[chaudoin@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:chaudoin@fas.harvard.edu)

Office Hours: By Appointment

**Overview**

This course studies the causes of human rights violations around the world and the internal and external forces that combat them. The syllabus is divided into these subtopics:

* **How and why**: Why do human rights violations occur in the first place? How do we measure and assess the severity of violations? How have these measures changed over time?
* **Internal forces**: How does internal politics and protests affect human rights violations? How do domestic political institutions (eg democracy) and domestic legal institutions (eg domestic courts) affect the severity of human rights violations?
* **External forces**: How do external forces affect human rights violations? How do other states influence human rights with coercion (eg sanctions)? How do non-state actors, like non-governmental organizations and activists, affect violations?
* **International institutions**: How do international institutions affect human rights violations? Under what conditions do treaties decrease rights violations? What are the effects of ad hoc bodies, like post-war tribunals? What are the effects of standing bodies, like the International Criminal Court?

**Class Objectives**

*Knowledge:* We will learn about key arguments, the theories behind them, and the empirical evidence that supports or disconfirms those theories.

As a disclaimer, this is not an international law course. We will become familiar with the key legal components of some human rights treaties, but our focus will be on social science and cause-and-effect questions, not legal concepts or normative questions.

*Critique:* We will assess each argument’s strengths and weaknesses. The readings on the syllabus are there because they are prominent arguments that deserve strong consideration, not because they are The Truth. We will critically evaluate their arguments and the choices authors made as they executed their research agendas.

*Construction:* Most importantly, we will ask “where should research go from here?” When we criticize, we will put more emphasis on how we could improve existing arguments and push research forward. This goal of the course will be most tied to the final project, described below.

**Grading**

* Participation 20%: This is a seminar, so I expect students to complete readings before class and come prepared to discuss each assigned reading. To receive full credit for participation, students should be prepared to make comments in class, engage with each other’s comments, and contribute to discussion.
  + Since COVID and remote learning bring particular challenges, we will have more “concrete” benchmarks for participation than in pre-COVID times.
    - In class participation: 40% of your participation grade will be based on the degree to which you participate in class with comments.
    - Discussion questions: 60% of your participation grade will be based on discussion questions that you submit before class. These are critical reflection questions like the ones we have on the syllabus. Do this three times during the semester. This is your chance to shape the discussion for that day’s class.
  + If you have a technical problem and drop out of a Zoom meeting. Please try and reconnect for 10 minutes and if it still won’t work, send me a message and we can figure out a way to make up coverage of the material.
    - One option, depending on the class’ preferences and depending on the location of our students, will be to record the rest of the meeting. I will then only share that recording with students who had technical problems.
* Take Home Midterm 20%: [[xx date]]. This is a 3-5 page exam based on short essay questions. You will have 24 hours to complete it. This is an individual assignment, without collaboration.
* Oral Presentation on Current Events Question 20%: At different points during class, pairs of students will present on topical, current events by relating them to research we have studied. By week 3, pairs of students will have selected their presentation date. Jointly, each pair will give a 10-minute presentation and then answer questions from the class.
  + For example, for our week on the International Criminal Court, you might be asked to present on a specific case, like the one involving the United States and Afghanistan. The list of questions and topics is in the syllabus.
* Final Research Paper 40%: [[Due xx date]]. This is an original research paper in which students identify a research question, develop a theoretical argument, and assess its predictions with data. This is a minimum of 18 pages, double spaced, 12 font, regular margins.
  + Again, since COVID and remote learning are challenging, we will have a lot more interaction and intermediate steps around the completion of this assignment.

**Summary of Key Dates**

These are the key dates for the semester, by week. Items in italics are outside of class.

Week 1

- Main readings: Intro and History

Week 2

**-** Main readings: Measurement and sources of HR violations

- Demonstrate citation trail following on Google Scholar

Week 3

- Main readings: Sources of HR violations, protests, dissent

- Choose Paper Pitch/Presentation Partners

*- Meet outside class to discuss buffet of ideas and which current event presentation you want*

Week 4

- Main readings: Domestic political institutions and HR

- Choose current event presentation dates for each partnership

*- Meet with partner; prepare for partner paper pitch presentation*

Week 5

- Main readings: NGOs, Naming and shaming

- Partners present each other’s ideas (3 min max).

Week 6

- Main readings: Norms and socialization

*- Meet with Prof. Chaudoin in office hours to describe 5 most relevant articles*

Week 7

- Main readings: External economic pressure

*- Take home midterm exam.*

*- Working on outline of paper.*

Week 8

- Main readings: HR Treaties

- Submit outline to Prof. Chaudoin.

*- Choose a student-chosen paper you want to nominate*

Week 9

- Main readings: Transitional justice, Ad hoc tribunals

- Nominate student chosen papers.

Week 10

- Main readings: International institutions

- Vote on student chosen papers.

Week 11

- Main readings: Public opinion

*- Submit “Key Figure” to Prof. Chaudoin*

Week 12/13

- Main readings: Student-chosen papers

**Academic Integrity**

Students should be aware that in this course collaboration of any sort on any work submitted for formal evaluation is not permitted. This means that you may not discuss your problem sets, paper assignments, exams, or any other assignments with other students. All work should be entirely your own and must use appropriate citation practices to acknowledge the use of books, articles, websites, lectures, discussions, etc., that you have consulted to complete your assignments.

The exceptions to this policy will be clear from the syllabus (eg a group presentation or peer feedback on a paper draft).

This course also follows Harvard College's policies on plagiarism. Specifically, any material submitted to meet course requirements - homework assignments, papers, projects, posted comments, examinations - is expected to be a student's own work, unless otherwise specified.

I ask all students to bookmark and consult regularly the Harvard Guide to Using Sources website at: http://usingsources.fas.harvard.edu. You are urged to take great care in distinguishing your own ideas and thoughts from information and analysis derived from printed and electronic sources and for giving proper citational credit when you use another’s idea.

**Statement on Inclusion**

I believe in incorporating a wide array of people and perspectives in this class. This means making sure that we cover the excellent work of many non-male scholars and non-white scholars. The syllabus reflects this commitment, and I work to improve it every year. This also means covering topics that pertain to gender, race, and non-US perspectives. I've worked on this balance after many discussions with students and colleagues.

I won't be perfect. For example, one shortcoming that I see in myself is that I can most easily reach for examples that relate to the United States, because it's what I know best. But I will continue to work on making this class a place where everyone can find something familiar and also something new, to become fascinated and challenged by the topic of International Relations. Please come and talk to me, with positive and negative feedback. My office door, email inbox, and ears are open.

**Statement about Surveillance Security**

Online classes pose a potential problem for students based in countries with governments that engage in surveillance of sensitive issues like human rights. We will take the following precautions:

* I want students to be aware of this issue and think for themselves about whether this class is appropriate for them. For students in China and Hong Kong, subjects that are sensitive to the CCP are likely to come up in this course. Though, we do not focus explicitly on those topics.
* Classes will not be recorded and students are not permitