against the government (Renteln, 1988).¹ This modern conception of rights can be traced back to Enlightenment political philosophy and the movement, primarily in England, France, and the United States, to establish limited forms of representative government that would respect the freedom of individual citizens.

John Locke, in his *Second Treatise on Government* (1690), described a “state of nature” prior to the creation of society in which individuals fended for themselves and looked after their own interests. In this state, each person possessed a set of *natural rights*, including the rights to life, liberty and property. According to Locke, when individuals came together in social groups, the main purpose of their union was to secure these rights more effectively. Consequently, they ceded to the governments they established “only the right to enforce these natural rights and not the rights themselves” (“Human Rights: Historical Development,” n.d.).

Locke’s philosophy, known as *classical liberalism*, helped foster a new way of thinking about individuals, governments, and the rights that link the two. His principles were adopted by the founding fathers of the United States in the *Declaration of Independence* (1776), which states:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. —That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed...

Similarly, the language used both by Locke and by the Founding Fathers clearly foreshadows the creation of a document like the Universal Declaration. These principles were further expounded and enshrined in the *U.S. Constitution* (1787) and *Bill of Rights* (1789).

Natural rights theorists have asserted the existence of specific rights -- most notably the right to self-preservation (Hobbes) and the right to property (Locke). Because such theorists take the validity of fundamental rights to be self-evident, there has traditionally been little tolerance for debate. One scholar notes that natural rights “seemed peculiarly vulnerable to ethical skepticism” (Waldron 1984: 3). Nevertheless, natural rights were not widely contested as they were asserted in a limited universe of shared Western values (Renteln, 1988).

What, then, is a right, and how are human rights distinct from natural rights? For many philosophical writers, a right is synonymous with a claim. The Oxford English Dictionary defines a right as “a justifiable claim, on legal or moral grounds, to have or obtain something, or

1. For more on the relationship between natural law and natural rights, see L. Strauss (1953), M. Roshwald (1959), and J. Donnelly (1985).

act in a certain way.” The classic definition of a human right is a right which is universal and held by all persons:

A human right by definition is a universal moral right, something which all men, everywhere, at all times ought to have, something of which no one may be deprived without a grave affront to justice, something which is owing to every human being simply because he is human. (Cranston 1973: 36)

One frequently cited definition of human rights posits four necessary requirements:

First, it must be possessed by all human beings, as well as only by human beings. Second, because it is the same right that all human beings possess, it must be possessed equally by all human beings. Third, because human rights are possessed by all human beings, we can rule out as possible candidates any of those rights which one might have in virtue of occupying any particular status or relationship... And fourth, if there are any human rights, they have the additional characteristic of being assertable, in a manner of speaking, ‘against the whole world.’ (Wasserstrom 1979: 50)

The United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights defines human rights as:

... rights inherent to all human beings, whatever our nationality, place of residence, sex, national or ethnic origin, color, religion, language, or any other status. We are all equally entitled to our human rights without discrimination. (“What are Human Rights?” n.d.)

The primary element recurring throughout each of these definitions is *universality* -- human rights are inalienable and fundamental rights to *all* persons are inherently entitled simply by virtue of being human. As we will soon observe, this crucial and existential element of universality is profoundly controversial and thus quite tenuous.

The innovation of human rights in the twentieth century extended the idea of individual rights to include all human beings, regardless of citizenship or state affiliation. Human rights helped reconstitute individual identity and freedom as something transcending national borders. As the atrocities of the World Wars made clear, there were times when the state became the citizen’s greatest enemy and outside protection was his or her best and only hope.

Before examining universality and other ideological conflicts concerning the idea of human rights, let us turn our attention now to the various kinds of rights that human rights encompass.

Three Generations of Human Rights

There are three overarching types of human rights norms: civil-political, socio-economic, and collective-developmental (Vasek, 1977). The first two, which represent potential claims of individual persons against the state, are firmly accepted norms identified in international treaties and conventions. The final type, which represents potential claims of peoples and groups against the state, is the most debated and lacks both legal and political recognition. Each of these types includes two further subtypes. Scholar Sumner B. Twiss delineates a typology:

Civil-political human rights include two subtypes: norms pertaining to physical and civil security (for example, no torture, slavery, inhumane treatment, arbitrary arrest; equality before the law) and norms pertaining to civil-political liberties or empowerments (for example, freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; freedom of assembly and voluntary association; political participation in one's society).

Socio-economic human rights similarly include two subtypes: norms pertaining to the provision of goods meeting social needs (for example, nutrition, shelter, health care, education) and norms pertaining to the provision of goods meeting economic needs (for example, work and fair wages, an adequate living standard, a social security net).

Finally, collective-developmental human rights also include two subtypes: the self-determination of peoples (for example, to their political status and their economic, social, and cultural development) and certain special rights of ethnic and religious minorities (for example, to the enjoyment of their own cultures, languages, and religions). (1998: 272)

This division of human rights into three generations was introduced in 1979 by Czech jurist Karel Vasak. The three categories align with the three tenets of the French Revolution: liberty, equality, and fraternity.

First-generation, “civil-political” rights deal with liberty and participation in political life. They are strongly individualistic and negatively constructed to protect the individual from the state. These rights draw from those articulated in the United States Bill of Rights and the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen in the 18th century. Civil-political rights have been legitimated and given status in international law by Articles 3 to 21 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the 1966 International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

Second-generation, “socio-economic” human rights guarantee equal conditions and treatment. They are not rights directly possessed by individuals but constitute positive duties upon the government to respect and fulfill them. Socio-economic rights began to be recognized by government after World War II and, like first-generation rights, are embodied in Articles 22 to 27 of the Universal Declaration. They are also enumerated in the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights.

Third-generation, “collective-developmental” rights of peoples and groups held against their respective states aligns with the final tenet of “fraternity.” They constitute a broad class of rights that have gained acknowledgment in international agreements and treaties but are more contested than the preceding types (Twiss, 2004). They have been expressed largely in documents advancing aspirational “soft law,” such as the 1992 Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, and the 1994 Draft Declaration of Indigenous Peoples’ Rights.

Though traditional political theory presents liberty and fraternity as inherently antagonistic (and therefore would assert the incompatibility of “collective-developmental” rights with the preceding generations), progressive scholars argue that the three generations are in fact deeply interdependent. For example, Twiss argues that no single generation can be emphasized to the exclusion of others without jeopardizing personas and communities over time, including jeopardizing the very interests represented in the type or generation of rights being privileged. (1998: 276). He offers examples of self-defeating imbalances that would result from the excessive prioritization of any one generation over another:

... to emphasize civil-political rights to the exclusion of socioeconomic and collective-developmental rights runs the risk of creating socially disadvantaged groups within a society to the degree of triggering disruption, which, in turn, invites the counterresponse of repression. To emphasize socioeconomic rights to the exclusion of civil-political rights runs the risk of ironically creating a situation where, without the feedback of political participation, the advancement of socioeconomic welfare comes to be hampered or inequitable. To emphasize collective-developmental rights to the exclusion of other types runs the risk of not only fomenting a backlash against civil-political repression but also of under-cutting the equitable distribution of the socioeconomic goods needed for the continuing solidarity of the society. (1998: 276)

Twiss rejects alleged incompatibilities between the three generations of rights. He asserts that, at worst, there may be tension between such rights in specific societies and at periods of socio-historic transition, but this does not mean tensions cannot be solved in a way that respects all three generations of rights. Human rights are so thoroughly interconnected that it is difficult to conceive of them as operating properly except in an interdependent and mutually supportive manner (1998: 276).²

Although the three generations framework is a valuable conceptual tool for thinking about rights, it is worth questioning some of its assumptions. Does the notion of a progression of rights and the metaphor of age it is based on make sense? Do second generation rights create the background conditions necessary for the exercise of first generation rights, as certain sections of the International Bill of Rights suggest, or are it the other way around? Should second and third generation rights be viewed as simultaneous? Does one generation take precedence over another,

2. For expositions of the opposing argument, see e.g., Park 1987; Arat 1991.

or are all equally important? Should second and third generation rights even be considered rights, or are they something fundamentally different?

The three generations framework contains within it room for many of the key debates about the nature of rights. It also encourages us to take a critical approach in challenging our own assumptions about rights as we begin to think about some of the real-world problems involved in the application of human rights in the sections ahead.

Major Ideological Tensions within Human Rights Doctrine

The UN asserts that human rights are, *inter alia*, universal and inalienable, interdependent and indivisible (“What are Human Rights?” n.d.). However, tensions between categories of and perspectives on rights present significant obstacles to the acceptance of -- much less the realization of -- universal human rights. Major ideological conflicts include: positive vs. negative rights; rights vs. duties; individual vs. group rights; and the problem of universality as Western imperialism.

Negative vs. Positive Rights

Philosophers and political theorists make a distinction between negative and positive rights. A negative right is a right *not to be* subjected to an action of another person or group; negative rights permit or oblige inaction. A positive right is a right *to be* subjected to an action or another person or group; positive rights permit or oblige action. In relation to the three generations of human rights, negative rights are often associated with the first generation while positive rights are associated with the second and third generations.

Negative and positive rights frequently conflict because carrying out the duties conferred by positive rights often entails infringing upon negative rights. For example, the positive right to social welfare confers a duty upon the government to provide services. Carrying out this duty entails increasing state expenditures, which would likely require raising taxes. This would however infringe upon citizens’ negative right not to have their money taken away from them. Because positive rights imply positive duties to take action whereas negative rights imply that others must only refrain from taking action, positive rights are generally harder to justify and require more complex ethical substantiation than negative rights.

Political philosopher Isaiah Berlin clarified the distinction in a famous lecture titled “Two Concepts of Liberty.” If negative liberty is concerned with the freedom to pursue one’s interests according to one’s own free will and without “interference from external bodies,” then positive liberty takes up the “degree to which individuals or groups” are able to “act autonomously” in

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

the first place.³ In other words, what are the conditions under which individuals shape their understandings of their own free will? What gives individuals a positive idea about how they should act, rather than negative limitations on how they may not act?

There was some disagreement about the relative importance of these two conceptions during the debates over the Universal Declaration and its Conventions. While the U.S. had adopted a welfare state model under the New Deal reforms of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt, economic and social rights were not part of the American political tradition in the same way they had been for many continental European governments or the increasingly powerful Soviet Union.

American disinclination to positive liberty can be attributed in part to the ideological campaign against the Soviet Union during the Cold War. The Soviets gave a high place to the collective over the individual. This meant priority for positive liberty, which they believed empowered the state to take sweeping action to provide for the well-being and “self-realization” of its citizens, sometimes at the expense of individual civil and political rights, such as the right to political participation.

Many in the West, however, viewed the Soviet position skeptically as a veiled attempt to return to the excesses of authoritarianism that the United Nations system of governance was designed to prevent. Great injustices have often been committed for the benefit of the collective good. Berlin and others were wary of “the way in which the apparently noble ideal of freedom as self-mastery or self-realization had been twisted and distorted by the totalitarian dictators of the twentieth century.”⁴ Insisting upon the primacy of negative rights, however, impedes the advancement of social justice by making it more difficult to justify allocating resources to help the underprivileged yet easy to justify inaction.

Ultimately, it remains an open question whether the positive and negative forms of liberty are two aspects of a common conception of rights or two distinct types of rights that are closely related without being identical.

Rights vs. Duties

It is worth examining the common conception in the Anglo-American tradition that rights are solely a form of personal entitlement. Many in Asia and the former Soviet Union, for example, argue that rights are equally an entitlement and a duty. Individuals have a reciprocal obligation to respect the rights of others if they expect to have their own rights respected in turn.

3. Berlin 1958. To read Isaiah Berlin’s lecture, see: <http://www.hss.bond.edu.au/phil12-205/Berlin%20Liberty2.pdf>

4. Id.

Take, for example, the right to religious expression. This right ensures that members of religious minorities are protected from interference in the exercise of their religious freedom; at the same time, it means that they must display the same tolerance when it comes to other religious practices that may differ from their own. In taking advantage of one's own freedoms, one accepts an obligation to respect the freedoms of others. Only in this way can the rights of all be protected and a measure of social harmony is achieved.

Systems of social organization that give equal priority to both the community and the individual tend to emphasize the dual nature of rights as both freedoms and duties. Society as a whole can only thrive when everyone fulfills his or her obligations to their fellow citizens. Under this view, the ability to exercise rights must first be earned by respecting them in others.⁵ This principle is enshrined in Article 29 of the Universal Declaration, which states, in its first clause, that "Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible."

The doctrine of logical correlativity -- that rights and duties are correlative -- is dominant among philosophers.⁶ This view conceptualizes rights and duties as flip sides of the same coin; one person's right exists by exerting a duty upon others. For example, the right of free speech "is understood in terms of the recognition that an individual's interest in self-expression is a sufficient ground for holding other individuals and agencies to be under duties of various sorts rather than in terms of the detail of the duties themselves."⁷

Logical correlativity affords a measure of flexibility to the formulation of international human rights standards. Correlativity is crucial because it means that the framing of moral claims in terms other than rights is not necessarily problematic. The recognition of an obligation may well signify the presence of an implicit right; thus a moral theory couched in the language of duty can be a legitimate vehicle for the advancement of rights.⁸

Universality and Western Imperialism

Perhaps the thorniest of conflicts within the realm of international human rights involves the question of whether claims of universality are merely attempts to impose Western values upon the rest of the world. Recall that inherent in the definition of human rights is an assumption of universality. This is not necessarily problematic in itself -- indeed, it is desirable that human rights not be reserved for some and made inaccessible to others.

5. Henkin 1998.
6. Renteln 1988.
7. Waldron 1979.
8. Renteln 1988.

However, the philosophical foundations for the universality of human rights have never been thoroughly demonstrated. In the absence of a satisfactory grounding for human rights, theorists are compelled to fall back upon mere assertions as to the self-evident nature of particular human rights; such dated essentialism has no answer to diverse moral systems that object to the existence of these asserted rights.⁹

Skeptics point to the distinctly Western origin of the language of rights and argue that rights cannot be found in non-Western moral systems. This view claims that the absence of any consideration of moral notions comparable to rights makes the presumed universality of human rights dubious at best.¹⁰ Once the diversity of moral systems is taken into account, it becomes difficult to understand why the presumption of universality could endure so long without being seriously questioned.

Some critics assert that the problem derives from the psychological predisposition of human beings to generalize from their perspectives, and claim that western philosophers are especially prone to projective their moral categories on others.¹¹ For example, traditional Kantian moral theory is based upon the assumption that human beings are “ends in themselves,” a statement that itself requires an underlying foundation but instead presumes that the rational process bears a single and universal result irrespective of cultural differences.

It is only within a universe of shared values that the presumption of universality encounters no difficulties. Various international human rights instruments have remained controversial precisely because they contain values that are not shares on a worldwide basis.¹² The United Declaration of Human Rights contains rights that openly express Western liberal values that may not be compatible with the many value systems of the world. Scholar S.P. Sinha argues that “to the extent these kinds of rights are concerned, we have the scenario of one particular culture, or one particular ideology, or one particular political system claiming to be imposed upon the entire world” (1978: 144). He further cautions that it is self-defeating for the human rights movement to impose such a system upon the entire world and then “retire in the smug delusion that having done that, justice has thereby been achieved for the individual.” (1978: 159)

For the skeptic, to assert the existence of universal standards is ethnocentric. The recognition of moral diversity calls into question the presumption of universality and leaves the concept of human rights prone to deterioration into senseless relativism.

Those who reject the charge of Western imperialism, on the other hand, acknowledge the historical influence of Western legal traditions on the international arena, but argue that the rights agreed upon are not exclusively Western moral and political values (Twiss 1998). This view asserts that human rights represent a modern social practice that embodies explicit

9. Id.

10. Id.

11. Id.

12. Id.

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

intercultural and international recognitions of crucial conditions of personal and communal flourishing. The practice of enumerating human rights endeavors to specify human interests of such fundamental importance that they ought to be socially guaranteed by otherwise diverse political and social systems (Twiss 1998).

Scholar Sumner Twiss, rather than perceiving the lack of philosophical grounding as a fault, argues that it operates to the advantage of human rights that they are not themselves strongly associated with any particular set of metaphysical or epistemological claims necessarily incompatible with cultural moral views (1998). He asserts that the international practice of human rights is compatible with a wide range of sociopolitical systems.

This implies that human rights can be compatible with both liberal and communitarian societies and traditions, and that rights are, in a significant sense, theory-neutral -- they permit broad diversity at the societal and cultural level, and resist attempts to locate human rights within any one political theory or system to the exclusion of all others (Twiss 1998). Twiss is careful to distinguish that theory-neutrality does not mean moral neutrality; human rights obviously have significant moral content. The claim is only that this moral content can be affirmed by otherwise diverse cultural moral traditions and sociopolitical systems. He uses this point to deflect the charge of Western imperialism:

“... Given the pragmatic character of this international practice, its theoretical neutrality, and its openness to diverse support at the internal cultural level, it is incorrect to claim that human rights presuppose Western competitive individualism or related conceptions of self and society” (1998: 274)

The drafters of the UDHR circumvented the problem of whether universality insinuated Western imperialism by opting to reach a pragmatic agreement on a set of essential human rights norms with the recognition that, given the diversity of the world's cultural and philosophical systems and traditions, no deeper theoretical agreement would be possible (Third Committee 1948). Agreement on practical norms that protected human dignity and welfare was deemed sufficient. Nevertheless, the lack of explicit justification continues to leave the notion of universal human rights vulnerable to attack.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights

History

The first step in implementing the new directives on human rights was to articulate a vision for these rights that all the members of the United Nations could embrace. Eleanor Roosevelt, former First Lady and widow of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, lead the working group that would put together this document. It took two full years, 81 meetings, 168 amendments, and nearly 1,400 votes for the document to be accepted.

On December 10, 1948, the UN General Assembly (comprised of 58 member states at the time) accepted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights without objection, with eight countries—including all six communist countries associated with the Soviet Union, South Africa, and Saudi Arabia – abstaining (48-0-8) (Bailey, n.d.).

Virtually all of the human rights identified in the UDHR systematically addressed and redressed the dehumanizing technique and conditions imposed by Nazi Germany on Jews and other marginalized populations prior to and during World War II (Twiss 2004; see also Morsink 1999). The framers of the declaration identified a range of safeguards intended to prevent egregious state behavior -- as a consequence, human rights were self-consciously conceived as representing the interests of individual human beings against transgressions by the state.

This remarkably went directly against nascent human rights developments in the earlier part of the century in the aftermath of World War I, a period characterized by national and international treaties aimed at protecting the rights of groups vulnerable to oppression by the dominant majorities of states (Twiss 2004). What was the reason for this sudden change? Twiss postulates:

“... the answer is not difficult to discern. As framed succinctly by one recent commentator, ‘The lesson of World War II was that emphasizing minorities and highlighting their differences through special protections encouraged groups to define themselves in opposition to others,’ and ‘Nazi racial doctrines appeared to be the inevitable result of such a course’ (Oestreich 1999: 113). That is, the very identification of groups as bearers of rights encourages oppositional conflict among them. So the framers of the UDHR followed another course, emphasizing the rights of individuals to essential civil, political, social, and economic conditions as well as their equality in such protections, with express avoidance of contributing to the power of groups” (2004: 42)

This is not to say that special considerations for minority ethnic groups were not considered; indeed, various delegates to the Third Committee, which discussed and debated the draft of the UDHR, expressed precisely these concerns. However, they were answered by the blanket

assumption that protecting individuals generally would also adequately protect members of minority groups (Twiss 2004).

This decision had the added consequence of giving the UDHR a decidedly individualistic, Western, and anti-socialist nature. Some also believe that the reason many of the values in the UDHR appear Western is that the Third World did not participate in great numbers when it was drafted; others recognize that the debates took place at a time when the great majority of Third World nations were still under colonial rule but maintain that the contribution of the Third World was by no means negligible (Renteln 1988).

Among the most active participants were Chile, China, Cuba, India, Lebanon, and Panama. At the General Assembly in 1948, Egypt, Ethiopia, Liberia, Afghanistan, the Philippines, Thailand, India, and Pakistan, as well as all of the Central and Latin American States were among the 48 voting in favor of the Declaration. Saudi Arabia, South Africa, and the Eastern European nations were the eight abstentions; no one voted against (Alston 1983).

The Document

The Universal Declaration is primarily a statement of principle, a foundation upon which the legal framework for practical protections of the agreed upon rights could be constructed. Above all, the Declaration was conceived as “a common statement of mutual aspirations – a shared vision of a more equitable and just world” (Bailey, n.d.)

The achievement of consensus among the diverse array of UN member states was almost as important as the substance of the document itself. The members of the working group and the UN **General Assembly** strove to accommodate the sometimes competing and conflicting claims of all the world’s cultures, ideologies, religions, and political interests, and to balance the different needs and capacities of both developed and developing countries (Bailey, n.d.). In the end, most agree that the Declaration managed to achieve this delicate balance, despite the claims of subsequent critics that the institutional processes underpinning its drafting and acceptance were largely driven by the Western powers that dominated the UN at the time of its founding.

The Universal Declaration can be divided into five thematic sections: a **preamble**; a definition of the basis and extent of all human rights (Articles 1-2); an outline of civil and political rights (Articles 3-21); an outline of economic, social, and cultural rights (Articles 22-27); and a conclusion that broadly describes the background conditions necessary for the exercise of the specified rights (Articles 28-30).

1. The Complete Preamble

The preamble—a truly landmark statement about what human rights mean, where they come from, and what purposes they serve—is the cornerstone of all modern human rights law. It is presented here in its entirety:

Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and **inalienable** rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world, Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people, Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law, Whereas it is essential to promote the development of friendly relations between nations, Whereas the peoples of the United Nations have in the Charter reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women and have determined to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, Whereas Member States have pledged themselves to achieve, in co-operation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect for and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms, Whereas a common understanding of these rights and freedoms is of the greatest importance for the full realization of this pledge,

Now, Therefore THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY proclaims THIS UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of Member States themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction.¹³

Introductory Articles

Article 1 clarifies the basis of all human rights, which rests on the premise that “all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights.” As human beings, “endowed with reason and conscience,” all people are entitled to the same standard of protection of respect, not only by governments but also by their fellow men and women. Each individual should “act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood” (UDHR).

This article introduces the central concept of human dignity from which all human rights are derived. It is also remarkable for stressing the universal nature of these rights.

Article 2 asserts the complete universality of human rights, “without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin,

13. “Universal Declaration.”

property, birth or other status.” In addition, rights are not conferred on individuals “on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs” (UDHR).

This provision is important because previous conceptions held that rights emanated from sovereign governments or rules and were often ultimately traced back to a form of divine sanction. The Universal Declaration severed rights from the question of citizenship, opening the door to a new kind of personal identity rooted in global citizenship. This modern identity would serve as a complement, if not substitute, for membership in a particular nation-state. It also ensured that protection would be extended to stateless peoples, such as refugees, or those who were oppressed within existing states.

Civil and Political Rights

Articles 3-21 of the Universal Declaration list, in brief form, the civil and political rights to which all people are entitled. Many of these rights will sound familiar, as they have much in common with the constitutions of many advanced democracies, such as the United States and France.

Rights articulated in these sections include: the right to life, liberty and security (Article 3); freedom from **slavery, torture** and “inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment” (Article 4-5); the right to equal protection from discrimination and due process of law (Articles 6-8, 10-11); freedom from “arbitrary arrest, detention or exile” (Article 9); freedom from “arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence” (Article 12); freedom of movement and of **asylum** in the face of persecution (Articles 13-14); the right to marry as one chooses and have a family (Article 16); the right to own property (Article 17); freedom of thought, conscience, religion, expression and association (Article 18-20); and the right to belong to a nationality, to engage in political participation and to enjoy equal access to public services (Articles 15, 21).

Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights

Articles 22-27 specify the economic, social and cultural rights that belong to all individuals above and beyond the basic political freedoms described above. While many U.S. citizens often do not think of the protections that fall in these areas as “rights,” strictly defined, many other countries in the world do, particularly countries with more socialized forms of government such as those in Western Europe.

Article 22 presents the rationale that justifies the inclusion of these rights in the Universal Declaration; it is quoted here in its entirety:

“Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national efforts and international co-operation and in accordance with

the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.”

This provision is remarkable in several respects. First, it holds that economic, social and cultural rights help create the background conditions necessary for the realization of human dignity, which Article 1 had established as the foundation for all human rights. The clause makes explicit what is implicit in the notion of human rights: that one must enjoy a measure of peace, health, and security in one’s environment as a precondition for being able to exercise one’s private rights.

Second, it calls not only for national action to secure these rights but also for “international co-operation.” This means that national governments have a responsibility to help other countries meet these human rights obligations in addition to meeting their own. It is therefore no longer acceptable for countries to know that violations are occurring elsewhere and not take any action. Whether this “co-operation” takes the form of more passive measures, such as technical assistance, or more active measures such as intervention is a complex question, some of the ramifications of which will be explored later in this brief (see “The Problem of Humanitarian Intervention” below).

Third, Article 22 recognizes that countries have different capacities, in terms of political “organization and resources,” to achieve the economic, social and cultural objectives specified in the Universal Declaration. It is important that each nation make all reasonable efforts within these constraints to fulfill its obligations to its people and the international community.

The rest of the enumerated rights in this section guarantee: the right to employment, non-discrimination in pay, a decent wage or supplemental income to ensure “for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity,” and unionization (Article 23); the right to rest and leisure (Article 24); the right to a standard of living that includes the determinants of physical well-being, such as “food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services” as well as forms of social insurance that protect an individual in the case of “unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control” (Article 25); the right to education and “full development of the human personality” (Article 26); and the right to “participate in the cultural life of the community” and benefit from scientific and technological advances (Article 27).

These rights involve complex questions in terms of how they should be interpreted and implemented. What does it mean, for instance, that one has the right to “full development of the human personality?” What constitutes “an existence worthy of human dignity?” Because these standards essentially bring the entire realm of social and economic policy into the domain of human rights, some believe they make the very notion of “rights” problematic, possibly eroding or weakening the imperative rigorously to enforce all human rights.

Key International Documents

The International Bill of Rights

The Universal Declaration was a consensus statement of principle but did not have legally binding force from the perspective of international law. The abstract set of principles articulated in the Declaration would have to be translated into more detailed conventions for member states to adopt and then use to fashion enforceable national legislation.

It took eighteen years of debate to determine how this translation should be achieved. A split emerged during the process of drafting the follow-up to the Universal Declaration because some countries maintained a different view about the nature of economic, political and cultural rights. It was therefore decided in 1952, based on a motion from India and Lebanon with support from Belgium and the United States, that two conventions would be drafted instead of one.¹⁴

In 1966, the drafts of two conventions were approved: the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). Both agreements entered into force for the states that ratified them in 1976.¹⁵ Collectively, these two Covenants along with the Universal Declaration became known as the International Bill of Rights.

The ICESCR will be covered in less detail in this Issue; the full text of the document can be found here: http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/a_cescr.htm.

1. The Status of Human Rights in International Law

It is important to understand that the Universal Declaration is itself more a commonly agreed vision than a binding legal document. It was designed to provide the foundation for future conventions that would further define human rights within a legal context. These conventions are essentially multilateral treaties, agreements made by a number of countries in which they voluntarily accept certain standards that then become enforceable in international law. It is important to note that not all states agree to the conventions passed by international legislators.

Conventions are common instruments in international affairs and are used when nations want to formalize relations and mutual obligations amongst one another. Once a country has signed and ratified a convention, it then adopts national laws that are legally binding within that particular state to implement the obligations in the convention. After ratification, some countries allow for immediate incorporation into national law; others (such as the United States) have a two-step process, in which ratification is followed by implementing legislation.

14. Robertson 29; “25 Questions & Answers” 7.

15. “United Nations Priority.”

States are able to adapt international commitments to the conditions of their local environment (even as they adopt principles that have an agreed upon meaning in the international community) in a fashion similar to the way federalized bodies like the European Union handle the localization of multilateral commitments, as “subsidiarity.”¹⁶ The ramifications of the localization process—and potential conflicts between the demands of local cultures and international norms – will be considered later in this Brief (see “Indigenous Rights” below).

The International Bill of Rights is so central to the purpose and operations of the United Nations that it has “become almost an extension of the UN Charter.” The Universal Declaration, as well as its conventions and protocols, is often referenced in debates held in the UN and in resolutions passed by the General Assembly and other UN bodies. As a result, many have come to believe that the International Bill of Rights, or at least many of the rights contained therein, have become part of customary international law, or *jus cogens* (literally, “compelling law”).¹⁷

Recognizing a law as *jus cogens* confers on it a special status that is meant to supersede all other forms of international law. No other treaties or international agreements, regardless of the will of individual states, can preempt or contradict *jus cogens* under any circumstances. In other words, “Unlike treaties, which only bind a country once it has accepted the treaty obligations, all countries in the world are bound, whatever their particular view may be. A country cannot repudiate international customary law, as it can a treaty obligation.”¹⁸

In 2002, for example, the U.S. was able to withdraw voluntarily from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty it had signed with Russia in 1972 without formal repercussions because this was merely a treaty between two nations.¹⁹ It would be far more objectionable – many would argue impossible –for the U.S. to withdraw from the Convention on Torture, since prohibition of torture is generally accepted as *jus cogens*.

The very notion of *jus cogens* is a powerful challenge to the sovereignty of states, and therefore many states have resisted accepting its validity. On the other hand, some contend that “contemporary society is bound together by the acceptance of fundamental principles constituting the rule of law, and that international law is an inseparable concomitant of an international public order.”²⁰

In other words, *jus cogens* helps ensure a peaceful and stable world by providing an eternal, immutable standard against which all actions may be judged; if human rights are universally accepted and contribute to this purpose, perhaps they should be granted special recognition in

16. Carozza 2003.

17. Bailey n.d.; “Human Rights Fundamentals;” “Jus Cogens.” There is a technical difference between customary law and *jus cogens*, but that is beyond the scope of this discussion.

18. Bailey n.d..

19. Marcus 2002.

20. O’Connell 1970.

this way. The reach of jus cogens remains a subject of debate, as does the open question of whether the UN's version of human rights merits such designation.

For more on treaties and customary law, see the "What Are the Sources of International Law?" section of the "International Law and Organizations" Issue-in-Depth (<http://www.globalization101.org/index.php?file=issue&pass1=subs&id=234>).

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

This section will cover some of the aspects in which the ICCPR differs or represents an evolution from the corresponding sections of the Universal Declaration, and will give some very brief examples. (The full text of the document can be found here: http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/a_ccpr.htm.)

The preamble largely repeats the language of the Universal Declaration itself, repeating that the rights presented in the document are "equal and inalienable" (for more on inalienability, see box below on "Key Properties of Human Rights").

Article 1 inserts a right not contained in the Declaration, the right of "all peoples" to self-determination and to "determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development."

The people of East Timor provide one case in which the right to self-determination was successfully invoked. This small country, representing part of an island in the Pacific Ocean between Indonesia and Australia, has a checkered history of colonial occupation. The territory was under Portuguese control for hundreds of years until 1975. Its independence was short-lived as it was soon invaded by its larger neighbor Indonesia and brutally occupied until the late 1990s. In 1999, calls for self-determination from the residents of East Timor resulted in a UN-sponsored election. The vote was overwhelming for independence, but Indonesian authorities violently resisted.

Article 4 specifies which rights in the ICCPR are non-derogable (see box on "Key Properties of Human Rights" below). These include the right to life and freedom from genocide (Article 6); freedom from torture (Article 7); freedom from slavery and forced labor (Article 8); universal recognition of all individuals as persons under the law (Article 16); and freedom of thought, conscience and religion (Article 18).²¹

21. Also covered are the right not to be imprisoned solely for violation of a contract (Article 11) and a prohibition against *ex post facto* criminalization of any act (Article 15).

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

Article 6 extends the protection of human life to a mass scale, explicitly prohibiting genocide (see the section on “Genocide” below). This clause also addresses the death penalty. While the ICCPR skirts the issue of the death penalty and does not protect individuals against legally imposed death penalties for “the most serious crimes,” a subsequent protocol to the convention allowed countries to do so if they wished. This omission from the ICCPR reflects the fact that many industrial countries, including the United States, continue to allow the death penalty. According to Amnesty International, in 2007 alone, 1,252 people were executed in 24 countries. Leading states for the use of the death penalty include Iran and China.

Article 8 adds compulsory labor to the Declaration’s prohibition of slavery; Article 20 covers wartime propaganda, which was widely used by the Nazis in World War II, and crimes resulting from “national, racial or religious hatred” (what we would now consider “hate crimes”); Article 24 establishes the groundwork for special protections concerning the rights of children, which include freedom from discrimination and the right to have a nationality; and Article 27 begins to address the rights of minority cultures (see “Indigenous Rights” below).²²

To date, 167 nations are parties to the ICCPR. It is worth mentioning that the United States, though it signed the convention in 1977, did not ratify it until 1992.²³ When the U.S. did ratify the agreement, it noted its reservations about the definition of torture in relation to its practice of legalized state execution and about the treatment of minors in its criminal justice system.²⁴

Key Properties of Human Rights

Two properties of human rights merit special attention from a legal perspective.

The first is the concept of rights as “*inalienable*.” Inalienable means that something cannot be transferred or assigned to another.²⁵ In practice, this means that you cannot cede your rights even if you wish to do so. One example where this is relevant involves forced labor and slavery. Imagine a family of six living in rural Thailand that is desperately poor. The family contains three boys and a girl, and the parents have difficulty providing for so many children. Seeing few other choices, the parents decide to sell their daughter for a fixed sum of money, and the girl agrees to go. She is then transported to the capital of Bangkok and set up in the sex trade, thereby incurring a large debt to her “employers.” She is then forced to work as a prostitute for insignificant wages that barely allow her to survive, let alone start paying off her debt. Even if the girl and her family have voluntarily agreed to this form of bonded labor—essentially slavery—they are not permitted to do so according to international law.

The second is the concept of “*derogability*.” Derogation is the act by which a law or right is eliminated by a subsequent law that “limits its scope or impairs its utility and force.”²⁶ There

22. “International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.”

23. “International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights” United Nations Treaty Collection.

24. “Declarations and Reservations.”

25. “Inalienable.”

26. “Derogation.”

may be certain circumstances in which the state feels it necessary to curtail certain individual rights for the greater good. Certain rights, such as the right to free expression, which is guaranteed in Article 19 of the ICCPR, are derogable. This right can be regulated to the extent that it can be demonstrated to serve vital public interests, such as public safety. In the U.S., for example, it is not permitted for a person to yell “Fire!” in a crowded theater when he or she knows that there is indeed no fire. This famous example was cited by U.S. Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes in the case *Schenck v. United States* (1919). The case involved the use of free speech in wartime and determined that free speech could be limited when “words are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the substantive evils that Congress has a right to prevent.”²⁷

Certain rights are designated as non-derogable, meaning they cannot be ignored under any circumstances. Hitler made arguments that the elimination of certain “undesirable” elements of society, including Jews, homosexuals, and Gypsies, was necessary to safeguard the national security of Germany. He used this contention to assert the sovereignty of the state and commit genocide against those groups. The ICCPR makes it clear that certain rights, such as the right to life and freedom from genocide, are absolutely non-derogable. The limits of derogability are a subject of continuing debate and discussion, as in the case of torturing of terror suspects during wartime (see “Torture and Inhuman Treatment” below).

In a sense, inalienability and non-derogability are two sides of the same coin: certain rights cannot be given away, just as certain rights cannot be taken away. Such rights are completely secure and guaranteed for every human being.

To learn more about international law, please visit <http://www.globalization101.org/issue/intlaw/>.

Extension of Human Rights Beyond the International Bill of Rights

The reach of human rights extends far beyond the scope of the International Bill of Rights, thanks to a large number of rights-specific conventions. There are too many to cover in great detail, but a number will be discussed at greater length throughout the Issue.

Some of the more important core international conventions dealing with human rights include the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948, 1951);²⁸ the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (1965, 1969); the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (1979, 1981); the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or

27. “*Schenck v. United States*.”

28. All dates refer to (a) date of adoption and (b) date of entry into force.

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

Punishment (1984, 1987); the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1990); and the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (1998, 2002).

In addition, there have been a number of notable regional human rights agreements. These include the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (1950, 1953); the American Convention on Human Rights (1969, 1978); the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (1982, 1986); and the Arab Charter on Human Rights (1994). These regional conventions have also been supplemented by a host of more rights-specific agreements addressing such topics as torture and disappearance of persons, rights of women and children, rights of indigenous peoples, and rights of the disabled among others.

For full texts, see the following links:

Convention on Genocide: http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/p_genoci.htm

Convention on Racial Discrimination: http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/d_icerd.htm

Convention on Discrimination Against Women:

<http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/e1cedaw.htm>

Convention Against Torture: http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/h_cat39.htm

Convention on the Rights of the Child: <http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/k2crc.htm>

European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms:

<http://conventions.coe.int/treaty/en/Treaties/Html/005.htm>

American Convention on Human Rights: <http://www.cidh.org/Basicos/basic3.htm>

African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights:

http://www.achpr.org/english/info/charter_en.html

Monitoring and Enforcement

A variety of agencies in both the public sector and civil society have sprung up over the last sixty years to ensure that the human rights protected by international agreements are properly implemented and enforced. These range from the various arms of the United Nations (see “UN Architecture” below) to the U.S. State Department’s Bureau of Democracy, Bureau of Human Rights and Bureau of Labor to large transnational NGOs such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch (see “The Rise of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Global Civil Society” below).

In general, it is assumed that states will (a) either prosecute offenders who commit human rights violations within their territory themselves, or (b) promptly extradite suspects to the state that has primary jurisdiction over the case for prosecution. Even within the international human rights regime, deference is still given to states out of respect for their sovereignty.

International authorities, such as the United Nations or the recently created International Criminal Court (ICC) (see “The International Criminal Court” below), generally intervene only in cases in which the state with jurisdiction cannot or refuses to prosecute. As a principle,

“Coercive international enforcement is extraordinarily contentious and without much legal precedent.”²⁹

For more on enforcement of international law and the importance of state sovereignty, see the “How Is International Law Enforced?” and “The Issue of Sovereignty” sections of the “International Law and Organizations” Issue in Depth.

UN Architecture

A complex architecture has arisen in the United Nations to deal with human rights issues. Some parts of this architecture were established by the UN Charter, such as the Commission on Human Rights, which was recently replaced by the Human Rights Council. The Human Rights Committee, the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) and General Assembly also have significant responsibilities related to human rights.

Other agencies within the UN are charged with monitoring implementation of the core human rights treaties (described in the previous section), including the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination; the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women; the Committee Against Torture; the Committee on the Rights of the Child; and the Committee on Migrant Workers.³⁰

In 1993, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) was created to oversee and coordinate the activities of all the UN agencies that work on human rights. The High Commissioner serves as an Under-Secretary General of the UN, directly under the Secretary General, and is thus a very high-ranking official. The current occupant of the post is Navanethem (Navi) Pillay of South Africa (as of September 1, 2008).³¹

The UN’s reach also extends to a number of international criminal tribunals that deal with the prosecution of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and related offenses. These include the International Criminal Court and the more locally oriented International Criminal Tribunals for Former Yugoslavia and Rwanda (see “Peacekeeping in Bosnia” and the box “Rwandan Genocide: Hutu vs. Tutsi” below).

For more on the architecture of the UN, see the “United Nations System” section of the “International Law and Organizations” Issue Brief (http://www.globalization101.org/issue_sub/intlaw/intOrganization/UN).

29. Donnelly 2002.

30. “Introduction to the Human Rights Committee.”

31. Sanchez.

What is the Difference Between the Commission on Human Rights, the Human Rights Council, and the Human Rights Committee?

These three UN bodies all have similar titles but distinct functions:

The ***Human Rights Committee*** was established to monitor compliance of the ICCPR in states that are party to the agreement (have ratified and adopted the ICCPR in their domestic law). It consists of 18 “independent experts who are persons of high moral character and recognized competence in the field of human rights.” Participating governments are required to file reports every five years that detail the state of civil and political rights in their countries, and the Committee meets three times a year to review these reports and issue recommendations based on their findings to the UN General Assembly.³²

The ***Commission on Human Rights*** was established by the UN Charter in 1946 with the idea that it would consist of representatives from various UN member states. Over the next fifty years, it was instrumental in bringing attention to human rights violations around the world. Over time, however, membership of the Commission came to be viewed as a “mere commodity,” something to be negotiated over within regional blocks—each of which had a fixed number of representatives—in exchange for influence.

According to Mexico’s ambassador to the UN, Enrique Berruga, “A *spot on the whaling commission would be traded for one on human rights as if countries were swapping ‘a bag of peanuts for a Rolls Royce.’*”³³ In the 1990s and 2000s, notorious human rights violators, such as Cuba, China, Sudan, Zimbabwe, and Libya, had secured spots on the Commission, and used their positions to block UN action against their own abusive practices.³⁴

In 2006, then-UN Secretary General Kofi Annan spearheaded an effort to replace the Commission with a new ***Human Rights Council***, which would have stricter scrutiny over which countries attained membership. Unfortunately, the first year of the Council was not promising, leading the *Washington Post* editorial page to call it “far worse than its predecessor” and “a travesty.”

Human rights advocates have pushed for action on pressing human rights violations in Darfur (Sudan) and Uzbekistan, among other places. But the Council—which still includes offenders such as China, Cuba, Sri Lanka, and Saudi Arabia—has refused to act, instead focusing on Israeli abuses in Lebanon. Some blame the disproportionate influence of the Organization of the Islamic Conference for this failure.³⁵

For its part, the United States did not immediately seek membership on the new Council in 2006,

32. “Introduction to the Human Rights Committee.”

33. Sanchez.

34. Id.

35. “Reform Run Amok.”

arguing that membership criteria are still not sufficient to enable it to be effective. This was remarkable because it was the first time the U.S. had chosen not to participate in the UN's main human rights body since its inception in 1946 (the U.S. was voted off for a year in 2001). However, U.S. President Barack Obama reversed course, and in 2009 joined the 47 member council. Upon joining, U.S. diplomats "*pledged to work constructively with other council members on behalf of the world's persecuted and abused people.*"³⁶

Human Rights and Violence

Human rights, at their most basic level, seek to protect an individual's right to life. Such protections range from the basic freedom from physical harm to highly complex forms of welfare assurance that encompass health, education, and the environment.

The very idea of human rights, as opposed to natural rights, emerged as a response to historical events that threatened the very right to exist for millions of vulnerable people. The horrors of the Holocaust led the people of the world to reassert the value of every human life and to create the international legal framework that ensured such atrocities would never occur again.

The practice of multilateral multiple countries working together to on a specific issue cooperation in matters involving violence had been well-established since the nineteenth century. A series of traditions and international agreements evolved to address the treatment of prisoners and soldiers on the battlefield. What was new about the genocides of the twentieth century was that they were perpetrated against noncombatant civilians who were largely defenseless.

Often, these extreme acts of violence were committed by governments against the very citizens whose rights those governments were meant to safeguard. International values and standards about the humane treatment of people in times of war needed to be extended to apply universally in all circumstances. It was clear that the rights of citizenship and strictly national enforcement mechanisms were no longer sufficient.

At first, the set of issues clustering around the topic of human rights and violence might not seem as controversial as some of the other issues this Brief will discuss later on. After all, who would object to the notion that governments and private citizens alike should not be allowed to kill or torture people? While such principles may seem to be clear cut in theory, they can become far more complicated when brought to bear on real-world situations. We will now turn to some of these debates.

36. "US Takes Seat on UN Human Rights Council."

Torture and Inhuman Treatment

International prohibitions against torture and inhuman treatment are some of the oldest humanitarian laws in existence. Even with a long and distinguished history of international agreements on this subject, torture remains a problem in the majority of the world. Amnesty International estimates that torture occurred in 140 countries between the years of 1997 and 2001.³⁷ Over the past several years, torture has become an increasingly contentious issue within the United States. Questions concerning what does and does not constitute torture have arisen to the forefront of the American political scene. New questions concerning what constitutes torture, whether torture is an appropriate interrogation tool and when various forms of interrogation techniques can and cannot be legally used has captured the attention of the world at large.

The Geneva Conventions

The first of the Geneva Conventions were negotiated and accepted in the nineteenth century to establish basic standards for the humane conduct of war. The first Geneva Convention, adopted in 1864 and in concert with the founding of the International Committee for the Red Cross, “provided for the neutrality of ambulance and military hospitals, the non-belligerent status of persons who aid the wounded, and sick soldiers of any nationality, the return of prisoners to their country if they are incapable of serving, and the adoption of a white flag with a red cross as the symbol of neutrality.”³⁸

Subsequent Geneva Conventions drew upon The Hague Conventions that addressed the use of inhumane forms of weaponry, such as gases that cause death by *asphyxiation* and expanding bullets in 1899, and poison gas and certain methods of biological warfare in 1925 following World War I.³⁹

The end of the Second World War led to the updating of the four primary conventions, which deal with the wounded and sick on land (Convention I); the wounded, sick, and shipwrecked on sea (Convention II); treatment of prisoners of war (Convention III); and protection of civilians in wartime (Convention IV). An additional protocol that entered into force in 1977 brought civil conflicts within the scope of the Geneva Conventions.⁴⁰

For the purposes of this Brief, the important thing to note about the Geneva Conventions is the strict prohibition against torture. Convention I outlaws torture against those who are not actively participating in a military conflict, including soldiers who have surrendered the sick and the

37. “Study Guides: Torture.”

38. “Politics and Economy: The Geneva Conventions.”

39. “Brief History.”

40. *ibid.*; “Politics and Economy: The Geneva Conventions.”

wounded.⁴¹ Convention II reiterates these protections with regard to those involved in maritime warfare.⁴² Convention III deals with prisoners of war, and bans physical and mental torture for the purposes of information collection or punishment.⁴³ Convention IV makes clear that civilians are protected as well as soldiers from inhumane treatment and torture.⁴⁴

Taken together, these Conventions established that certain activities or forms of treatment violated fundamental notions of human dignity, even in the most extreme of situations: armed conflict. Nations accepted the Conventions and the restrictions they imposed because these ensured their own people would be humanely treated by the enemy. Further international agreements would extend the reach of protection of human dignity beyond the battlefield.

For the full texts of the Geneva Conventions, see:
<http://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/WebCONVFULL!OpenView>

UN Efforts to Secure Freedom from Torture

A dedicated Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment was completed in 1984 and entered into force in 1987.⁴⁵ Article 1 of the Convention against Torture defines torture, inhuman or degrading treatment in the following way:

An act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted on a person for such purposes as obtaining from him or a third person information or a confession, punishing him for an act he or a third person has committed or is suspected of having committed, or intimidating or coercing him or a third person, or for any reason based on discrimination of any kind, when such pain or suffering is inflicted by or at the instigation of or with the consent of or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity. It does not include pain or suffering arising only from, inherent in or incidental to lawful sanctions.⁴⁶

This definition is extremely broad, and the nature and limits of behavior covered by this language has been much debated. The key properties of torture, however, are clearly presented: (a) the infliction of severe pain or suffering, (b) the presence of an intention to torture, (c) a purpose to extract information or a confession or to punish, and (d) some form of authorization by officials in power.

The codification of human rights within the United Nations is constantly evolving. The Convention established a UN Committee on Torture and appointed a Special Rapporteur on

41. "Convention (I)."

42. "Convention (II)."

43. "Convention (III)."

44. "Convention (IV)."

45. "Convention Against Torture."

46. *ibid.*

Torture to coordinate the UN's efforts and to investigate individual complaints through country visits and annual reports.⁴⁷ It should be noted that torture is also discussed in the International Bill of Rights in Article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) and Article 7 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).

The ban on torture encompasses four separate human rights. The first is the right to be protected from torture, whether carried out by states or private individuals, by all legal, administrative and judicial means available (Convention Against Torture, Articles 2 and 4).⁴⁸

The second is the right to have those accused of torture prosecuted, wherever they may be (Convention Against Torture 5, 6, and 8). This is a good example of the blurred line between a right and duty, because the *right* to prosecution enjoyed by individuals also imposes an obligation on all states either to extradite suspects to the proper jurisdiction or to prosecute them themselves.⁴⁹

The third is the right of a person to not “be expelled, returned or extradited to another state” if there is suspicion that that person might be subject to torture, inhuman or degrading treatment (Convention Against Torture, Article 3). This principle of non-refoulement will be examined more closely later in this section (see “Non-Refoulement: Extraordinary Renditions and Outsourcing Torture” below).⁵⁰

The fourth is the “right of victims to obtain redress, fair compensation, including rehabilitation and the right of victims to make a complaint, to have it impartially investigated, and to be protected from retaliation for making complaints.” Forms of compensation can include financial awards, medical care, and other measures to restore a victim’s “dignity and reputation” in both the private and public spheres.⁵¹

Non-Derogability and State Sanctions: Unlawful Combatants?

Article 4 of the ICCPR designated certain rights as non-derogable, and torture was included in this group, meaning that states are not permitted to restrict this right for any purpose. The Convention against Torture reiterates this in Article 1 when it dismisses “lawful sanction” as a justification for torture and in Article 2 where it states, “No exceptional circumstances whatsoever, whether a state of war or a threat of war, internal political instability or any other public emergency, may be invoked as a justification of torture.”⁵²

47. “Special Rapporteur.”

48. “Study Guides: Torture.”

49. *ibid.*

50. *ibid.*

51. *ibid.*

52. “Convention Against Torture.”

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

U.S. violations of this provision came to light in dramatic fashion in 2004 when pictures emerged of prisoners being tortured at the U.S.-operated detention facility of *Abu Ghraib* in Iraq. Many blamed the shocking developments on the Bush administration's post-September 11th reinterpretation of the Geneva Conventions, which essentially held that terrorist enemies of the United States should not be protected under international law because of their status as “*unlawful combatants*” in the global War on Terror.⁵³ Similar accusations against the Bush administration arose in response to the questioning and treatment of suspected terrorists held at the Guantanamo Bay detention center.

Part of the foundation for this argument rests on the question of whether suspected terrorists associated with al-Qaeda or operating in Iraq merited the status of “*lawful combatant*.” Lawful combatants are those who “at a minimum conduct their operations in accordance with the laws of war.”⁵⁴ The laws of war have been internationally established by tradition and by international agreements such as the Geneva Conventions and the *Hague Conventions* of 1907.⁵⁵ Individuals engaged in conflict who adhere to the laws of war must be treated as prisoners-of-war and enjoy the rights afforded by the Geneva Conventions. It was argued that terrorists, “by repudiating the most basic requirements of the laws of war – first and foremost the prohibition on deliberately attacking civilians...put themselves beyond Geneva’s protections.”⁵⁶

The origins of this policy go back to 2002 when lawyers in the Justice Department and Office of White House Counsel argued that the Geneva Conventions could be disregarded to protect the United States from imminent terrorist attacks based on the authority of the president as commander-in-chief of the armed forces.⁵⁷

Prisoners affiliated with the al-Qaeda terror network and Taliban of Afghanistan had been transferred to the U.S. military base at *Guantanamo Bay*, Cuba – a “legal twilight zone” viewed by some administration officials as “the legal equivalent of outer space” – for interrogation by *Central Intelligence Agency (CIA)* operatives and U.S. military intelligence personnel. It was hoped these prisoners could be persuaded to provide information about future terrorist threats to the United States.⁵⁸ In the words of then-White House Counsel Alberto Gonzales,

“The war on terrorism is a new kind of war...The nature of the new war places a —high premium on other factors, such as the ability to quickly obtain information from captured terrorists and their sponsors in order to avoid further atrocities against American civilians...In my judgment, this new paradigm renders obsolete Geneva’s strict

53. Barry et al.

54. Rivkin Jr. and Casey.

55. “The Hague Convention, 1899-1954.”

56. Rivkin Jr. and Casey.

57. Priest and Smith.

58. Barry et al.

limitations on questioning of enemy prisoners and renders quaint some of its provisions.”⁵⁹

New guidelines were drawn up at the Department of Justice that detailed the techniques interrogators were permitted to use to procure information under certain limited circumstances. Some of these techniques could be characterized as torture. They could only be considered acceptable under a very narrow view of what constitutes torture under international law, a view that was opposed by many of the military’s most experienced lawyers, who felt it to be a violation of a fifty-year tradition of adherence to the Geneva Conventions. A “72-point matrix for stress and duress” instructed officials in which techniques could be used in which situations.⁶⁰

According to a Justice Department memo, as long as techniques were not “equivalent in intensity to the pain accompanying serious physical injury, such as organ failure, impairment of bodily function, or even death” and did not result in “significant psychological harm of significant duration, e.g. lasting for months or even years,” many questionable practices could be used. Justice Department officials suggested that soldiers engaging in these practices might be able to claim they were carrying out “superior orders” to avoid prosecution.⁶¹

Senior military officials sharply criticized the Bush administration’s position, arguing, “There is a calculated effort to create an atmosphere of legal ambiguity about how the conventions should be interpreted and applied.” This ambiguity allowed techniques that the Red Cross has designated “tantamount to torture” to become entrenched over the course of several years and eventually spread to the now infamous prison of Abu Ghraib.⁶²

Advocates of human rights were appalled when the history of the Bush administration’s so-called “torture memos” were revealed. The “superior orders” defense proposed by the Justice Department memos was uncomfortably similar to the “I was just obeying orders” plea offered by Nazi war criminals at the Nuremberg trials after World War II. The suggested justifications for torture expressly contradict the principles stated in Article 1 of the Convention Against Torture, which the United States ratified in 1994.⁶³

Though the Bush administration retreated from the policies of 2002-2004 regarding torture and the Geneva Conventions, the arguments made in the “torture memos” raise important questions about the nature of rights in an increasingly globalized world. President Obama, upon taking office in January of 2009, signed an executive order to close Guantanamo Bay. Obama said, “he was issuing the order to close the facility in order to ‘restore the standards of due process and the core constitutional values that have made this country great even in the midst of war, even in

59. Barry et al.

60. Priest and Smith; Barry et al.

61. Priest and Smith.

62. Barry et al.

63. “Status of Ratification of the Convention Against Torture.”

dealing with terrorism.”⁶⁴ Unfortunately, more than two years later, the controversial prison is still open and Obama’s ban on holding new trials there has been reversed.⁶⁵

Do changing conditions of international security, such as the renewed threat of global terrorism, mean that we should change our conception of the limits of human rights? Is the current framework, which was developed to apply to and be administered by the nation-states of the twentieth century, still appropriate for the twenty-first century? Should terrorists not affiliated with any state be classified as “unlawful combatants?” Should torture be a completely non-derogable right, or should exceptions be made? If so, what should the scope of these exceptions be? The debate on these questions will continue for many years to come.

Non-Refoulement: Extraordinary Renditions and Outsourcing Torture

The principle of non-refoulement, found in Article 3 of the Convention against Torture, states that governments must not only refrain from torturing individuals themselves but also refuse to turn people over to other countries in which there is a reasonable suspicion they will be tortured.

In the last few years, questions have been raised about whether certain practices employed by the American CIA violate this principle. One such practice, extraordinary renditions, entails “secretly spiriting away suspects to other countries without due process,” often based on little evidence other than the suspicion of terrorist activity.⁶⁶

In a rendition, an individual can be snatched off a street corner, sometimes in broad daylight in their home town, by men in black hoods, loaded on a plane, and transported to a foreign country where he or she is jailed and interrogated for months at a time. The frequency of renditions by the CIA increased rapidly in the days and years following 9/11 as terrorist suspects and members of al-Qaeda were picked up and fed into a “global ‘ghost’ prison system.”⁶⁷

Some, such as then-CIA Director George Tenet, claimed the practice of renditions produced valuable information that “shattered terrorist cells and networks, thwarted terrorist plans, and in some cases even prevented attacks from occurring.” Once the interrogations were complete, some prisoners were simply flown home and released, while others were brought to ***Guantanamo Bay***, which came to become a “‘dumping ground’ for CIA mistakes.”⁶⁸ It was here that questionable tactics the CIA had used were adopted by military personnel and eventually made their way over to Iraq.⁶⁹

64. Henry et al.

65. “Barack Obama Restarts Guantánamo Trials.”

66. Hirsh et al.

67. Id.

68. Priest.

69. Hirsh et al.

Many argued that the network of secret CIA prisons, which stretched from Eastern Europe to the Middle East and Afghanistan, violated both the letter and the spirit of the Convention Against Torture. When the CIA did not interrogate prisoners in their own custody, they often turned them over to countries where there was legitimate reason to believe they would be tortured. U.S. government officials claim they no longer render prisoners to governments suspected of conducting torture, such as Syria, but “such scruples are being ignored when it comes to rendering suspects to allies like Egypt and Jordan, even though some officials do not believe ‘assurances’ from these nations that they were not mistreating prisoners.”⁷⁰

The Harrowing Story of Khaled El-Masri

Khaled El-Masri, a German citizen of Lebanese ancestry, was kidnapped by local authorities in December 2003 while on vacation in Macedonia because his name resembled that of one of the hijackers involved in the September 11 terrorist attacks. Macedonian police turned El-Masri over to the CIA after more than twenty days of captivity, and, handcuffed and blindfolded, he was transferred by secret flight to a CIA prison in Afghanistan. El-Masri was jailed in deplorable conditions without charge and was denied any form of legal representation. He claims that he was physically abused by interrogators during this time and had no contact with his family.⁷¹

When the CIA realized that the suspicion surrounding El-Masri’s terrorist ties was baseless, they informed him that he would be released but that “he would not receive any documents or papers confirming his ordeal.” American officials “would never admit they had taken him prisoner” and warned him that no one would believe his story if he tried to go public. El-Masri was flown to Albania and then allowed to return to Germany, without any compensation or apology for what he had suffered.⁷²

The *American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU)* filed a lawsuit against Tenet and the U.S. government in 2006, but the suit was dismissed by several courts on the grounds that “allowing the case to proceed would jeopardize state secrets.” El-Masri is considering an appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court.⁷³ Ultimately, the Supreme Court refused to hear the case.⁷⁴ El-Masri’s plight has become a symbolic cause for those who oppose the American policy of extraordinary renditions.

Youtube Clip: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mBZBA-uMreU>

70. Id.

71. Priest.

72. Id.

73. “Extraordinary Rendition: El-Masri v. Tenet.”

74. Greenhouse.

The practice of extraordinary renditions raises more questions about the limits of the protection against torture. Should renditions be permitted if they do produce valuable intelligence that saves lives? Should we believe government claims that interrogations under such conditions are effective? Are there any circumstances under which *refoulement* should be allowed? How troubling are the secrecy and lack of transparency surrounding this process? Is invoking the need to safeguard “state secrets” sufficient justification for reinterpreting a state’s commitments under the International Bill of Rights and the Convention against Torture?

The guarantee of *non-refoulement* is a good example of the complexity of many human rights. It is both an individual right and a government duty, an obligation for governments not to torture and to take active steps to ensure that no one in their custody is ever put into a situation where torture is likely to occur. According to International Law, negligence or passing off responsibility to other governments is not a valid excuse when it comes to torture.

The Ticking-Time Bomb Scenario: Jack Bauer and the Influence of ‘24’

A suspected terrorist, visibly roughed up, sits in front of a television monitor, unable to move because bound to a chair. On the screen, he watches video footage of his family, held hostage by masked men with machine guns. His interrogator warns that if he does not reveal the location of a nuclear bomb threatening Los Angeles, his wife and children will be murdered. Still refusing to talk, he cries out in horror as one of his sons is shot and falls over. He cracks and finally divulges details about the bomb. As he is escorted from the room, the monitor flickers to reveal that the entire scene has been faked and the suspect’s family remains unharmed. The interrogators got the information they wanted, but was their deception ethical? Did it constitute a form of psychological torture that is illegal under international law?⁷⁵

The scene just described occurred not in real life but on the popular American television program ‘24.’ Over the course of its six seasons, ‘24’ has depicted practices that could be characterized as torture in sixty-seven occasions, far more than any other show. Critics accuse the show of “glamorizing” torture; the show’s producers argue that they do not condone torture, except in the extreme circumstances in which their stories are set.⁷⁶

These circumstances are known as the “ticking time bomb” scenario: it is known that a real threat exists, there is a finite amount of time before the damage is done, and authorities have someone in their custody that they are confident has information that could save the day. Those who support the limited use of torture often point to precisely this scenario as the one case in which extreme measures would be justified in order to protect the public good.

But many are concerned about the increasing acceptance of torture in the popular media and its affects on the American psyche, and ‘24’ is the poster boy for this post-September 11

75. Mayer.

76. *ibid.*

phenomenon. Nonprofit groups such as Human Rights First and the Parents Television Council estimate that the number of times torture was shown on television jumped from 102 between 1996 and 2001 to 624 from 2002 to 2005.⁷⁷

Military leaders are worried about the influence of '24' on its personnel. U.S. Army Brigadier General Patrick Finnegan, dean of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, recently requested a meeting with the show's producers to ask them to stop or at least change the way they present torture. Finnegan and others lamented the "toxic effect" the show was having on some soldiers, including many serving in Iraq, for whom DVD's of television programs and movies "can sometimes substitute for or trump military training, and transmit a dark message to soldiers." The star of '24,' a character named Jack Bauer is viewed by fans as a patriotic hero, whose tactics, while gruesome, usually achieve the desired results.⁷⁸

Experienced interrogators insist that torture is not an effective method of acquiring information. Joe Navarro, a Federal Bureau of Investigation official who has conducted thousands of interrogations, suggests that torturing suspected terrorists just does not work, "These are very determined people, and they won't turn just because you pull a fingernail out...They almost welcome torture...They expect it. They *want* to be martyred."⁷⁹ The group that met with the show's producers encouraged them, if they insisted on continuing to display torture, to at least make it realistic and acknowledge the risks involved. These include duration (it can take weeks or months to "break" a suspect), reliability (suspects often provide false information to escape further harm), and mortality (victims of torture may die in the process).⁸⁰

Given these qualifications, it is natural to wonder how realistic the ticking time bomb scenario truly is. Would this highly specific set of conditions justify torture? Is the increased acceptance of such techniques in the media having a negative effect on viewers? Do these negative effects extend to military personnel engaged in real-life interrogation situations? Is this problem significant enough to demand the attention of government regulators?

Genocide

If torture violates the right to protection from physical harm on the individual level, then genocide extends this principle to a mass scale. Genocide is defined by the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide (1948, 1951) as:

77. Miller.

78. Mayer.

79. *ibid.*

80. Miller.

Any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

- Killing members of the group;
- Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
- Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
- Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
- Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.⁸¹

Genocides have occurred throughout human history, but they did not become a matter of pressing international concern until after World War II, when the full details of the Holocaust were revealed. Tens of millions of people were systematically massacred, using the full resources of the modern nation-state and the latest technology to make the executions more efficient.

What distinguishes genocide as a unique crime is the intent to destroy a group of people based on their identity as a particular group. It is fundamentally different from the killing that occurs in war, which, as detailed in the previous section on torture, usually involves standing armies and is governed by longstanding rules and traditions (see “Non-Derogability and State Sanction: Unlawful Combatants?” above). To a certain extent, war, terrible as it is, has been sanctioned by the international community as a tool of foreign policy that is acceptable under certain circumstances. War is regarded as “politics conducted by other means.”⁸²

The scope of war’s legitimacy—in a range of situations, from being a response to unwarranted aggression to preemptive war—is peripheral to this Brief. What is relevant here is that the unprecedented violence of the first half of the twentieth century taught the world a lesson. The international community determined that certain forms of killing—those rooted in a desire to exterminate an entire population—were abhorrent to the newly recognized notions of basic human dignity expressed in the UN Charter and International Bill of Rights.

For an authoritative history of genocide in the twentieth-century, see Samantha Powers’ *A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide* (2002).

Criminalizing Genocide in International Law

The idea of genocide as a distinct crime did not have any currency before World War II. The term was introduced by a Polish-Jewish jurist named Raphael Lemkin who emigrated from Poland to the United States when Germany invaded at the beginning of World War II. At the time, he was working to have crimes that would later be designated as genocide criminalized

81. “Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.”

82. de Waal.

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

under international law. It was in his 1944 book, *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*, that he coined the word genocide, defining it as "...a coordinated plan of different actions aiming at the destruction of essential foundations of the life of national groups, with an aim of annihilating the groups themselves."⁸³

After the war, Lemkin was instrumental in making sure that genocide was among the list of offenses for which Nazi officials were prosecuted (see "Courts and Justice in International Law: The Post-World War II Military Tribunals" below), but genocide had not yet been legally declared a crime under international law. Lemkin actively lobbied for several years until the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide was adopted by the UN in 1948. For the next ten years, he passionately devoted himself to persuading as many countries as possible to ratify the Convention and pass national legislations implementing its principles.⁸⁴

The Genocide Convention declared genocide an "odious scourge" from which mankind must be "liberate[d]." It officially criminalized genocide in all its forms: the act itself, conspiracy or attempts to commit genocide, incitement to encourage genocide, or complicity in genocidal acts. Importantly, Article 4 made clear that any individual could be held liable for the crime of genocide, whether they were acting in a public or private capacity.⁸⁵ Thus, no one would be safe from prosecution and no excuses could be advanced to justify this terrible act.

Genocide vs. War Crimes vs. Crimes Against Humanity

The concept of genocide can be confusing because it often seems to overlap with two other types of crimes that have a special place in international law: war crimes and crimes against humanity.

A war crime is generally understood to be a violation of the laws and customs of war, as established by the Geneva and Hague Conventions and other international traditions. Over time, our understanding of what constitutes a war crime has evolved as international courts and tribunals have issued rulings and established precedents to that effect.

Some examples of war crimes include: "Wanton destruction of cities, towns or villages, or devastation not justified by military necessity; attack, or bombardment, by whatever means, of undefended towns, villages, dwellings, or buildings; seizure of, destruction or willful [sic] damage done to institutions dedicated to religion, charity and education, the arts and sciences, historic monuments and works of art and science; plunder of public or private property."⁸⁶

A crime against humanity is thought to be a crime "committed in armed conflict but directed against a civilian population." Crimes against humanity can include slavery, deportation, certain kinds of incarceration, and "persecutions on political, racial and religious grounds." The

83. "Coining a Word and Championing a Cause."

84. *ibid.*

85. "Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide;" Marks and Clapham 228-230.

86. Kafala.

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

distinction between war crimes and crimes against humanity is subtle and not entirely fixed.

The crime of “mass systematic rape,” for example, was upgraded from a war crime to a crime against humanity in a 2001 ruling by an international court sitting in the Hague, Netherlands.⁸⁷ Both types of crimes are regarded as extremely serious and are subject to prosecution by UN-authorized international tribunals.

Genocide shares characteristics with both war crimes and crimes against humanity, but is considered the most egregious crime of all. It goes beyond the crimes of war and constitutes an attack against the very existence of people.

87. *ibid.*

Courts and Justice in International Law: The Post-World War II Military Tribunals

In the wake of World War II, the victorious Allied powers – notably the U.S., Great Britain, Soviet Union and France—established and authorized an International Military Tribunal to prosecute high-ranking Nazi officials for war crimes and crimes against humanity, among other alleged offenses.

The jurisdiction afforded to the Tribunal was somewhat unique because it covered “offenses [that] had no particular geographical location.”⁸⁸ These offenses were crimes against human dignity as well as crimes against specific individuals. It represented a concrete recognition that a violations of human rights had occurred that were equally as important, if not more important, than other well-defined transgressions against the laws of war. Eventually, 19 other nations joined in supporting the authorization of the Tribunal.

The trials that followed, known as the Nuremberg trials after the German city in which they were held, considered the charges against 24 Nazi leaders. It took 216 court sessions over a one year period for verdicts to be reached. In the end, three defendants were acquitted, three were imprisoned with 10-20 year sentences, three were given life prison sentences, twelve were condemned to be hanged, and two were exempted from prosecution (one had committed suicide, the other was deemed mentally unfit for trial).⁸⁹



The defendants made two arguments against the charges. First, they claimed that only states, and not individuals, could be held responsible for the types of crimes of which they had been accused.⁹⁰ The court’s rejection of this argument set a landmark precedent, establishing that rights could be discussed and enforced on the level of the individual regardless of the

88. “Nurnberg Trials.”

89. Ibid.

90. Ibid.

involvement of states, and that state authority could not be used to shield individuals from criminal accountability.

The second argument challenged the very basis of the charges, asserting that several of the offenses should not be considered crimes since they were criminalized in law (through the various UN conventions described in this Brief) only after they had been committed, i.e. *ex post facto* (literally, “after the fact”).⁹¹ The court’s rejection of this argument, broadly speaking, hinged on the idea that these crimes had already been implicitly covered under preexisting international law and bolstered the claims of human rights advocates that such rights should be considered settled international law, or *jus cogens*.

Similar trials were held in Tokyo, known as the Tokyo trials, for suspected Japanese war criminals under the jurisdiction of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East. All 25 defendants were convicted, and seven were condemned to death by hanging.⁹² The Nuremberg and Tokyo tribunals provided a model for how war crimes, crimes against humanity, and eventually genocide could be prosecuted under international law.

The Persistence of Genocide and Subsequent UN Tribunals

Unfortunately, recognizing genocide as a crime under international law was not sufficient to prevent future genocides from occurring. There have been a number of genocides since the end of World War II.

The Cambodian Genocide and the Khmer Rouge

Between 1975 and 1979, 1.7 million Cambodians (21 percent of the population) were murdered by the dictator Pol Pot and his Khmer Rouge party as he tried to turn the country into a totalitarian communist state modeled on China.⁹³

The violence was directed against native Cambodians, in an attempt to enforce the rigid new system of political and social organization, and against ethnic minorities, including Chinese, Vietnamese and Thai.

The Cambodian genocide came at the height of the Cold War, when U.S. involvement in Vietnam and opposition to the Soviet Union meant that the administrations of Presidents Gerald Ford and Jimmy Carter aligned the U.S. with China and its ally, the Khmer Rouge. In 1979, the neighboring government of communist Vietnam invaded Cambodia and deposed Pol Pot, thereby stopping the genocide.

91. *ibid.*

92. “War Crime: The Nuremberg and Tokyo Trials.”

93. “The Cambodian Genocide Program.”

Nonetheless, the U.S. led an international movement to support Khmer guerillas in their fight against the Vietnamese occupiers and to isolate Cambodia.⁹⁴

It took nearly 20 years for serious negotiations to make progress on establishing a tribunal to prosecute accused Khmer Rouge war criminals. The Cambodian government wanted to jointly administer the tribunal with the UN. But UN officials, including Secretary General Kofi Annan, worried that the Cambodians could not “guarantee the necessary standards of independence, impartiality and objectivity” necessary to legitimize the tribunal and allow for its effective operation in the search for justice. They were also troubled by the insistence that “Cambodian national law would prevail over the court.”⁹⁵

In 2006, an agreement was finally reached for a UN-sponsored trial to commence. Many felt the tribunal was necessary but too late in coming. Pol Pot had already died in 1998, as had several other senior Khmer Rouge officials, therefore preventing the execution of justice that would have helped heal the country.⁹⁶

Nonetheless, in July 2010, Khmer Rouge commander, Kaing Guek Eav was found guilty of war crimes and crimes against humanity and was sentenced to 35 years in prison. He was the first of five senior leaders to face trial.

Although the belated agreement for a trial is welcome, Cambodia offers an example of how geopolitical interests often trump humanitarian ones and of the dangers of waiting too long for mobilizing the machinery of international law in the service of justice.

The Rwandan Genocide: Hutu vs. Tutsi

The African country of Rwanda became a colony of Belgium in 1916. The population of Rwanda consisted of two main ethnic groups, the minority Tutsis (about 15 percent of the population) and the majority Hutus (about 85percent). The Belgian authorities favored the Tutsis and empowered them to assist with the administration of the colony, essentially creating a class system that was formalized by the issuing of ethnic identity cards in 1926.

In 1959, the Hutus rebelled and over 150,000 Tutsi refugees fled to neighboring Burundi. Belgium was forced to grant Rwanda independence in 1961-1962, but ethnic tensions continued to intensify as the new Hutu rulers consolidated their power. Violence between the two groups dragged on for the next 25 years.⁹⁷

The international community pressed Rwanda’s Hutu leader, General Juvenal Habyarimana, to open the government to the participation of multiple political parties. In the early 1990s, the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF), a group comprised of Tutsi exiles, invaded Rwanda and

94. “Cambodia 1975: The Genocide;” Kiernan.

95. Barrow.

96. Hinton

97. “Rwanda: A Historical Chronology.”

opened hostilities with government forces. The government's army responded by training and equipping a civilian militia, known as the interahamwe (literally, "those who stand together").

The UN attempted to bring the two sides together to negotiate a peace settlement, but Rwanda was thrown into chaos when a plane carrying Habyarimana was shot down and the general himself was killed.

Over the next 100 days, the interahamwe and government forces slaughtered 800,000 people, the vast majority of them ethnic Tutsis. UN peacekeepers, which had been sent to Rwanda to monitor the situation, lacked a mandate to intervene in the conflict and were unable to stop the carnage. The violence was not halted until the RPF succeeded in overtaking the capital.⁹⁸

In 1995, the UN established an International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda based in Arusha, Tanzania. Since 1997, the Tribunal has completed 59 cases of which 37 people were convicted, one person was arrested for false testimony, and eight people were acquitted; 13 cases are being appealed. There have been several convictions on the charge of genocide, including one of a prime minister.

One of the achievements of the tribunal has been the important precedent it set regarding the prosecution of rape as an element of genocidal activity.⁹⁹ Although the international community failed to intervene yet again while genocide was actually being committed, the Rwanda Tribunal has largely succeeded in introducing a measure of timely justice for these terrible crimes.

International Criminal Court (ICC)

All of the tribunals discussed so far have been temporary and *ad hoc*, meaning they were constituted to prosecute a specific set of crimes, occurring within a specific geographical territory and a specific timeframe. As genocides continued to occur in the postwar period, a movement developed to found a permanent, standing court that could try cases involving war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocides committed anywhere in the world at any time. The *Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court* was adopted by the United Nations in July of 1998 and entered into force in July of 2002.¹⁰⁰ The Court is located in The Hague, Netherlands. As of July 2012, 121 countries have ratified the statute.¹⁰¹

The ICC, like many of its predecessor tribunals, seeks to prosecute individuals rather than states. Its jurisdiction is both broad and limited. It is broad in the sense that it can take cases from any

98. *ibid.*; "Rwanda: How the Genocide Happened."

99. "Achievements of the ICTR."

100. "Rome Statute."

101. "Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court."

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

country in the world, but it is limited by the principle of *complementarity*.¹⁰² This principle holds that the ICC “can only act in cases where states are unwilling or unable to do so.”

Thus, the ICC is designed to respect state sovereignty in situations where states are willing to act responsibly to fulfill their obligations to international justice. States that are party to the Statute and accept the standing of the Court can refer cases to the ICC for investigation, as can the UN *Security Council*. ICC prosecutors can initiate their own investigations when approached by victims or NGOs, as long as the principle of complementarity is respected. The ICC is also limited in that it can only review crimes that have been committed subsequent to its establishment in July 2002.¹⁰³

A few countries, most notably the US, voted against the Rome Statute and have not supported the creation of the ICC (the others being China, Iraq, Libya, Yemen, Qatar, and Israel). The Bush administration worried that “the ICC may exercise its jurisdiction to conduct politically motivated investigations and prosecutions of U.S. military and political officials and personnel.” The U.S. has aggressively tried to secure exemptions from prosecution for American citizens, both in the UN Security Council and on a bilateral basis with other countries through bilateral immunity agreements (BIAs), also-called “*impunity agreements*.” Many advocates of human rights fear that this policy will produce a “two-tiered rule of law for the most serious international crimes: one that applies to U.S. nationals; another that applies to the rest of the world’s citizens.”¹⁰⁴

Supporters of the ICC argue that the U.S. has little to fear. As a general principle, any cases brought against the U.S. would face strict scrutiny before reaching the Court, and the U.S. judicial system would have an opportunity to prosecute the case first if it merited legal action. American citizens who might be accused of the types of crimes covered by the ICC’s mandate would already be subject to prosecution in the countries in which those crimes had been committed, regardless of the existence of the ICC. The main contribution of the Rome Statute is that it allows countries to “exercis[e] their sovereign right to allow an international court to prosecute certain crimes committed on their territory rather than conducting these trials themselves.” Opponents of the Court continue to maintain that politically motivated prosecutions against the U.S. would be inevitable, and that provisions for due process are insufficient to meet American legal standards.¹⁰⁵

To date, the Obama administration has seemed fairly open to ratifying the Rome Statute, yet it has not taken any significant steps towards that end.¹⁰⁶ The U.S may be preparing to shift away from the stance they held concerning the ICC under the Bush Administration. In 2009, U.S. Ambassador Susan Rice, in a Security Council hearing, reportedly said that the ICC “looks to

102. “International Criminal Court: Basic Fact Sheet.”

103. “International Justice;” “International Criminal Court: Basic Fact Sheet.”

104. “International Criminal Court: Basic Fact Sheet.”

105. “The United States and the International Criminal Court.”

106. “Myths and Facts About the International Criminal Court.”

become an important and credible instrument for trying to hold accountable the senior leadership responsible for atrocities committed in the Congo, Uganda and Darfur.”¹⁰⁷ Recognition from U.S diplomats concerning the credibility of the ICC represents a fairly dramatic shift away from the previous administration’s stance on the court.

As of May 2011, the ICC has received 9,214 communications to investigate alleged crimes in 140 countries. As of June 2011, seven investigations were ongoing under the Court’s oversight: in the Central African Republic,¹⁰⁸ Uganda, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Darfur (Sudan), the Republic of Kenya, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, and the Republic of Côte d’Ivoire. Two cases involving Venezuela and the U.S. presence in Iraq had been dismissed, and five others remained under consideration.¹⁰⁹



Picture: Displaced person camp in Darfur

To date, “Uganda, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Central African Republic – have referred situations occurring on their territories to the Court.” Additionally, the United Nation’s Security Council referred the circumstances in Darfur, Sudan – a non-State Party, to the ICC.¹¹⁰ These statistics suggest that the ICC has been careful in interpreting its mandate as a “court of last resort.”

For more on the crisis in Darfur, consult the “Darfur: A Case Study” news analysis, which can be found at: <http://www.globalization101.org/index.php?file=news1&id=82>

The United Nations, in conjunction with the government of Sierra Leone, established the Special Court for Sierra Leone, to try those who bore “greatest responsibility for serious violations of international humanitarian law and Sierra Leonean law committed in the territory of Sierra Leone since 30 November 1996.” In total, thirteen indictments were presented by officers for

107. Kilgannon.

108. International Criminal Court

109. Hanson.

110. “Situations and Cases.”

the court. To date, “The trials of three former leaders of the Armed Forces Revolutionary Council (AFRC) and of two members of the Civil Defence Forces (CDF) have been completed, including appeals.” Three former leaders of the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) were sentenced to 25-52 years for war crimes and crimes against humanity. Additionally, former Liberian President Charles Taylor is currently sitting trial at The Hague and facing similar accusations.¹¹¹

For more on the aforementioned court hearings, view the Special Court for Sierra Leone’s website at <http://www.sc-sl.org/HOME/tabid/53/Default.aspx>.

The International Criminal Court vs. the International Court of Justice (ICJ)

The *International Criminal Court*, as the previous section elaborated, is the standing judicial body dedicated to investigating and prosecuting war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide. Its function is to protect certain fundamental human rights. It both protects and prosecutes individuals, not states.

The *International Court of Justice* is the international judicial body responsible for adjudicating disputes between states on questions of international law. It was established in Article 33 of the UN Charter to work towards the peaceful resolution of conflicts that might have resulted in hostilities in the past. It has a variety of methods open to it, including “negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, *arbitration*, judicial settlement, and resort to regional agencies or arrangements.”¹¹² The Court conducts hearings and trials, known as *contentious cases*, and issues advisory opinions, in what are known as *advisory proceedings*.¹¹³

One example of the type of case the ICJ hears involved a territorial dispute between Israel and Palestine. Israel had constructed a wall in the contested West Bank territory in order to protect itself from suicide bomb attacks. Palestinian authorities objected that construction of the wall violated international law, and the ICJ agreed. The Court held in an advisory opinion that the wall was “tantamount to annexation” and “impeded the Palestinian right to self-determination,” which is found in the ICCPR among other places. ICJ decisions are non-binding, and Israel vowed not to accept the ruling in 2004; Israel’s allies, the U.S. and the United Kingdom joined with it in questioning the jurisdiction of the ICJ over the situation.¹¹⁴

For full documentation on this case, consult the ICJ: <http://www.icj-cij.org/docket/index.php?p1=3&p2=4&code=mwp&case=131&k=5a>.

This case illustrates the complexities of trying to enforce international law. There will always be countries that challenge the legitimacy and authority of bodies like the ICJ, but the ICJ and

111. “About the Special Court for Sierra Leone.”

112. “The Court: History.”

113. “Cases.”

114. “UN Rules Against Israeli Barrier.”

other institutions like it are the best frameworks the international community has developed so far for peacefully resolving disputes across borders.

The role of courts and tribunals in enforcing international law remains an area of fierce contention. Some wonder whether the function of these bodies is *deterrence* or *retribution*. Is the goal of prosecuting individuals in the ICC or more specialized tribunals to punish these people for the specific crimes they have committed, or to send a broader message in hopes that imposing “exemplary punishments on selected individuals” will decrease the chances that the crimes they have committed will be repeated in the future?¹¹⁵ Genocide continues to be a threat in many countries, even with the increased media attention given to crises like the one in Darfur. In the next section, we will turn to the vexed question of how countries decide to intervene to stop genocide before it happens.

Interventions

The Problem of Humanitarian Intervention

Courts of international law represent one way in which the international community has decided to limit the sovereignty of states. Certain crimes must be prosecuted, whether states like it or not; if national governments shirk this responsibility, mechanisms are in place to supersede state authority. In some cases, advocates of human rights and humanitarian concerns believe broader and more substantial interventions are justified.

One such instance occurs when genocide is in progress and can either be prevented or stopped. The relevant problem becomes: under what circumstances can the priority of state sovereignty be ignored in the interests of humanity? Humanitarian intervention has been defined by Robert Keohane and J.L. Holzgrefe as:

The threat or use of force across state borders by a state (or group of states) aimed at preventing or ending widespread and grave violations of the fundamental human rights of individuals other than its own, without the permission of the state within whose territory force is applied.

The key points here are: it involves the use of force; it occurs without permission; and its purpose is to prevent “widespread and grave” violations of human rights on the scale of genocide.¹¹⁶

115. Marks and Clapham 225.

116. Barsa.

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

Intervention thus constitutes a serious challenge to the authority of a sovereign nation and requires an equally serious justification. Where competing interests are at stake – such as the general reluctance to engage in unprovoked military activity and the imperative to protect human rights – one must be sacrificed.¹¹⁷ Sometimes violations of individual freedom and human dignity are so objectionable that the presumptions in favor of sovereignty and against the use of force are eroded.

Some argue that sovereignty is not a prerogative automatically conferred on all states. Human rights should be the priority because they are “intrinsic,” while sovereignty is merely “instrumental,” meaning it is only a means to the end of ensuring that human dignity is respected.¹¹⁸ According to one version of this argument, “In the nineteenth century, full sovereign rights were extended only to states that met minimum standards of ‘civilization’ ... [now it seems that] human rights—or, more precisely, avoidance of genocide—is emerging as something like a new standard of civilization.”¹¹⁹

Just as one can argue that individual rights double as duties, that is, that they require reciprocal respect for the rights of others before they can be exercised, so too could one claim that sovereignty entails duties as well as right for all states (see “Rights vs. Duties vs. Aspirations” above). If states cannot protect the most basic human right—the right to life—then they are not entitled to invoke the mantle of sovereignty in their defense against the compelling interest of the international community to deal with genocide.

Peacekeeping in Bosnia

As the Soviet Union collapsed in the 1989-1991 period, countries were under its control for generations struggled to reclaim their independent identities. Yugoslavia faced a particularly difficult challenge because its integrity as a country was questionable: it functioned as an unstable collection of different and often fractious ethnic groups, including Serbs, Croats, and Bosnian Muslims. The country dissolved into a number of competing parts. The newly independent countries of Serbia and Croatia fought for territory and influence in the land that separated them, Bosnia-Herzegovina, initiating a brutal war that raged for much of the first half of the 1990s.

117. Peterson.

118. Peterson; Terry.

119. Donnelly 250.

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

In early 1992, the United Nations established in a *peacekeeping* force, the UN Protection Force (UNPROFOR), to provide security for the streams of *humanitarian aid* that were flowing into Bosnia from the international community. UNPROFOR's mission was to remain "passive and impartial," and to "find a middle way between traditional peacekeeping missions that 'sustain' a peaceful environment and large-scale enforcement operations that use active military force to 'create' such an environment."¹²⁰

At the time the UN became involved, the question of genocide was not a major issue, yet it was hard for peacekeepers to ignore the atrocities that were occurring once they were on the ground. Skeptics of UN involvement believed that the West, specifically the members of the *North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)*, had been galvanized to action out of guilt, "to assuage Western consciences about the barbarity taking place in a 'European' war."¹²¹ They also cited the increased presence of media in the war zone, and the so-called "*CNN effect*" by which public opinion was shaped by the shocking images seen on television.¹²²



Picture: Croatian refugees housed by UNPROFOR, Source: <http://www.un.org/av/photo>

The task of the protective force was complicated by the fact that there was no peace to police.¹²³ On the contrary, some believe that the UN presence may have exacerbated the conflict, because "the well-intentioned international effort keeps Bosnian society functioning at a level that is just tolerable enough to keep any of the belligerents from negotiating seriously for peace."¹²⁴ The UN tried to take a more active role by establishing "safe zones" under international protection in the capital of Sarajevo, Goradze, Srebrenica, and a few other locations. But Serbian forces overran the safe zone at Srebrenica in 1995, massacring more than 7,500 Muslim men and boys

120. Hillen III.

121. *ibid.*, Carey.

122. de Waal.

123. Hillen III.

124. *ibid.*

in what many have called “worst atrocity in Europe since World War II.”¹²⁵ Even the presence of UN forces could not prevent this terrible act of violence from occurring.

The *Srebrenica massacre* changed the international community’s relation to the Bosnia War, and NATO responded by initiating more aggressive military air strikes against Serbian forces around Sarajevo. Hostilities began to wind down at the end of 1995, partially because Serbian leaders had accomplished many of their goals of “*ethnic cleansing*” and because Croatian forces had begun to gain momentum in a counter-assault.¹²⁶

The *UN International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia*, which was established in 1993 in the middle of the war, was charged with investigating and prosecuting war crimes and other crimes that had occurred during the conflict. Serbian President Slobodan Milosevic, who had orchestrated many of the war’s atrocities, was indicted but died in prison while his trial was still in progress.¹²⁷ Over 160 people have been indicted by the tribunal thus far and proceedings are ongoing for an additional 35 people.

The crisis in Bosnia provides an example of a case where the international community attempted to stop wartime violations of human rights in a manner somewhere in between strict peacekeeping and full-blown military intervention. UN efforts in Bosnia were not entirely effective in meeting this objective, partially because they were too late in recognizing the true nature of what was happening and partially because sufficient resources were not devoted to the task. These lessons would be applied just a few years later in Kosovo.

Intervention in Kosovo

Kosovo was a province of Yugoslavia that traditionally enjoyed a limited form of autonomy during the period of communist domination. The province was located in Serbian territory, but its population consisted of an overwhelming majority of ethnic Albanians (about 1.8 million) from neighboring Albania. In 1989, the Serbian-led government of Yugoslavia terminated Kosovo’s autonomy, sparking a resistance movement known as the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA).

After the cessation of hostilities in Bosnia, the conflict in Kosovo intensified, resulting in hundreds of thousands of refugees leaving the province. The UN Security Council passed a series of resolutions—numbers 1160, 1199, and 1203—addressing the unfolding situation in Kosovo, but UN-sponsored peace negotiations in Rambouillet, France collapsed in March of 1999.¹²⁸

125. “Ratko Mladic Is Still At Large.”

126. de Waal.

127. “General Information;” Simons.

128. Terry; Dietrich

Under *Chapter VII*, Article 42 of the UN Charter, the provision often cited as justification for humanitarian intervention, the UN Security Council can authorize the use of force when such actions are “necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security.”¹²⁹ The Security Council sought to invoke this provision to take a more active role in Kosovo, but Russia and China vetoed the authorization of force. As a result, NATO decided to intervene without UN sanction and launched a campaign of air strikes against Serbian forces. The action was decisive and successful, and led to the withdrawal of Serbian troops from Kosovo.¹³⁰ Since 1999, Kosovo has been administered by the United Nations Interim Administrative Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK). “As of June 2012, 76 of 193 United Nations member states have recognized Kosovo as an independent state.”¹³¹

Humanitarian Intervention in Perspective

In the case of Kosovo, a humanitarian intervention was effective in preventing a potential genocide from occurring before it happened. It was reasonable to believe, given Serbia’s recent history of *ethnic cleansing*, that Kosovo’s ethnic Albanians were at grave risk. But the complexity of the situation must be understood: intervention was blocked by the UN Security Council, and NATO was forced to act *unilaterally*.

The implicit rationale for NATO activity was that the Security Council had been derelict in its responsibilities. This dereliction did not change the urgency of the situation or make it any less justifiable to intervene; rather, it shifted the responsibility to other willing parties, just as responsibility shifts to the ICC when national governments refuse to prosecute certain crimes that fall under their jurisdiction (see “The International Criminal Court (ICC)” above).

In the end, the mission’s success was its own justification. In the eyes of many, this is true for all humanitarian interventions. In the nineteenth century, the British statesman Sir William V. Harcourt argued, “As in the case of revolution, its [intervention’s] essence is its illegality and its justification is its success.”¹³² While this principle may be true, it does not make it any easier for policymakers to judge when intervention is appropriate before undertaking it.

Although the twentieth century saw an increasing number of precedents, such as Congo in 1961 (approved by the UN) and Bangladesh in 1971 (which was roundly condemned) and gradually more widespread acceptance of the notion of humanitarian intervention, most experts believe intervention will remain a rarely employed last resort. Even the success of Kosovo is sobering: “NATO’s decision to rely on air strikes rather than ground forces also led many to conclude that major powers remain so intolerant of casualties that humanitarian interventions will remain

129. “Charter of the United Nations: Chapter VII.”

130. Terry; Dietrich.

131. “About UNMIK.”

132. de Waal.

rare.”¹³³

Cynics maintain that the primary consideration for countries to intervene will always be the extent to which their own strategic interests are at stake. This explains the reluctance of the West to intervene in African genocides, such as those in Rwanda and Darfur, where few strategic interests are at stake. When the international community wants to intervene, the institutional mechanisms that facilitate interventionist actions through the UN are relatively weak.¹³⁴

The proper scope of humanitarian intervention will remain an important question for the 21st century, as the international community continues to debate proactive ways to prevent the most egregious violations of human rights, particularly in the case of genocide.

Responsibility to Protect (R2P)

An important advancement in the subject of humanitarian intervention is the idea of Responsibility to Protect, or R2P. This principle is outlined in a December 2001 report by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS). After the failure of the international community to successfully intervene in Rwanda, among other places, then UN Secretary General Kofi Annan posed the serious question of how to balance state sovereignty and protection of all peoples from crimes against humanity, such as genocide. The result was the ICISS report, which first mentioned the idea of R2P.

After much debate on the legality and necessity of humanitarian intervention, the commitment to R2P was made at the UN World Summit in 2005. Since then, the current UN Secretary General has continued moving forward in the implementation of R2P. It has three basic pillars:

- **“Pillar One** stresses that States have the primary responsibility to protect their populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity.
- **Pillar Two** addresses the commitment of the international community to provide assistance to States in building capacity to protect their populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity and to assist those under stress before crises and conflicts break out.
- **Pillar Three** focuses on the responsibility of international community to take timely and decisive action to prevent and halt genocide, ethnic cleansing, war crimes and crimes against humanity when a State fails to protect its populations.”¹³⁵

133. Dietrich.

134. Donnelly 169-170; Falk 178-183.

135. “An Introduction to the Responsibility to Protect”

As expected, R2P has a great number of critics as well as proponents. The critics maintain that states will only act only in their own interests, therefore making humanitarian interventions difficult and biased. It remains to be seen how R2P will be implemented and if it can positively affect the future of humanitarian intervention.

Impact of Globalization

How has globalization affected human rights thinking in the international arena? Scholar Sumner Twiss addresses this question in his article “History, Human Rights, and Globalization” (2004). Here we will examine his analysis of the impact of globalization on two broad issues: changes in the conception and content of human rights, and changes with regard to the major players in both abusing and guaranteeing human rights. In the following sections, we will demonstrate how globalization has helped to advance collective and indigenous rights, women’s rights, and children’s rights.

Twiss employs a heuristic developed by Richard Falk to elucidate his case: globalization-from-above and globalization-from-below. The former refers to economic and political collaboration among big powers such as state actors and financial and corporate agents, and the latter refers to social, political, and cultural collaboration among local, national, and international agencies (e.g., non-governmental organizations, United Nations organs) interested in advancing or changing the quality of civil societies across the world, perhaps even forming a global civil society (Twiss 2004).

Changes in the Conception and Content of Human Rights

The development of new concepts of human rights has been significantly assisted by globalization processes acting in concert with the political coming-of-age of minority ethnic populations and women’s and children’s movements for liberation and development.

Indigenous Rights

Indigenous peoples are those communities, groups, or nations often referred to as tribal peoples or First peoples which inhabited lands later colonized by others. They are prevalent throughout the world and represent more than 400 million persons. Their worldviews and practices connect them socially, economically, and spiritually to certain natural environments or bioregional locations crucial to their identity and survival as distinct peoples (Twiss 2004).

Although found in diverse areas of the world, indigenous peoples have been subjected to a similar history of oppression involving military conquest bordering on genocide, dispossession from and exploitation of their lands, forced relocation, deprivation of their traditional means of

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

subsistence and livelihood, removal of their children and denial of traditional cultural education, interference with their religious practices, discrimination in the dominant surrounding society, and marginalization in political processes (Twiss 2004). There is a history of systematic destruction and oppression.

Given this history, what has changed recently to call attention to indigenous rights? Twiss argues that processes of globalization-from-above -- namely, collaboration between state actors and agents of capital formation such as the International Monetary Fund and World Bank -- have instituted policies and procedures that have so accelerated the destruction of these people that their seemingly imminent annihilation is impossible to ignore. Simultaneously, processes of globalization-from-below -- including communications, information, and travel technologies, and NGOs assisted by these technologies -- have made it possible for indigenous peoples to come together and develop strategies of resistance (Twiss 2004; see also Ewen 1994).

Indigenous peoples have articulated, in one voice, the claim that they have collective human interests and rights to preservation and self-determination as enumerated in the Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. These collective rights claims have, however, aroused consternation in the international community as the concept of group rights runs against the prevailing individualistic orientation of accepted human rights norms.

Individual Rights or Group Rights

Due to these injustices, international human rights efforts have sought to protect indigenous peoples, particularly in recent years. However, there remains significant disagreement regarding the best method and framework to use to do so. A key question in this discussion is whether identity is defined through individual characteristics or through group membership. The answer to this question helps determine whether group rights (in this case for indigenous groups) are truly necessary or whether the interests of groups are better served by vigorous enforcement of individual human rights.



Picture: Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues

As such, discussions of indigenous rights necessarily raise important questions regarding the international human rights framework. The classic liberal approach, which remains dominant today, emphasizes individual rights over collective rights. In part, this is driven by the notion

that the guarantee of rights for individuals will lead to rights for groups. Human rights flow from the individual to the group rather than the other way around, i.e. identity is defined through individual characteristics, not group membership.

However, despite this traditional focus on individual rights, protections for groups have become increasingly accepted in certain circumstances. For instance, the 1948 *Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide* specifically bans violence targeting a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group for destruction. This convention reflects the growing notion that “membership of a minority community entails distinct human rights.”¹³⁶ Adopted in 1966, the *Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* protects minorities’ rights to enjoy their own culture, practice their own religion, and use their own language. Additionally, the *UN Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic Minorities*, adopted in 1992, further extended the norm of granting rights to minorities.

Efforts to provide protections explicitly for indigenous peoples have only recently gained traction. It was not until 1982 that a *Working Group on Indigenous Peoples* was formed under the *United Nations Economic and Social Council*. Although a *Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* was drafted in 1985, little progress was made until June 29, 2006, when the UN *Human Rights Council* adopted the Declaration. However, stiff resistance to the Declaration remains in the General Assembly, primarily by states worried that it could advance the claims of indigenous groups to independence, thereby impacting the territorial boundaries of these states. This will be covered in more depth below.

For the full text of the Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, see: <http://www.ohchr.org/english/issues/indigenous/docs/declaration.doc>.

Land and Environment

The lives of indigenous peoples are often inextricably linked with their relationship to the environment. Their traditions often demonstrate an attachment to land and a strong responsibility for preserving it for future generations.¹³⁷ In fact, many indigenous people have a profoundly spiritual relationship with nature, one that ties the land to their very existence.¹³⁸ There is also a strong correlation between areas of high biological diversity and the presence of indigenous peoples in those areas around the world, including the “Biological 17” nations that are home to two-thirds of the world’s biological resources.¹³⁹

136. Marks and Clapham, 45.

137. “Leaflet 10: Indigenous Peoples and the Environment.”

138. Peang-Meth, 106.

139. *ibid.*

Because indigenous groups have tended to preserve their lands, there are often abundant resources available on their lands that mainstream society may want to access, such as oil, lumber, and farmable land. These economic pressures can seriously threaten both the environment, but also the indigenous groups who depend on the land for their way of life. Therefore, the protection of this land as well as indigenous rights to preserve their group's land is integral to indigenous survival.

The Amazon River Basin

The Amazon River Basin is a massive rainforest in nine South American countries that is also home to over 300 indigenous groups.¹⁴⁰ The Amazon basin is also one of the richest areas of biological diversity in the world, but one that is being reduced every day by increased settlement and destruction of the forest for agricultural use as well as for the extraction of raw materials such as gold and iron.

This development directly impacts residents of the Amazon, such as the Kayapo, Waiapi, and Yanomami indigenous peoples of Brazil. Millions of acres of their ancestral homelands have been destroyed, and in some cases, such as with the Ashaninka, indigenous peoples have not only lost their land, but been forced into slavery for plantation owners who have taken their lands.¹⁴¹

The devastation of parts of the Amazon River Basin not only robs indigenous peoples of their fundamental rights, but it also decimates some of the last great expanses of biological diversity left on the planet.



Picture: Amazon River

The issue of human rights and environmental protection are inherently linked in this region, providing an even greater justification for the recognition of group rights.

In response, the indigenous peoples of the Amazon region have organized themselves into the Coordinating Body for the Indigenous Peoples' Organizations of the Amazon Basin and are pressing for their rights to their lands, as well as their rights to participate in decisions affecting their lands.

140. "Focus: Land Rights in the Amazon River Basin."

141. *ibid.*

Cultural Rights

Indigenous peoples are also an important source of cultural diversity: 4,000 to 5,000 of the world's 6,000 cultures are indigenous.¹⁴² Further, approximately three-quarters of the world's languages are spoken by indigenous peoples. These languages are disappearing rapidly due to the pressures being placed on indigenous peoples.

The forces of globalization are reducing the number of cultures around the world and strengthening ties between those that remain. This process often increases the similarities between cultures while reducing their differences. The promotion of homogenous cultures could pose a serious threat to human survival. Researchers are recognizing that cultural diversity drives changes in civilization, just as biodiversity enables biological evolution.

Importantly, a significant amount of ecological knowledge is accumulated by the indigenous peoples who live in rare and poorly understood ecologies. Their knowledge is held in their language, so with the loss of their language the world loses the intimate knowledge of the plants that could provide future medical treatments or technological advances. In fact, the U.S. *National Institutes of Health* concluded that "traditional knowledge is as threatened and is as valuable as biological diversity. Both resources deserve respect and must be conserved."¹⁴³

But, beyond the direct benefits that can be gained for science or industry, the protection of language and culture hold merits in its own right. Indigenous peoples' rights seek to protect this special class of minorities that are particularly vulnerable to the encroachment of the modern state and the wider societies they support. Language and culture are key attributes that define these peoples' identities and therefore deserve special efforts of protection.

Bilingual Education in New Zealand

The Maori are the indigenous peoples of New Zealand who signed a treaty, the Treaty of Waitangi, with the British Crown in 1840 that established British rule throughout New Zealand, but that also recognized certain rights for the native Maoris. Among those rights was the right to preserve the Maori language and culture. However, by the end of World War II, most Maori children were educated only in English so the Maori language was slowly disappearing. To reverse this trend, the Maori lobbied the New Zealand government to establish native-language education programs.

The result was the creation of the Kohanga Reo in 1981, a comprehensive education program for Maori children involving Maori language immersion as well as a complete education in Maori history and culture. The program provides a parallel system of education to the traditional, English-based program used primarily by New Zealanders of European descent.

142. "Leaflet 10: Indigenous Peoples and the Environment."

143. *ibid.*

Now, the Maori system includes primary schools, secondary schools, and even a university. All are funded by the New Zealand government, but curricular decisions are community based and help strengthen both the Maori language, but also Maori ethnic and group identity.¹⁴⁴

Self-Determination

The right to *self-determination*, as asserted in the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights as well as the Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, provides a substantial portion of the intellectual underpinning for the protection of individual human rights.¹⁴⁵ It presents the notion that individuals are guaranteed the right to decide their own paths in life without undue burdens by the state. However, the term “self-determination” also holds more specific meanings, one of which can include the right to independence and sovereignty. The key debate for indigenous rights touches on the latter.

Harking back to the previous discussion of group versus individual rights, group rights have grown out of provisions from the decidedly state-centric and individualistic Covenants on Civil and Political Rights and on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights. While these covenants primarily dealt with securing individual rights, they also affirmed the right to self-determination to all “peoples.” States continue to interpret this clause narrowly, thereby excluding indigenous groups from this right, but the lack of clarity in the covenants regarding the definition of “all peoples” has created a wedge for indigenous groups to use to press for their group rights.¹⁴⁶

This raises the question of what, precisely, self-determination means. There are four orders of self-determination that experts refer to. The first is characterized by decolonization whereby a people overcome foreign rule to achieve independence within internationally recognized borders, such as happened throughout Africa in the 1960s, or in India when it won its independence from Britain in 1947. The second-order involves the achievement of independence of states or republics within a federal system, such as occurred for the former states of the Soviet Union (Estonia, Lithuania, Belarus, etc.). Third-order self-determination occurs with the struggle for independence by a subunit of a unitary state, such as Kosovo from Bosnia, or Quebec from Canada. These movements for secession from an existing unitary state are often met with fierce resistance by the threatened state and are generally not recognized as legitimate under international law. Finally, the fourth-order would be efforts by indigenous peoples to obtain self-determination.¹⁴⁷

In addition to these varying units seeking self-determination, each may be striving for varying degrees of independence. For instance, some groups may be pressing for political and civil rights within the broader political structure that already exists. Others may seek greater

144. Hornberger, 451.

145. Falk, 98.

146. Falk, 134.

147. Falk, 100.

independence for autonomous action in realms such as education policy and land rights, as well as autonomous political structures, and yet remain under the larger authority of the state. Finally, independent state-hood may be the ultimate desire meaning the group would obtain complete control over certain internationally recognized territory. For an additional discussion of self-determination in this Brief, as applied to East Timor, see “International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights” above.

These degrees of independence lie at the heart of the debate over indigenous rights. Not all indigenous peoples seek the same level of autonomy, while existing states are often extremely concerned about any possibility of indigenous peoples obtaining full independence. One of the prime tenets of international law is that a nation state’s national unity and territorial integrity are guaranteed. Therefore, the drive for self-determination that would provide absolute independence is not permitted because it would involve the break-up of an existing state.¹⁴⁸ In such an instance, the claim to self-determination of the indigenous group would collide with the right of the people in the modern territorial state to self-determination because the indigenous claim could dissolve the larger state. This reasoning is precisely why many states continue to oppose the adoption of the draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples by the UN General Assembly.

However, many indigenous peoples are not actually seeking full independence, in part out of recognition that such a goal is nearly impossible. Rather, what they often seek is to “generate enforceable limits on encroachment by the state and to protect domains of traditional life.”¹⁴⁹ In essence, the goal becomes the creation of a relatively autonomous zone within the existing state founded on a relationship of respect for the traditions of the indigenous people within their autonomous region. Under such an arrangement, the state retains its territorial integrity while the indigenous group gains protections for its unique traditions and increased control over its internal affairs.

Women’s Rights

At the outset of the modern human rights movement, the UN Charter emphasized the importance of nondiscrimination. The principle was incorporated into the UDHR’s Article 2, which mandates that all persons are entitled to all human rights “without distinction of any kind,” including race, sex, religion, political opinion, national and social origin, among others (Brownlie and Goodwin-Gill, 2002). Although a number of delegates did argue for giving more explicit attention to issues of gender discrimination, they ultimately satisfied themselves with folding the prohibition on gender discrimination with the general nondiscrimination of Article 2 and avoiding sexist language in the UDHR as much as possible (Twiss 2004; see also Morsink 1999. and Bell 1992).

148. Peang-Meth, 103.

149. Falk, 129.

They therefore declined to specifically identify and remedy the particular vulnerabilities of women in traditional and modern societies. While this approach was entirely consistent with the general strategy of emphasizing individual human rights, this strategy -- as we have seen with the case of indigenous rights -- left various groups vulnerable to systematic abuse by others (Twiss 2004). This has persistently been the case for women in the context of patriarchal societies.

Since the drafting of the UDHR, empirical studies have definitively shown that there is considerable justification for more focused concern for the human rights of women (Sen 1999). Twiss provides a litany of compelling evidence:

“It is clear, for example, that especially in the underdeveloped and developing countries of the world, women suffer disproportionately from hunger, malnutrition, and lack of access to health care; they are subjected to domestic violence, rape during peacetime and war, and sexual abuse and harassment; they... suffer from unequal pay and other discriminatory treatment; in many cases there are substantial barriers to political participation in their societies... and they often suffer from unequal treatment before the law...” (2004)

Increasing awareness of these problems led to women’s liberation movements across the world. In the late 1960s, through the 1970s, and continuing to the present day, these movements have coordinated their efforts, assisted by global information, communication, and transport technologies -- globalization - from - below -- to liberate women from practices and conditions of oppression (Twiss 2004).

The UN has had a longstanding commitment to safeguarding the rights of women since the international human rights regime began to emerge in the post-World War II period. Women represent more than half of the world’s population and have been systematically repressed for much of ancient, as well as modern, history.

Women are *disempowered* in many parts of the world, both in the familial, economic, and political spheres, and thus face structural challenges to improving their lots. In many cases, women cannot overcome these obstacles without some form of international assistance. In addition, they face issues unique to their sex, such as those involved in reproduction, which demand special group-specific



Picture: International Women’s Day in Liberia

protections.

A number of international conventions have been established to deal with women's rights. These include the *Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others* (1949, 1951), the *Convention Concerning Equal Remuneration for Men and Women Workers for Work of Equal Value* (1951, 1953), the *Convention on the Political Rights of Women* (1952, 1954), the *Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages* (1962, 1964), the *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women* (1979), the *Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women* (1993), and the *Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, Supplementing the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime* (2003).

Two human rights issues involving women will be discussed below: reproductive rights and human trafficking.

For more on women's issues, see the Issue in Depth on "Women and Globalization," which can be found at: http://www.globalization101.org/issue_main/woman/.

For full texts of the conventions mentioned above, see the following links:

- Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons: <http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/33.htm>
- Convention Concerning Equal Remuneration: http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/d_ilo100.htm
- Convention on the Political Rights of Women: <http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/22.htm>
- Convention on Consent to Marriage: <http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/63.htm>
- Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women: <http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/e1cedaw.htm>
- Declaration on the Elimination of Violence Against Women: [http://www.unhchr.ch/huridocda/huridoca.nsf/\(Symbol\)/A.RES.48.104.En](http://www.unhchr.ch/huridocda/huridoca.nsf/(Symbol)/A.RES.48.104.En)
- Protocol to Prevent, Punish and Suppress Trafficking in Persons: http://www.uncjin.org/Documents/Conventions/dcatoc/final_documents_2/convention_%20traff_eng.pdf

Reproductive Rights and Sexual Autonomy

From the basic guarantees of the right to life and freedom from physical harm, it is not much of a stretch to arrive at the notion that individuals should have "control over what happens to their bodies." As Human Rights Watch points out,

Millions of women and girls are forced to marry and have sex with men they do not desire. Women are unable to depend on the government to protect them from physical violence in the home... Women in state custody face sexual assault by their jailers. Women are punished for having sex outside of marriage or with a person of their choosing... Husbands and other male family members obstruct or dictate women's access to reproductive health care.¹⁵⁰

The right of women to maintain control over their bodies is implicitly recognized by human rights protections ranging from the right to health and freedom from discrimination to the right to privacy and freedom from torture.¹⁵¹ Reproductive rights are a very delicate subject but one that receives a lot of attention in public debates in both developed and developing countries.

In the United States, for example, the issue of *abortion* has been one of the hottest areas of contention in the *culture wars* and in presidential campaigns. Advocates of a "woman's right to choose" argue that women should have complete control over their bodies, including developing fetuses, and therefore the right to decide if and when to terminate a pregnancy. Although having an abortion can be a devastating and traumatic experience, many believe women should have the option to take this course if they deem it necessary.

Opponents of abortion, who would classify themselves as "pro-life," assert that fetuses should be treated as independent persons even before birth, and that abortion is equivalent to a form of murder – one that should not be permitted in any, or perhaps only the most extreme, circumstances, as when the life of the mother is in imminent danger. They object to the U.S. Supreme Court's 1973 decision in *Roe v. Wade*, which allowed for abortions to continue to be performed.

PBS Video on Roe V Wade: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1q5AgCzPIuA>.

Female Genital Mutilation (FGM)

In other parts of the world, notably in Africa (in 28 countries) and Middle East, the fight over reproductive rights and sexual autonomy is arguably more extreme. One violation of these rights that has attracted vast amounts of attention is the controversial practice of female genital mutilation, also known as "female circumcision." The World Health Organization estimates that 100-140 million women and girls have suffered this procedure, which involves painful surgeries on the female genitalia "for cultural, religious, or other non-therapeutic reasons."¹⁵²

FGM is performed by a number of different cultures for a number of different reasons. Sometimes the goal is to limit and control female sexual desire, sometimes it is seen as a rite of passages for girls into womanhood. Some cultures point to health grounds, claiming it is for hygiene. In a few Muslim communities, it is tied to an interpretation of Islam. Whatever the

150. "Women's Rights."

151. "Human Rights Violations Related to Women's Sexual Autonomy."

152. "Female Genital Mutilation."

justification, FGM is “usually performed by a traditional practitioner with crude instruments and without anesthetic,” posing a serious risk to those who undergo the procedure.

In addition to the physical side-effects, the mental and psychological harm can be permanent: it “may leave a lasting mark on the life and mind of the woman who has undergone it. In the longer term, women may suffer feelings of incompleteness, anxiety and depression.”¹⁵³

Does FGM constitute torture or an acceptable cultural practice whose deep-rooted traditions justify its existence? Is it a violation of privacy or a proper exercise of familial authority? These questions are important to ponder in trying to understand the scope of a woman’s human rights.

To see a videos about FGM, please watch <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Gh4fWUVcBN4> (a women discusses her experience after FGM) and http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TMSQPDD1B2g&feature=player_embedded (please note there is some tribal nudity).

For more on women and health issues, see the “Health” section of the “Women and Globalization” Issue: http://www.globalization101.org/issue_sub/woman/womanhealth/

Human Trafficking

Trafficking is a form of human slavery that involves the movement of people from one place to another. The Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others, which built on a number of previous international agreements regarding slavery, relates the problem of trafficking to the general human rights framework in its preamble:

Whereas prostitution and the accompanying evil of the traffic of persons for the purpose of prostitution are incompatible with the dignity and worth of the human person and endanger the welfare of the individual, the family and the community...¹⁵⁴

As this statement makes clear, trafficking is often associated with sexual slavery. Slavery and *prostitution* are horrific features of human society that have continued to survive from ancient to modern times. In the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, the problem of trafficking expanded to

153. *ibid.*

154. “Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others.”

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

previously unknown levels and entered into public awareness to a greater extent than ever before. Unprecedented levels of freedom of movement and innovations in transportation made the threats of human trafficking and prostitution even more viable.

Conflict-ridden countries and those with weak national governments have always been at risk with regard to human rights violations. But now, with the borders between countries becoming increasingly porous due to heavy volumes of international trade and the relatively open migration of large numbers of people from one place to another, trafficking of people is an issue that may well come to dominate international organized crime in the new millennium.

Trafficking is a multi-faceted problem affecting many different types of people, but the U.S. State Department estimates that 80 percent of the 600,000-800,000 persons that are trafficked every year are women and girls.¹⁵⁵ This makes trafficking a particularly pressing problem for advocates of women's rights.

Trafficking usually results in some form of bonded labor, but it can begin in many ways: "Some leave developing countries, seeking to improve their lives through low-skilled jobs in more prosperous countries. Others fall victim to forced or bonded labor in their own countries. Some families give children to related or unrelated adults who promise education and opportunity—but deliver the children into slavery for money."¹⁵⁶



Picture: United Nations Mission in Kosovo interview possible victims of trafficking, source, United Nations

Bride Selling in China

One example of the way in which trafficking is expanding in the era of globalization involves bride selling in China. Chinese families have long had a traditional preference for male children

155. "Trafficking in Persons Report: Introduction."

156 *ibid.*

over female children. With China's massive population – now over 1.3 billion – sons were needed to work and help sustain the family economically, while daughters were often viewed as a burden.¹⁵⁷ The country's "one-child policy" also meant that girls were becoming increasingly scarce, especially in urban areas. In some parts of the country, the ratio of boys to girls was as high as 117 to 110.¹⁵⁸

This has created a situation in which many Chinese men have difficulty finding a partner for marriage: "Men still feel social pressure to marry, causing some who cannot find marriageable women to try buying brides from other regions of the country, or from border areas with neighboring countries, such as North Korea." Women are either sold or kidnapped to meet this demand, and can then be forced into "marriage, prostitution or concubinage."¹⁵⁹

This practice violates international conventions on trafficking as well as the Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages, which states in Article 1 that "no marriage shall be legally entered into without the full and free consent of both parties."¹⁶⁰ China has signed but not ratified the Convention on Consent to Marriage.¹⁶¹

Trafficking is an extremely difficult problem to control, given the coordination required among national governments and law enforcement operations, but one that must be given proper attention. The lives of millions of women and children are at stake.

For more about women and trafficking, see the "Modern Day Slavery" section of the "Women and Globalization" Brief: http://www.globalization101.org/issue_sub/woman/modernwoman/.

See also the news analysis titled "U.S. State Department Report on Trafficking Produces Changes:" http://www.globalization101.org/news1/US_State_Department_Trafficking_Report.

157. "China."

158. "Trafficking in Persons Report: Introduction."

159. *ibid.*

160. "Convention on Consent to Marriage."

161. "Status of Ratifications, Reservations and Declarations: Convention on Consent to Marriage."

Children's Rights

Children represent another segment of the population that has been singled out by a number of covenants for special protection in international human rights law since children generally lack the maturity and autonomy to defend their own interests and safeguard their own rights. In most cases, responsibility for the interests of children rests with their parents. But, as we have already seen in some cases, such as bonded, families cannot always be relied upon; nor can the state or national governments that should be the child's last line of defense.



The idea of extending dedicated human rights to children is a relatively new one, but its origins can be traced back even before the founding of the United Nations, to the child welfare movement of the early twentieth century.¹⁶² In 1924, the *Geneva Declaration on the Rights of the Child* was adopted by the *League of Nations*. This short document only has five concise provisions. It requires that children be given “the means requisite for...normal development, both materially and spiritually (Article 1); that children be fed, housed, and cared for (Article 2); that children “be the first to receive relief in times of distress” (Article 3); that children be protected from exploitation (Article 4); and that “the child must be brought up in the consciousness that its talents must be devoted to the service of fellow men” (Article 5).¹⁶³

This was followed by the more complex *UN Declaration of the Rights of the Child* in 1959. The UN version added rights to a name and nationality (Principle 3), to special education for the disabled and handicapped (Principle 5), to education (Principle 7), and to exemption from work before a minimum age (Principle 9). Another provision with broad application was included, specifying that “the child, for the full and harmonious development of his personality, needs love and understanding. He shall, wherever possible, grow up in the care and under the responsibility of his parents, and, in any case, in an atmosphere of affection and of moral and material security.” It was also made clear that children should, “save in exceptional circumstances,” not be separated from their mothers.¹⁶⁴

The principles outlined in the UN Declaration on the Rights of the Child were formulated in comprehensive fashion into a *Convention on the Rights of the Child* (1989, 1990). It is notable

162. Marks and Clapham, 19.

163. “Geneva Declaration of the Rights of the Child.”

164. “Declaration on the Rights of the Child.”

that this convention, although drafted at a relatively late stage in the development of human rights, has quickly become the “most widely ratified human rights treaty” of them all. It has been ratified by nearly every state in the world, with Somalia and the United States (both of which have signed, but not ratified the agreement) being two exceptions.¹⁶⁵ The United States did not ratify the Convention due to concerns regarding its federal system of government which was deemed incompatible with certain provisions of the agreement requiring national education policies or other requirements typically handled at the state or local level in the U.S. political system.

This convention is grounded in four key principles that establish a framework for thinking about the human rights of children. First, it reaffirms the principle of non-discrimination (Article 2). Second, it establishes a standard for making any decisions involving children: the top consideration should always be “the best interests of the child,” as defined by “public or private social welfare institutions, courts of law, administrative authorities or legislative bodies” (Article 3).

Third, it protects every child’s right to life and development, and all the corollary rights those two entail (Article 6).

Fourth, it guarantees children some role, to whatever extent is appropriate, in decisions that are made on their behalf: “State parties shall assure to the child who is capable of forming his or her own views the right to express those views freely in all matters affecting the child, the views of the child being given due weight in accordance with the age and maturity of the child” (Article 12).¹⁶⁶ This latter point stresses the importance of establishing direct channels of communication between children and governments that are unmediated by families or human rights groups.

The Convention also leaves states parties to “fix minimum ages for admission to employment, subject to the right of children to be protected from economic exploitation, hazardous work, or work that is likely to interfere with their education or be harmful to their health or development.”¹⁶⁷ International human rights law generally, and the Convention on the Rights of the Child specifically, seeks to create a protected space in which children can flourish without threat of violence or oppression.

Child Labor

Children work for a variety of reasons ranging from economic necessity to cultural and social norms. In certain circumstances, work experience may be beneficial to children or their families, as the work and income can be a positive experience. However, child labor becomes a cause for

165. “Path to the Convention.”

166. “Convention on the Rights of the Child;” Marks and Clapham, 20.

167. Marks and Clapham, 27-28.

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

concern when labor becomes exploitative, hazardous, or interferes with the right of a child to an education. Additionally, the age of the child plays a significant role in the acceptability of work performed.

The *International Labor Organization (ILO)* has long been concerned with child labor. As far back as 1921, it adopted Convention 10 which prohibits the employment of children under 14 in any agricultural business. The ILO then adopted various conventions covering specific sectors, but recognized the need to place a blanket restriction on all forms of child labor below a certain age.

As a result, in 1973, *ILO Convention 138* was adopted specifying that the minimum age for any employment “shall not be less than the age of completion of compulsory schooling and, in any case, shall not be less than 15 years.”¹⁶⁸ Finally, in 1999, the ILO adopted *Convention 182*, now considered one of its five key conventions, prohibiting the worst forms of child labor for all children under the age of 18. These “worst forms” include slavery, child prostitution, and child pornography, as well as any other work that is likely to harm the health, safety, or morals of children.

Despite the ILO’s efforts, approximately 215 million children are engaged in child labor around the world, of which 115 million are believed to be working under hazardous conditions.¹⁶⁹ Many children work in manufacturing, as domestic help, or in services; however, the vast majority of child laborers, 70 percent, work in the agricultural sector.¹⁷⁰

<p><u>Cotton Picking in Egypt</u> Over one million children are involved in Egypt’s cotton industry; its major cash crop. Their primary job is controlling pests that can ruin cotton plants by manually inspecting and treating the leaves of the cotton plants.</p> <p>Generally, the work is done during the summer so it does not interfere with schooling; however, it is grueling and often runs eleven hours per day, every day of the week. Beatings by foremen, extreme heat, and exposure to dangerous pesticides are common as well.¹⁷¹ In fact,</p>	<p><u>The Elimination of Child Labor in Pakistan’s Soccer Ball Industry</u> By the mid-1990s, roughly 75 percent of the soccer balls produced in the world were made in the Sialkot district of Pakistan.</p> <p>The International Labor Organization (ILO) produced a report in 1996 detailing the working conditions in the Sialkot’s soccer ball industry and estimated that 7,000 children between the ages of 5 and 14 were involved in the manual production of soccer balls. These children typically worked 8 to 11 hour days and many had never attended school a single day in their lives.¹⁷⁵ This situation clearly violated Pakistan’s ILO Convention 138</p>
--	---

168. ILO Convention 138.

169. UNICEF Statistics.

170. “Backgrounder: Child Labor in Agriculture.”

171. “Underage and Unprotected: Child Labor in Egypt’s Cotton Fields.”

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

<p>two of the five pesticides regularly used are classified as “highly hazardous.”¹⁷²</p> <p>The result of these working conditions on young children has been significant. Children suffer high rates of injuries and risk being beaten for their work performance. In fact, Human Rights Watch interviewed a child in Egypt who commented on his two foremen, saying, “One of them I hate; the other one I like. The one I hate used to beat and kick me whenever I missed a leaf. The other one beats and kicks me lightly.”¹⁷³</p> <p>The exposure to pesticides can cause acute effects such as dizziness and vomiting as well as disrupting the nervous and endocrine systems of children.¹⁷⁴ The extreme heat of the Egyptian summer also endangers these children, as they often are provided minimal access to water and toilets. Further exacerbating an already untenable situation is the meager pay the children receive for this excruciating work which averages just US\$0.81 per day.</p> <p>Various organizations, such as Human Rights Watch, are working both to raise awareness of this situation and to convince the Egyptian government to meet its obligations under ILO Convention 138 that prohibits Egypt from allowing children below the age of 14 from working.</p>	<p>commitment to prohibit child labor below the age of 14.</p> <p>As a result of the ILO’s report and the publicity that came with world-wide revelation of the conditions in the industry, including introduction in the U.S. Senate by Senator Tom Harkin (Democrat – Iowa) of an amendment aimed at Pakistan that would have prohibited U.S. imports of goods made by child labor, an agreement was reached between the ILO and the Sialkot Chamber of Commerce on February 14, 1997. The goal of the agreement was the elimination of all child labor (defined as children under the age of 14 in this case) in the soccer ball industry in Sialkot, Pakistan.¹⁷⁶</p> <p>The agreement created a program designed to replace work with education for the children who were stitching soccer balls. By 2004, the ILO reported that over 10,000 children had received an education as a result of the agreement and an additional 5,000 had received health care coverage.¹⁷⁷</p> <p>The most critical development of this agreement was the enabling of families to place their children in schools rather than the soccer ball industry. In part, this resulted from a change in social standards in the Sialkot district that no longer tolerated child labor, but it was also the result of a shift in the economics of the district that enabled the families to forgo the income formerly produced by their children. The long-term impact should be significant as these children will now have educations that can enable them to seek different or more lucrative work once they are older.</p>
--	--

175. “From Stitching to School: Combating Child Labour in the Soccer Ball Industry in Pakistan.”

172. “Backgrounder: Child Labor in Agriculture.”

173. *ibid.*

174. “Underage and Unprotected: Child Labor in Egypt’s Cotton Fields.”

176. *ibid.*

177. *ibid.*

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

Child Soldiers

With the increase in intra-state wars in the 1990s after the end of the *Cold War*, the use of children as soldiers increased rapidly. It is a global problem with estimates suggesting as many as 300,000 children are being used in 30 conflicts around the world.¹⁷⁸ National militaries and rebel groups alike are using children in armed conflict. In part, this staggering number has been driven by the availability of lightweight arms that are easy to use even by children.

Children are particularly susceptible to manipulation and forced recruitment due to their physical and emotional immaturity. In particularly violent or political conflicts, adults may prove difficult to recruit and to manage, whereas highly impressionable children are more easily molded and forced into service. As a result, armed forces are more likely to target children for recruitment in prolonged conflicts as a way to replenish their ranks.



In many instances, children are abducted from their families off the streets or from their schools. After their abduction, children may be forced to commit atrocities against their own families in an effort to alienate them from society and bind them to their abductors.¹⁷⁹ In some circumstances, children will be forced to use drugs as a means of brain washing them into believing that they must fight for a given cause. Other times, children may join forces to obtain regular access to food or for survival as a result of extreme economic hardship at home. Further, ongoing conflicts may eliminate other alternatives for children by ruining their family farms, closing their schools, or robbing them of their parents.

Once pressed into service, children fill many roles, from serving directly in combat to working as spies, messengers, and cooks, to clearing mines with their bodies or being forced into sexual roles for the personal use of commanders. Girls are particularly susceptible for the latter role, but have also been forced to commit atrocities and can make up as much as one third of the child soldiers pressed into service in some conflicts.¹⁸⁰

Additionally, some of these children are younger than 10 years old and are forced to participate in unbelievable violence.¹⁸¹ The atrocities they are encouraged to commit, sometimes through the use of drugs or threats of violence, are often incomprehensible to such young children. The

178. "Child Soldiers: A Global Issue." Amnesty International.

179. "Facts about Child Soldiers."

180. "Facts About Child Soldiers."

181. Amnesty International, "Child Soldiers."

gruesome level of violence they are exposed to often results in severe psychological stress that can prove debilitating throughout their lives even once hostilities have ended.

Because of the horrific consequences for children, international human rights law has sought to prohibit their use as soldiers. The Convention on the Rights of the Child specifically states that state parties “shall take all feasible measures to ensure that persons who have not attained the age of fifteen years do not take a direct part in hostilities.”¹⁸² The Convention further encourages states parties to give priority to older recruits when recruiting children between the ages of 15 and 18. Some states have tried to strengthen these restrictions by adopting the Optional Protocol to the Convention. This protocol extends the obligation to take all measures to prevent those under 18 years of age from taking a direct part in hostilities, while also banning the drafting of anyone under 18 into the armed forces, but allowing voluntary recruitment of 15 to 18 year olds.¹⁸³

The *African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child* contains a stronger prohibition, banning the recruitment (voluntary or otherwise) of anyone under 18. Importantly, the International Criminal Court includes the use of children under 15 in hostilities as a war crime that it can prosecute. These overlapping legal requirements on states that have adopted these conventions, charters, and statutes are designed to strengthen the notion of children as a protected class particularly deserving of defense against hostilities and the disruption of their development.

The Child Soldiers Prevention Act of 2008 became effective in 2009. This act requires that the U.S. State Department’s Annual Trafficking in Persons report publishes a list of countries that recruit and use child soldiers. In the following fiscal year, those governments that are identified are subject to restrictions on security assistance and commercial licensing of military equipment. Countries identified in 2012 include: Burma, Libya, Democratic Republic of the Congo, South Sudan, Somalia, Sudan and Yemen.¹⁸⁴

Child Soldiers in Sierra Leone

The devastating eleven year civil war in Sierra Leone wreaked havoc across this West African country of approximately six million people from 1991 to 2002. Throughout the conflict, horrific brutality and unconscionable crimes were committed by forces on all sides of the war. In particular, children were heavily recruited to become ‘soldiers’ by the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) and the Armed Forces Revolutionary Council (AFRC), the two primary opposition forces, as well as by government forces later in the war.

The various forces recruited child soldiers for many of the reasons outlined above in this issue brief; children are easily indoctrinated, fearless, and have not yet developed a clear sense of what is morally right or wrong. It is unclear how many children ended up fighting

182. “Convention on the Rights of the Child.”

183. Marks and Clapham, 28.

184. “Trafficking in Persons Report”

in the civil war, but during the conflict, one government commander estimated that in one small district alone over 3,000 children were involved in the fighting.¹⁸⁵

Sadly, many of the children who were pressed into service in Sierra Leone were forced to commit horrific atrocities such as killing their own families and murdering or maiming innocent civilians. Often, commanders would give the children drugs prior to any attacks so that the children would do anything they were ordered to do, no matter how violent. The brainwashing and exposure to violence often became so complete that some of the children were proud of how good they were at killing.

As the civil war came to a close in 2001 and 2002, the fledgling government of Sierra Leone sought United Nations assistance for delivering justice for the innocent victims caught in the civil war. A novel approach was adopted, creating the *Special Court for Sierra Leone* that is a hybrid domestic-international court.

This court has been given jurisdiction to try crimes related to the recruitment and use of child soldiers by all parties in the civil war. The Court was also given jurisdiction over the crimes committed by child soldiers themselves – a controversial decision because it could mean the prosecution of children as young as eight.¹⁸⁶ (The discussion of children in criminal justice systems that follows will shed light on the controversy surrounding the prosecution of children.)

The creation of the Special Court for Sierra Leone was an important step in the effort to confront the evil of using children as soldiers. It will help strengthen the norm against this particularly gruesome exploitation of children and may discourage the future use of children in combat situations. Presently, Charles Taylor, the former President of Liberia, is undergoing trial at the Special Court for Sierra Leone (which is located at the Hague) for crimes against humanity and several other charges.

To watch a personal account of child soldiers in Sierra Leone, click [here](http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/video/2009/jul/12/liberia-child-soldiers) (<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/video/2009/jul/12/liberia-child-soldiers>).

Juvenile Justice

Concerns regarding juvenile justice center on the rights of children with respect to criminal liability, procedures, and sentences. Specifically, the Convention on the Rights of the Child provides protections for children who are alleged to have violated penal laws. First, state parties are encouraged to implement special criminal justice systems for children, including laws, procedures, and institutions specifically tailored to children. Second, under article 40 of the

185. "Sierra Leone: Sowing Terror; Atrocities against Civilians in Sierra Leone."

186. Cohn, 1.

Convention, these systems are required to take into account a child's age when determining culpability for crimes committed.¹⁸⁷

This last point has important ramifications, including the right to be detained separately from adults, the right to privacy in all proceedings, and the right to be imprisoned only as a last resort for the shortest appropriate time. The creation of special juvenile systems must also include standard protections against arbitrary detainment and for fair trials that should be the hallmark of all criminal justice systems.

Because of the adoption of the Convention, many countries have begun to change their juvenile justice systems to bring them into compliance with the requirements of the convention. This has been particularly true of Latin America, with Brazil leading the way in 1990, and Ecuador, Peru, Mexico, El Salvador, and Nicaragua following over the next few years. Unfortunately, despite the improvements in law in some countries, many others have not followed through on their commitments under the Convention. The actual practice of law, despite what is on the books, sometimes varies widely from the new requirements of their new laws. As a result, much remains to be done to fully protect children exposed to criminal justice systems around the world.

Changing Players: Abusers and Guarantors of Human Rights

In this section, we will introduce transnational corporations and social movements as influential players joining traditional state actors on the human rights scene.

The principal players at the time of the UDHR's adoption were state actors, in the role of both abusers and guarantors of human rights. The entire point of the UDHR was to rein in abuses of state power by granting protections to individual persons. States were to hold themselves accountable for the provision and protection of the human rights of their respective citizens; as a consequence of this compact, states agreed to be the guarantors of their citizens' human rights and agreed also to the legitimacy of being brought to justice by other compacting states for any serious breached.

Twiss notes that "some might say that it was unwise to put the foxes in charge of the chicken coops, but it must be said that anything more than this strategy -- particularly with the then emerging Cold War -- was simply not politically feasible" (2004: 51). How has this situation changed at all in recent years, and how do these changes relate to the phenomenon of globalization? Twiss illustrates three topics in response: revisionment of the role of state actors

187. "Convention on the Rights of the Child."

in the international arena, the rise of transnational corporate actors, and the emergence of new social movements and the rising prominence of NGOs (2004).

State Actors

Increased global communication, intercultural contact, and economic and political interdependence have made human rights violations and their repercussions on international peace and security ever-more apparent (Twiss 2004). This has had the impact of fostering an emergent, revisioned role of collective state intervention not originally anticipated by the drafters of the UDHR. This revisioned role was augmented most directly by the end of the Cold War, which had restrained the political feasibility of humanitarian intervention. After the war, a liberal conception of state sovereignty -- wherein states are explicitly constrained by international human rights conventions -- began to supplant the classical, Westphalian conception of non-intervention except in cases threatening to international peace and security (Twiss 2004). Under this revised conception of sovereignty, egregious human rights abuses are no longer regarded by the international community as purely domestic affairs.

Transnational Corporate Actors

The processes of economic globalization in particular have engendered transnational financial institutions and corporations whose economic power exceeds that of many nations. Barring discussion of the intentions of these corporations, the fact is that many of their policies have resulted in massive violations of human rights, particularly socio-economic rights (Twiss 2004). For example,

“The policies of the World Bank and IMF -- at least until very recently -- stipulated changes in the economic and political structure of beneficiary underdeveloped states that led to internal problems of, for example, unemployment, worker abuse, adverse effects of industrial pollution on health, and redeployment of resources away from social programs that clearly work to the detriment of the socio-economic rights of many, while fattening the purses of political and corporate leaders” (Twiss 2004: 53)

Economic globalization processes have spawned, in the transnational corporation, a new kind of human rights abuser that is largely beyond the control of international human rights conventions and mechanisms directed solely to state actors. Recent developments in the management of transnational corporations have, however, raised the issue of corporate responsibility for protecting human rights. A few institutions now explicitly recognize this responsibility. While such conscious actions were and continue to be prompted in large part by outside advocacy groups, they also represent acknowledgement by the agents of globalization-from-above that with power comes responsibility (Twiss 2004).

Social Movements and NGOs

Processes of globalization-from-below has spurred the growth of another type of human rights actor in the international scene in the form of a guarantor not envisioned at the time of the UDHR -- large grass-roots social movements. These movements continue to gain increasing power to demand more human policies and practices from states and transnational corporations. In 1987, Richard Falk identified at least five types of social movements that are by all accounts becoming ever more evident:

- “(1) resistance movements for the causes of ecology, environmental protection, peace, and disarmament;
- (2) permanent, al-though unofficial, international tribunals conducting inquiries and issuing decisions about cases of state oppression;
- (3) movements by NGOs to pressure states to punish perpetrators of egregious human rights violations and to recover victims' property wrongfully appropriated;
- (4) consumer-based movements to hold governments and corporations accountable for technological disasters and policies adversely affecting human welfare; and
- (5) counterconferences held in tandem with official state and international conferences and consultations, delegitimizing the latter and evoking more relevant grass-roots agendas” (1987: 190-94).

The significant success of these social movements can be attributed in part to the rising force and legitimacy of NGOs since the adoption of the UDHR. Indeed, one of the most significant areas in which the continuing elaboration and widening scope of human rights has intersected with increasing levels of globalization is the realm of global civil society. ***Non-governmental organizations*** perform important work in a variety of fields, but monitoring and advocacy of human rights protection is one of the more important functions they perform.

For a sense of the scope of this field, see this list compiled by the University of Minnesota’s Human Rights Library: <http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/links/ngolinks.html>.

These organizations are not affiliated with any government, but they often deal with the same public policy issues that governments do, only from a different angle. In one sense, they help to bridge the gap between individuals and the larger political, economic and social forces to which they are subject.

Three Global Human Rights NGOs in Focus

Three of the oldest, largest, and most effective human rights NGOs are the following:

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)

The ***International Committee of the Red Cross*** has been operation since 1863, and its own history is intertwined with that of humanitarian law from its earliest conception. A young banker

from Geneva named Henry Dunant was on his way to meet Emperor Napoleon III of France when he passed through the town of Solferino, in northern Italy, and observed the deplorable conditions that the wounded soldiers from the ongoing War of Italian Unification were suffering from. He came up with the idea that there should be “some international principle, sanctioned by a convention and inviolate in character, which, once agreed upon and ratified, might constitute the basis for societies for the relief of the wounded in the different European countries.”¹⁸⁸

Dunant founded the ICRC, and his writings spurred a flurry of international activity that eventually produced the first *Geneva Convention*, which is essentially the first document of international humanitarian law. Subsequent Geneva Conventions—there are four in total—would create an internationally accepted framework for the treatment of soldiers in war, whether as active in the field, as enemy prisoners, or as a wounded soldier (see “The Geneva Conventions” below). These were the first treaties to recognize the notion of universal rights that applied to all individuals regardless of nationality.¹⁸⁹

The mission of the ICRC is to monitor the enforcement of the Geneva Conventions, by “visiting prisoners, organizing relief operations, re-uniting separated families and similar humanitarian conflicts.” While the Geneva Conventions only apply to international conflicts, the ICRC performs similar services in areas of internal conflict as well, in a manner consistent with the spirit of the Conventions.¹⁹⁰

It has been active in nearly every major conflict of the twentieth century, including both World Wars. The ICRC plays a unique and vital role in international affairs as a respected and objective mediator. It operates in ways and in places where national governments would be unwelcome or ineffective. In 2007, for example, the ICRC interceded on behalf of prisoners of the Revolutionary Armed Forces (FARC) of Colombia and secured their release.¹⁹¹

It also spawned a sister organization, the *International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies*, in 1919 to promote humanitarian values on national level. National Red Cross societies advance these values by helping with disaster preparation, providing emergency relief assistance, and by working to improve health and community care.

Today, the Federation is active in 185 countries, including many parts of the Muslim world, through its Red Crescent societies.¹⁹²

Amnesty International (AI) and Human Rights Watch (HRW)

Amnesty International and *Human Rights Watch* are two of the best known and well-regarded

188. “From the Battle of Solferino;” “Henry Dunant.”

189. “From the Battle of Solferino;” “What Are the Origins.”

190. “ICRC’s Mandate and Mission.”

191. “Colombia.”

192. “Who We Are.”

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

NGOs dealing with human rights. Both organizations perform a variety of activities focused on documenting and publicizing human rights violations around the world, as well as helping to coordinate grassroots community activism.

Amnesty International, founded in 1961, devotes much of its work to the protection of the freedoms of conscience and expression and freedom from discrimination. It has also given major attention to prisoners of conscience, torture and the death penalty.

It sends experts into the field in more than 80 countries to “talk with victims, observe trials and interview local officials and human rights activists.”

In addition, its staff monitors local media reports, conduct research, issue findings in a variety of forms, and organize advocacy campaigns through letter-writing campaigns, public demonstrations, and government lobbying to end human rights abuses.¹⁹³

Amnesty International was also a recipient of the 1977 Nobel Peace Prize.

Since 1978, Human Rights Watch, the largest human rights organization based in the U.S., has strove to fulfill a similar mission. HRW conducts investigations into alleged human rights violations, publishes its findings to “embarrass abusive governments in the eyes of their citizens and the world...then meets with government officials to urge changes in policy and practice.”

Although HRW’s staff, comprises of 150 professionals, academics, and experts, its strength lies in its partnerships with local human rights groups, further extending its reach to the ground level and across the globe.¹⁹⁴

In recent years, HRW has waged campaigns to eliminate the use of child soldiers in countries such as Burma, Burundi, Lebanon, Nepal, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, and Uganda; to ban the use of landmines around the world (156 countries are party to the 1997 Mine Ban Treaty; in recent activity since 2005, Algeria, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Guinea-Bissau, and Nigeria have decommissioned their entire arsenals of antipersonnel mines); and to bring former Chilean dictator Augusto Pinochet to justice, among many others (see “Child Soldiers” below).¹⁹⁵

In addition to the major international NGOs, there are many thousands of local NGOs dedicated to serving the needs of particular communities. Taken together, this massive network of individuals, who have empowered themselves to ensure the protection of human rights for all mankind, constitute a new layer of global civil society that largely didn’t exist even forty years

193. “About AI.”

194. “About HRW.”

195. “States Parties” International Campaign to Ban Landmines.

Globalization 101

A project of  **LEVIN** Institute

ago. The story of this civil society is increasingly becoming the human face of international activism in the twenty-first century.

For more on non-governmental organizations, see the “Non-Governmental Organizations” section of the “International Law and Organizations” Issue in Depth (http://www.globalization101.org/issue_sub/intlaw/variousActorsInternationalLaw/NGOs).

Glossary

Abortion: the termination of a pregnancy by the removal of an embryo or fetus from the uterus.

Abu Ghraib: a prison in Iraq where prisoners were abused and brutalized by U.S. personnel in 2004.

Advisory Proceeding: a proceeding that does not involve any parties, and therefore does not have a plaintiff or defendant. The opinions produced by the Court in such proceedings are advisory in nature, and are intended to provide a statement of what the law is regarding a situation without providing a legally binding remedy to a dispute.

American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU): a non-governmental organization dedicated to preserving individual rights and liberties in the United States through litigation and public policy advocacy.

Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty: a treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union signed on May 26, 1972 that limited the deployment of anti-ballistic missile systems in each country. These systems were designed to defend against incoming missile-delivered nuclear weapons.

Arbitration: the process by which the parties to a dispute submit their differences to the judgment of an impartial person or group agreed upon by mutual consent.

Asphyxiation: the condition of suffocation or of being deprived of oxygen by choking, smothering, strangulation, or by gas or other poisonous agents.

Asylum: protection and immunity from extradition granted by a government to a political refugee from another country.

Autonomy: independence or freedom.

Bill of Rights: the first ten amendments to the U.S. Constitution that guarantee certain fundamental rights of the people, such as the right to free speech and freedom of religion.

Central Intelligence Agency (CIA): a United States government agency responsible for the collection and analysis of intelligence and information outside the United States.

Chapter VII: the part of the Charter of the United Nations that outlines the enforcement powers of the Security Council. Under Chapter VII, the Security Council has the power to determine the existence of any threat to the peace or act of aggression and to then authorize the use of armed force to restore and maintain international peace and security in the face of the threat or act of aggression.

Charter of the United Nations: the document signed by the original 51 founding countries that created the United Nations. All nations that have subsequently joined the UN have also signed the document. It describes the structure and function of the UN, in a somewhat similar manner as a constitution describes the structure and function of a state.

Classical Liberalism: a doctrine stressing the importance of human rationality, property rights, natural rights, individual freedom, free markets, and limited government.

CNN Effect: the manner by which public opinion is shaped by the images seen on television, specifically referring to war-time coverage.

Cold War: a term used to describe the relationship between the United States and Soviet Union from World War II until 1990 that was characterized by intense political opposition and military rivalry that never developed into a full-scale, armed war.

Complementarity: the principle that the International Criminal Court (ICC) can act only in cases where states are unwilling or unable to prosecute crimes under the ICC's jurisdiction on their own. The idea is to use the ICC only as a last resort when a state will not or cannot act on its own.

Contentious Cases: cases involving disputes between two parties requiring judicial settlement.

Convention: an international agreement between two or more states.

Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment: a multilateral treaty under the purview of the United Nations that requires signatory countries to take effective measures to prevent torture within their borders. The Convention was adopted by the UN General Assembly on December 10, 1984 and entered into force on June 26, 1987.

Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide: a multilateral treaty under the purview of the United Nations that defines and outlaws genocide. Adopted by the UN General Assembly in December 1948 and came into force in January 1951.

Culture War: a conflict between groups with differing ideas, philosophies, and beliefs. The term is sometimes used to refer to conflict between competing social values within the political system.

Customary International Law: rules of law derived from the consistent conduct of states acting out of the belief that law required them to act that way, i.e. persistent and customary practice of states can lead to the consideration of their behavior as creating a legal precedent for future action.

Crimes Against Humanity: crimes committed in armed conflict that are directed against a civilian population (rather than just the opposing military forces). Crimes against humanity are very similar to ‘war crimes,’ and are often difficult to differentiate from ‘war crimes,’ but are more narrowly focused attacks against civilian populations.

Declaration of Independence: the document that proclaimed the independence of the American colonies from England, adopted by the Second Continental Congress on July 4, 1776.

Derogability: the act by which a law or right is modified by a subsequent law that limits its scope or impairs its utility and force.

Deterrence: the discouragement of specific actions or attempts to prevent specific behavior.

Development Ladder: term referring to the incremental steps in development each state experiences throughout its development into an industrial state.

Disempowered: to be deprived of power.

Divine Right: the notion that monarchs are endowed with their authority to rule by God, not by the people.

Enlightenment, (The): a philosophical movement in the 18th century that advocated the use of reason and individualism to scrutinize previously accepted traditions; the movement resulted in political, religious, and educational reforms.

Ethnic Cleansing: the systematic elimination of an ethnic group from an area or society by forced migration or genocide.

Ex post facto: Latin term meaning “after the fact.” In legal settings, laws passed *after* the commission of a specific action that criminalize that action cannot be used to prosecute that instance of the action because it was not a crime at the time it was committed, i.e. the law was passed *ex post facto*.

Extradite: the act of delivering a fugitive to the authorities of another country pursuant to a preexisting agreement between the countries.

Fraternity: the quality of being brotherly or of having a common purpose. Similar in meaning to ‘solidarity.’

General Assembly: the main deliberative body of the United Nations. Each member nation is represented in the assembly and has one vote.

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

Geneva Conventions: a series of four treaties that provide the international legal standards for the conduct of war. The four conventions cover the treatment of the wounded and sick on land and sea, as well as the treatment of prisoners of war, and the protection of civilians in wartime. See section on “Geneva Conventions” in the Issue Brief for more details.

Genocide: the systematic, planned, and deliberate extermination, attempt to exterminate, or conspiracy to exterminate an entire national, racial, ethnic, or religious group.

Guantanamo Bay: the location of the U.S. Naval base in Cuba where a detention facility was created in 2002 for the detention of unlawful combatants collected by U.S. forces in Afghanistan, Iraq, and other countries.

Guerilla: a member of an irregular armed force (a military force not controlled by a government) that often operates in small units to sabotage, harass, and undermine a stronger force by surprise attacks.

Hague Conventions: international treaties negotiated at The Hague, Netherlands in 1899 and 1907 that were among the first formal codifications of the laws of war.

Hate Crime: a crime motivated by prejudice or intolerance toward a racial, gender, ethnic, religious, or social group.

Helsinki Accords: also known as the Helsinki Final Act of 1975, this is the document that created the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). This was an agreement among the United States, Canada, the Soviet Union and most of the countries of Europe. The document recognized the existing boundaries of states at the time, but also included a strong expression of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the right to self-determination.

Holocaust: the genocide of European Jews and others by the Nazi regime during World War II.

Humanitarian Aid: assistance provided to innocent civilians caught in the middle of a conflict, such as medical assistance, food, and temporary housing.

Impunity Agreements: a term typically used to refer to agreements between the United States and other countries that provide an explicit exemption for all U.S. citizens from International Criminal Court jurisdiction, guaranteeing that the other country will not surrender a U.S. citizen to the Court in the event that he or she is indicted by the Court.

Inalienable: not transferable to another or capable of being repudiated. Inalienable rights are those that are inherent to each person and that cannot be taken away from each individual.

Indigenous: peoples who inhabited a land before it was conquered by colonial societies and who consider themselves distinct from the societies currently governing those territories.

International Bill of Rights: the term used to refer to both the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights when considered together.

International Court of Justice (ICJ): the principle judicial body of the United Nations with responsibility for adjudicating disputes between states on questions of international law. The Court does *not* have jurisdiction over individuals, and individuals have no standing to bring a suit before the ICJ.

International Criminal Court (ICC): a permanent international court created by treaty, with 104 states party to the treaty. The treaty came into force in July, 2002. The Court has jurisdiction over war crimes, crimes against humanity, and genocide involving countries that are party to the treaty and in instances when those countries are unwilling or unable to prosecute an instance of one of those crimes occurring on its territory.

International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR): the international court created under United Nations auspices to prosecute those responsible for the genocide committed in Rwanda in 1994 as well as other offenses against international humanitarian law. The court is international in character due to concerns that Rwanda was incapable for prosecuting these crimes solely under its domestic legal system due to the extreme violence and instability the genocide caused.

International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia (ICTY): the international court created under United Nations auspices to prosecute those responsible for the war crimes that occurred during the conflict in Bosnia, such as ethnic cleansing and the Srebrenica massacre.

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR): is a legally binding treaty that embodies many of the rights proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The treaty offers the right of self-determination; right to freely dispose of wealth and resources; right to life; right to pardon in case of death sentence; right not to be subject to torture; right not to be held in slavery; right to liberty and security of person; right to be informed of charges if arrested; right to compensation if unlawfully arrested; right to leave and enter their own country without restrictions; right to be treated equally at court; right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; right to freedom of association; right to marry; right to a nationality; and other basic rights. The covenant ensures that these rights should be carried out without discrimination.

International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR): is a legally binding treaty that embodies many of the rights proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The treaty offers the right of self-determination; right to work; right to favorable and just conditions at work; right to form trade unions; right to strike; right to protection for mothers after childbirth; right to adequate standard of living; right to physical and mental health;

right to education; and other basic cultural and economic rights. The covenant ensures that these rights should be carried out without discrimination.

International Criminal Tribunals: international courts constituted to prosecute war crimes, genocide, and other human rights crimes that are of an international character. The two prime examples of these are the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda. Both were created to deliver justice to the victims of ethnic cleansing, genocide, and war crimes committed by or supported by the governments of each country. Importantly, these types of tribunals are typically created with the help of the United Nations in instances when the national courts are not capable of prosecuting these crimes for whatever reason (lack of capacity, political instability, etc.).

International Military Tribunal: the tribunal created by the victorious allies in the European theater of World War II to try those Nazis deemed responsible for war crimes and crimes against humanity. Often, this tribunal is referred to as the Nuremberg Tribunal, or Nuremberg Trials, for the German town where the tribunal sat.

International Military Tribunal for the Far East: The tribunal created by the victorious allies in the Pacific theater of World War II to try leaders of the Empire of Japan who were responsible for war crimes and crimes against humanity. Often, this tribunal is referred to as the Tokyo Tribunal, or the Tokyo Trials for the capital city of Japan.

Jurisdictional: restricted to the geographic area controlled or otherwise under the authority of a state.

Jus Cogens: a principle of international law that is based on values taken to be fundamental to the international community and that cannot be set aside.

Lawful Combatants: those who act in accordance with the law of war, generally understood to be the Geneva Conventions and Hague Conventions. This designation carries legal protections, provided for under the above conventions, for anyone detained and classified a lawful combatant.

Laws and Customs of War: the standards of conduct of warfare as established by the Geneva and Hague Conventions that limit the type and scope of justifiable actions that may be taken by each side in a war.

League of Nations: an international organization created by the Treaty of Versailles in 1919 to promote world peace and cooperation in the wake of World War I. It was replaced by the United Nations in 1946, an organization with a significantly different structure.

Legal Precedent: a legal decision or form of proceeding that serves as an authoritative rule in future similar cases or situations.

Multilateral: involving more than two countries or parties.

Natural Rights: rights deriving from natural law, a body of law believed to be derived from nature, and therefore to be binding on human actions in addition to law established by human authority.

New Deal: the programs advocated by and created by U.S. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt that were designed to promote economic recovery from the Great Depression as well as social reform.

Non-derogable: refers to rights that cannot be taken away or limited under any circumstances. For instance, the right to live and the right to freedom from genocide are so fundamental that no limit may justly be placed on them.

Non-governmental organization (NGO): an organization not affiliated with any government, but that deals with public policy issues, often in an advocacy role. Often helps link individuals and society to the larger political forces and structures to which they are subject.

Non-refoulement: the principle that governments must not only refrain from torturing individuals themselves but also refuse to turn people over to other countries in which there is a reasonable suspicion they will be tortured (found in Article 3 of the Convention Against Torture).

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO): an alliance of states formed for the purpose of collective defense, principally in response to the perceived threat of the Soviet Union. The alliance continues to exist despite the fall of the Soviet Union, and now exists as a more general collective defense mechanism against any possible threats. It is primarily comprised of the United States and Canada along with most of the countries of the European Union and Turkey.

Nuremberg Trials: the trials of military and political leaders of Nazi Germany for crimes against humanity and war crimes committed during World War II before the International Military Tribunal. See also “International Military Tribunal” above.

Peacekeeping: the attempt to maintain peace and security by the deployment of armed forces to a particular region or country. Generally, such operations are directed under United Nations auspices in post-conflict societies in an effort to reconstruct the state and aid in its transition out of conflict. See “Chapter VII” above for more information.

Preamble: an introductory statement, particularly in formal documents, that explain their purpose.

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

Preemptive War: an attack or war waged in the face of an imminent, credible attack or invasion, generally pursued to gain a strategic advantage. Such a war may be sanctioned under international law if the threat is imminent, credible, and significant. This is distinct from ‘preventive war’ which is waged to prevent another country from gaining a strategic advantage, such as the development of weapons of mass destruction prior to an imminent attack. Whether ‘preventive war’ is sanctioned by international law remains controversial and is generally doubted.

Progressive Realization: the constant improvement of human rights.

Propaganda: information, ideas, or rumors that are spread for the purpose of promoting some cause.

Prostitution: the act or practice of engaging in sexual activities for money.

Protocol: the first draft of a treaty before ratification, or an international agreement of less formal stature than a treaty. The term ‘protocol’ may also be used to refer to an optional and supplemental agreement to a treaty that states have already signed.

Ratify: to confirm or express consent by formal approval, often through voting.

Rendition (extraordinary rendition): the secret removal of a suspect to another country without due process of law. Often, the suspect is delivered to a country where torture is secretly allowed.

Retribution: a justly deserved punishment or penalty.

Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court: the multilateral treaty that established the International Criminal Court. See “International Criminal Court” above.

Secretary General: the chief administrator of the United Nations. The Secretary General serves for renewable five-year terms after appointment by the General Assembly acting on the nomination of the Security Council. By convention, the Secretary General cannot be a national of one of the five permanent members of the Security Council (Britain, China, France, Russia, and the United States).

Security Council: the division of the United Nations that is responsible for maintaining international peace and security. It is composed of five permanent members, each of which may veto any proposed resolution and ten temporary members that serve two year terms and do not have a veto. The five permanent members are Britain, China, France, Russia, and the United States.

Self-determination: the right of people to form the government of their choosing, without reference to the desires of any other nation.

Slavery: the state of being owned or under the complete control of another person.

Social Security: the provision of economic security and welfare for individuals by the government through programs and direct payments provided by public funds and/or payments collected from employers and employees.

Solidarity: a union of interests or purposes or of fellowship among members of a group. Similar in meaning to ‘fraternity.’

Sovereign: autonomous, independent, self-governing state with sole power over its internal affairs.

Special Rapporteur: the title given to individuals designated to work on behalf of international organizations, often the United Nations, who are given specific mandates to investigate, monitor, and recommend actions on a specific human rights issue.

Srebrenica massacre: the massacre of an estimated 8,000 people in the town of Srebrenica by the Serbian Army in July, 1995 during the war in Bosnia.

Subsidiarity: the principle that matters ought to be handled by the lowest or smallest competent authority. In practice this means leaving local issues to be handled by local government while national issues (such as war or national security) should be handled by national government. In the context of the International Criminal Court, the term refers to the principle of allowing a country to prosecute a crime the Court has jurisdiction over unless that country is unwilling or unable to do so, at which point the Court will exercise jurisdiction.

The Enlightenment: see ‘Enlightenment, (The)’

Three Generations of Rights: the grouping of rights into three distinct categories, generally in the order in which they are protected during a country’s development into an advanced, industrial state. First generation rights are the most basic, fundamental rights and include civil and political rights; those that deal with liberty, freedom of speech, due process of law, etc. Second generation rights are social, economic, and cultural in nature; focusing on access to employment, housing, and health care. Finally, third generation rights encompass a much broader range of “rights,” such as the right to a healthy environment, the right to protection of cultural heritage, and the right to social development.

Tokyo Trials: the trials of military and political leaders of the Empire of Japan for crimes against humanity and war crimes committed during World War II before the International Military Tribunal for the Far East. However, the Emperor of Japan was not included in the list of persons indicted. See also “International Military Tribunal for the Far East” above.

Torture: the act of inflicting excruciating physical or mental pain, as punishment or revenge, as a means of getting a confession or information, or for sheer cruelty.

Trafficking: in the context of “human trafficking,” it is the illegal recruitment and trade of people to be exploited against their will.

Treaty: a formal, legal agreement between two or more states.

Tribunals: seats or courts of justice; often those that have jurisdiction on behalf of countries such as the Nuremberg Tribunal. See “Nuremberg Trials” for more information.

UN Transitional Administration in East Timor: The United Nations program that administered the territory of East Timor during its transition from occupation by Indonesia to its full independence, running from August 1999 to May 2002.

United Nations: an international organization formed in 1945 after the end of World War II to promote international peace, security, and cooperation. It was created under the terms of the charter signed by 51 founding countries in San Francisco in 1945.

Universal Declaration of Human Rights: the declaration is primarily a statement of principle, a foundation upon which the legal framework for practical protections of the agreed upon rights could be constructed. It is not a legally binding document, but rather serves as a statement of aspirations for all states to achieve a more equitable and just world.

Unilateral: undertaken by or relating to only one side. A unilateral action in international relations is one taken by only one state, not a group of states.

Unlawful Combatants: the classification used by the United States for terrorist enemies that are captured by U.S. forces. This classification does not enjoy the legal protections provided under the Geneva Conventions for the detainment of prisoners of war or other “legal” enemy combatants. (See discussion of “lawful combatant” in the Issue Brief for further information).

U.S. Constitution: the document that provides the fundamental principles and laws that prescribe the structure, functions, and limits of the U.S. government.

War Crimes: violations of the laws and customs of war as codified by the Geneva and Hague Conventions. These crimes include, but are not limited to, the destruction of cities or towns not justified by military necessity, the targeting and killing of civilians, torture, killing a surrendered combatant, willful destruction of religious institutions or educational centers, and the plunder of public or private property.

Works Cited

Introduction: What Are Human Rights?

- Arat, Zehra (1991). *Democracy and Human Rights in Developing Countries*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publisher.
- Cranston, Maurice William (1973). *What are human rights?* London: Bodley Head.
- Donnelly, Jack (1982). Human Rights and Human Dignity: An Analytic Critique of Non-Western Conceptions of human Rights. *American Political Science Review* 76: 303-316.
- Locke, John (1690). *Second Treatise on Government*.
- Park, Han S. (1987). Correlates of Human Rights: Global Tendencies, *Human Rights Quarterly* 9, 405-413.
- Renteln, Alison Dundes (1988). The Concept of Human Rights. *Anthropos*, 83 (4), 343-364.
- Roshwald, Mordecai (1958). The Concept of Human Rights. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 19, 354-379.
- Strauss, Leo (1953). *Natural Right and History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Twiss, Sumner B. (1998). Moral Grounds and Plural Cultures: Interpreting Human Rights in the International Community. *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 26:2, 271-282.
- (2004). History, Human Rights, and Globalization. *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 32:1, 39-70.
- Vasek, Karel (1977). Human Rights: A Thirty-Year Struggle: The Sustained Efforts to Give Force of Law to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. *UNESCO Courier* 30: 11.
- Waldron, Jeremy (1984). *Theories of Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wasserstrom, Richard (1979). Rights, Human Rights, and Racial Discrimination. In: D. Lyons (ed.), *Rights*; 46-57. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- “What are Human Rights?” Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights, <http://www.ohchr.org/en/issues/Pages/WhatareHumanRights.aspx>

Major Ideological Tensions within Human Rights Doctrine

- Berlin, Isaiah (1958). *Two Concepts of Liberty: An Inaugural Lecture delivered before the University of Oxford on 31 October 1958*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Henkin, Louis (1998). The Universal Declaration and the Cold War. *American Philosophical Association Newsletter* 97:2.
- Renteln, Alison Dundes (1988). The Concept of Human Rights. *Anthropos*, 83 (4), 343-364.
- Sinha, S.P. (1978). Human Rights Philosophically. *Indian Journal of International Law* 18, 139-159.
- Twiss, Sumner B. (1998). Moral Grounds and Plural Cultures: Interpreting Human Rights in the International Community. *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 26:2, 271-282.
- United Declaration of Human Rights (1948).

Waldron, Jeremy (1984). *Theories of Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights

- Alston, P. (1983). The Universal Declaration at 35: Western and Passe or Alive and Universal? *International Commission of Jurists Review* 31, 60-70.
- Bailey, Peter. "The Creation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights." Universal Rights Network, <http://www.universalrights.net/main/creation.htm>.
- Morsink, Johannes (1998). *The Universal Declaration of Human Rights: Origins, Drafting, and Intent*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Twiss, Sumner B. (2004). History, Human Rights, and Globalization. *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 32:1, 39-70.
- United Declaration of Human Rights (1948).

Key International Documents

- "A Brief History of the Laws of War." *Geneva Conventions: A Reference Guide*, Society of Professional Journalists, <http://www.genevaconventions.org/>.
- "A United Nations Priority: Universal Declaration of Human Rights." *Human Rights Today: UN Briefing Papers*, United Nations, <http://www.un.org/rights/HRToday/declar.htm>.
- African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights: http://www.achpr.org/english/info/charter_en.html
- American Convention on Human Rights: <http://www.cidh.org/Basicos/basic3.htm>
- Carozza, Paolo G. (2003). Subsidiarity as a Structural Principle of International Human Rights Law. *American Journal of International Law* 97:1, 38-79.
- Convention on Genocide: http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/p_genoci.htm
- Convention on Discrimination Against Women: <http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/e1cedaw.htm>
- Convention on Racial Discrimination: http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/d_icerd.htm
- Convention on the Rights of the Child: <http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/k2crc.htm>
- "Declarations and Reservations: International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights." Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, United Nations, http://www.ohchr.org/english/countries/ratification/4_1.htm.
- "Derogation," in *Black's Law Dictionary*, 7th ed., Bryan A. Garner. (St. Paul: West Group, 1999).
- Donnelly, Jack (2002). *Universal Human Rights in Theory and Practice*, 2nd ed. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms: <http://conventions.coe.int/treaty/en/Treaties/Html/005.htm>

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

- Falk, Richard. *Human Rights Horizons: the Pursuit of Justice in a Globalizing World* (New York: Routledge, 2000).
- Geneva Convention (1929).
- “Human Rights Fundamentals: What Are Human Rights?” in *Human Rights Here and Now: Celebrating the Universal Declaration of Human Rights*, ed. Nancy Flowers. University of Minnesota, Human Rights Resource Center.
- “Inalienable,” in *Black’s Law Dictionary*, 7th ed., Bryan A. Garner. (St. Paul: West Group, 1999).
- International Bill of Rights (1966).
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966)
- “Introduction to the Human Rights Committee.” Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, United Nations, <http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu2/6/a/introhrc.htm>.
- “Jus Cogens,” in *Black’s Law Dictionary*, 7th ed., Bryan A. Garner. (St. Paul: West Group, 1999).
- Marcus, Jonathan. “US Formally Dumps ABM Treaty.” *BBC News*, June 13, 2002.
- O’Connell, D.P. (1970). *International Law*, 2nd ed. Vol. 1. London: Stevens & Sons.
- Robertson, A.H. (1972). *Human Rights in the World*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- “Schenck v. United States.” U.S. Supreme Court Case; available at: http://www.law.cornell.edu/supct/html/historics/USSC_CR_0249_0047_ZO.html
- “The Hague Convention, 1899-1954.” World War I Document Archive, Brigham Young University Library, <http://net.lib.byu.edu/~rdh7/wwi/hague.html>.
- “The United States and the International Criminal Court.” Human Rights Watch, <http://www.hrw.org/campaigns/icc/us.htm>.

Responding to Human Rights Violations

- “About the Special Court for Sierra Leone.” The Special Court for Sierra Leone,
- “About UNMIK.” UNMIK At a Glance, United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo, <http://www.unmikonline.org/intro.htm>.
- “Achievements of the ICTR.” International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, <http://69.94.11.53/default.htm>.
- “An Introduction to the Responsibility to Protect.” International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect, <http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/about-rtop>.
- “Barack Obama Restarts Guantánamo Trials.” The Guardian, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/mar/07/guantanamo-bay-trials-restart>.
- “Cambodia 1975: The Genocide.” Peace Pledge Union Information, http://www.ppu.org.uk/genocide/g_cambodia1.html.
- “Cases.” International Court of Justice, <http://www.icj-cij.org/court/index.php?p1=1&p2=1>.
- “Coining a Word and Championing a Cause: The Story of Raphael Lemkin.” United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, <http://www.ushmm.org/conscience/history/lemkin/>.
- “Convention (I) for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field. Geneva, 12 August 1949.” International Humanitarian Law – Treaties

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

- & Documents, International Committee of the Red Cross,
<http://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/7c4d08d9b287a42141256739003e636b/fe20c3d903ce27e3c125641e004a92f3!OpenDocument>.
- “Convention (II) for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of Armed Forces at Sea. Geneva, 12 August 1949.” International Humanitarian Law – Treaties & Documents, International Committee of the Red Cross,
<http://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/7c4d08d9b287a42141256739003e636b/44072487ec4c2131c125641e004a9977!OpenDocument>.
- “Convention (III) Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War. Geneva, 12 August 1949.” International Humanitarian Law – Treaties & Documents, International Committee of the Red Cross,
<http://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/7c4d08d9b287a42141256739003e636b/6fef854a3517b75ac125641e004a9e68!OpenDocument>.
- “Convention (IV) Relative to the Protection of Civilians in Time of War. Geneva, 12 August 1949.” International Humanitarian Law – Treaties & Documents, International Committee of the Red Cross,
<http://www.icrc.org/ihl.nsf/7c4d08d9b287a42141256739003e636b/6756482d86146898c125641e004aa3c5!OpenDocument>
- “Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.” Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, United Nations,
http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/p_genoci.htm
- “General Information.” ICTY At a Glance, International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, <http://www.un.org/icty/glance-e/index.htm>.
- “Henry Dunant (1828-1910),” International Committee for the Red Cross, April 6, 1998,
<http://www.icrc.org/Web/eng/siteeng0.nsf/htmlall/57JNVQ>.
- “International Criminal Court: Basic Fact Sheet.” Human Rights Watch,
<http://hrw.org/campaigns/icc/whowhat.htm>.
- “International Justice: The International Criminal Court.” Amnesty International,
<http://web.amnesty.org/pages/icc-index-eng>.
- “Key Figures of ICTY Cases.” ICTY At a Glance, International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, <http://www.un.org/icty/glance-e/index.htm>.
- “Myths and Facts About the International Criminal Court.” Human Rights Watch,
<http://www.hrw.org/campaigns/icc/facts.htm>.
- “Politics and Economy: The Geneva Conventions.” *NOW*, May 21, 2004,
<http://www.pbs.org/now/politics/geneva.html>.
- “Reform Run Amok: The U.N.’s New Human Rights Council Makes the Old One Look Good.” *Washington Post*, Editorial, October 12, 2006; A26.
- “Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.” Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, United Nations,
<http://www.ohchr.org/english/law/criminalcourt.htm>.
- “Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court” United Nations Treaty Collections, United Nations. http://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtdsg_no=XVIII-10&chapter=18&lang=en

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

- “Rwanda: A Historical Chronology.” *Frontline*,
<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/rwanda/etc/cron.html>.
- “Rwanda: How the Genocide Happened.” *BBC News*, April 1, 2004,
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/1288230.stm>.
- “Situations and Cases” International Criminal Court, July, 2009.
- “Special Rapporteur on Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.” Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, United Nations, <http://www.ohchr.org/english/issues/torture/rapporteur/>.
- “Study Guides: Torture, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment.” Human Rights Education Associates, <http://www.hrea.org/learn/guides/torture.html>.
- “The Cambodian Genocide Program.” Yale University, <http://www.yale.edu/cgp/>.
- “The Court: History.” International Court of Justice, <http://www.icj-cij.org/court/index.php?p1=1&p2=1>.
- “UN Rules Against Israeli Barrier.” *BBC News*, July 9, 2004,
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/3879057.stm.
- “US Takes Seat on UN Human Rights Council.” VOA News, June, 19, 2009
<http://www.voanews.com/english/2009-06-19-voa29.cfm>
- “War Crimes: The Nuremberg and Tokyo Trials.” *Encyclopedia Britannica Online*, 2007,
<http://search.eb.com/eb/article-224687>.
- Barrow, Greg. “Cambodia Resumes UN Tribunal Talks.” *BBC News*, January 6, 2003,
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/2633617.stm>.
- Barry, John et al. “The Roots of Torture: The Road to Abu Ghraib Began After 9/11, When Washington Wrote New Rules To Fight a New Kind of War,” *Newsweek*, May 24, 2004; pg. 26.
- Barsa, Pavel. “Waging War in the Name of Human Rights? Fourteen Theses About Humanitarian Intervention.” *Perspectives* 24, Summer 2005.
- Carey, Henry F. “U.S. Domestic Politics and the Emerging Humanitarian Intervention Policy: Haiti, Bosnia, and Kosovo.” *World Affairs* 164(2), Fall 2001.
- Convention Against Torture: http://www.unhcr.ch/html/menu3/b/h_cat39.htm
- De Waal, Alex. “No Such Thing as Humanitarian Intervention: Why We Need to Rethink How to Realize the ‘Responsibility to Protect’ in Wartime.” *Harvard International Review*, March 21, 2007, <http://hir.harvard.edu/articles/1482/>.
- Dietrich, John W. “Kosovo and the Challenge of Humanitarian Intervention: Selective Indignation, Collective Action, and International Citizenship.” *Human Rights Quarterly* 24(4), November 2003.
- Greenhouse, Linda. “Supreme Court Refuses to Hear Torture Appeal.” *New York Times*, October 9, 2007. http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/09/washington/09cnd-scotus.html?_r=3.
- Hanson, Stephanie. “Africa and the International Criminal Court.” Council on Foreign Relations, <http://www.cfr.org/publication/12048/>.
- Hillen III, John F. “Killing with Kindness: The UN Peacekeeping Mission in Bosnia.” Foreign Policy Briefing #34, Cato Institute, June 30, 1995.
- Hinton, Alex. “We Can’t Let the Khmer Rouge Escape.” *Washington Post*, August 4, 2006; A17.

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

- Hirsh, Michael et al. "Aboard Air CIA: The Agency Ran a Secret Charter Service, Shuttling Detainees to Interrogation Facilities Worldwide. Was It Legal? What's Next?" *Newsweek*, February 25, 2005; pg. 32.
<http://www.icc-cpi.int/Menus/ICC/Situations+and+Cases/>
<http://www.sc-sl.org/ABOUT/tabid/70/Default.aspx>
- Kafala, Tarik. "What Is a War Crime?" *BBC News*, July 31, 2003,
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/1420133.stm>.
- Kiernan, Ben. "The Cambodian Genocide and Imperial Culture." In *90 Years of Denial*, *Aztag Daily*, April 2005, 20-1,
<http://www.yale.edu/cgp/KiernanCambodia30thAnniversaryEssay.doc>.
- Kilgannon, Thomas. "Obama May Place the U.S Under International Criminal Court." *Human Events.com*, February, 10, 2009. <http://www.humanevents.com/article.php?id=30632>
- Marks, Susan and Andrew Clapham. *International Human Rights Lexicon*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
- Mayer, Jane. "Whatever It Takes: The Politics of the Man Behind '24.'" *The New Yorker*, February 19, 2007; pg. 66.
- Miller, Martin. "'24' Gets a Lesson in Torture From the Experts." *Los Angeles Times*, February 13, 2007.
- Peterson, Shannon (2004) "The Future of Humanitarian Intervention." *International Politics* 41(3).
- Priest, Dana and R. Jeffrey Smith. "Memo Offered Justification for Use of Torture." *Washington Post*, June 8, 2004; A01.
- Rivkin Jr., David B. and Lee A. Casey, "It's Not Torture, and They Aren't Lawful Combatants." *Washington Post*, January 11, 2003; A19.
- Sanchez, Marcela (2006). "Where the Rights Commission Went Wrong." *Washington Post*, March 24, 2006.
- Simons, Marlise. "Milosevic Dies of Heart Attack, Autopsy Shows." *New York Times*, March 13, 2006, <http://topics.nytimes.com/2006/03/13/international/europe/13milosevic.html>.
- Terry, James P. "Rethinking Humanitarian Intervention After Kosovo: Legal Reality and Political Pragmatism." *The Army Lawyer*, August 2004.

Impact of Globalization

- "About AI: Frequently Asked Questions." Amnesty International,
<http://web.amnesty.org/pages/aboutai-faq-eng>.
- "About HRW." Human Rights Watch, <http://www.hrw.org/about/howweare.html>.
Accelerating action against child labour. (2010).
<http://www.ilo.org/ipecinfo/product/viewProduct.do?productId=13853>
- "Backgrounder: Child Labor in Agriculture." Human Rights Watch,
<http://hrw.org/backgrounder/crp/back0610.htm>
- "Child Soldiers." Human Rights Watch, <http://hrw.org/campaigns/crp/index.htm>.

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

- “China.” *The World Factbook 2007*, Central Intelligence Agency, <https://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/ch.html>.
- “Colombia: FARC-EP Hands Over two Police Officers to ICRC.” Regional News, International Committee of the Red Cross, <http://www.icrc.org/web/eng/siteeng0.nsf/html/colombia-news-090307!OpenDocument>.
- “Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others.” Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, <http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/33.htm>.
- “Convention on the Rights of the Child.” The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, <http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/k2crc.htm>.
- “Declaration on the Rights of the Child.” Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, <http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/25.htm>.
- “Facts about Child Soldiers” Human Rights Watch; http://hrw.org/campaigns/crp/fact_sheet.html
- “Female Genital Mutilation.” Fact Sheet #241, World Health Organization, June 2000, <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs241/en/index.html>.
- “Focus: Land Rights in the Amazon River Basin,” UN Cyberschool Bus; http://www.un.org/cyberschoolbus/indigenous/locate_focus.asp
- “From Stitching to School: Combating Child Labour in the Soccer Ball Industry in Pakistan.” International Labor Organization and the International Programme on the Elimination of Child Labour, 2004. <http://www.ilo.org/ipeinfo/product/viewProduct.do;jsessionid=0a038009ce9ee54e8c77b3b4e6d8b29933da52f091d?productId=2099>
- “From the Battle of Solferino to the Eve of the First World War,” International Committee for the Red Cross, December 28, 2004, <http://www.icrc.org/web/eng/siteeng0.nsf/html/57JNVP>.
- “Geneva Declaration of the Rights of the Child.” *Human Rights Library*, University of Minnesota, <http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/instree/childrights.html>.
- “Human Rights Violations Related to Women’s Sexual Autonomy and Reproductive Choices.” Human Rights Watch, <http://hrw.org/english/docs/2005/07/07/ameri11295.htm>.
- “Leaflet 10: Indigenous Peoples and the Environment.” United Nations High Commissioner on Human Rights; <http://www.ohchr.org/english/about/publications/docs/indileaflet10.doc>
- “Path to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.” UNICEF, http://www.unicef.org/crc/index_30197.html.
- “Sierra Leone: Sowing Terror; Atrocities against Civilians in Sierra Leone.” Human Rights Watch, July 1998, Vol. 10, No. 3; <http://www.hrw.org/reports98/sierra/>
- “States Parties” International Campaign to Ban Landmines.
- “Status of Ratifications, Reservations and Declarations: Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages.” United Nations Treaty Collection, February 5, 2002, http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu3/b/treaty3_.htm.
- “The ICRC’s Mandate and Mission,” International Committee for the Red Cross, http://www.icrc.org/Web/Eng/siteeng0.nsf/htmlall/section_mandate?OpenDocument

Globalization 101

A project of  SUNY LEVIN Institute

- “Trafficking in Persons Report: Introduction.” Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons, U.S. Department of State, June 2012, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/192587.pdf>.
- “Underage and Unprotected: Child Labor in Egypt’s Cotton Fields” Human Rights Watch <http://www.hrw.org/reports/2001/egypt/Egypt01.htm>
- “What Are the Origins of International Humanitarian Law,” International Committee for the Red Cross, October 31, 2002, <http://www.icrc.org/web/eng/siteeng0.nsf/html/5KZFR8>.
- “Who We Are: Our Mission and Role,” International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, http://www.ifrc.org/who/index.asp?navid=03_01.
- “Women’s Rights.” Human Rights Watch, <http://hrw.org/women/>.
- Cohn, Ilene, “The Protection of Children and the Quest for Truth and Justice in Sierra Leone.” *Journal of International Affairs*, Fall 2001; Vol. 55, Iss. 1.
- Ewin, Alexander, ed. (1993). *Voice of Indigenous Peoples: Native People Address the United Nations*. Santa Fe: Clear Light Publishers.
- Falk, Richard. *Human Rights Horizons: the Pursuit of Justice in a Globalizing World* (New York: Routledge, 2000).
- Hornberger, Nancy H. “Language Policy, Language Education, Language Rights: Indigenous, Immigrant, and International Perspectives.” *Language in Society*. Oct. 1998; Vol. 27, Iss. 4. <http://www.icbl.org/index.php/icbl/Universal/MBT/States-Parties>
- International Labor Organization (ILO) Convention 138, <http://www.ilo.org/ilolex/cgi-lex/convde.pl?C138>
- Marks, Susan and Andrew Clapham. *International Human Rights Lexicon*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
- Peang-Meth, Abdulgaffar, “The Rights of Indigenous Peoples and Their Fight for Self-Determination.” *World Affairs*, Winter 2002; Vol. 164, No. 3.
- Twiss, Sumner B. (2004). History, Human Rights, and Globalization. *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 32:1, 39-70.
- UNICEF Statistics; http://www.unicef.org/protection/index_childlabour.html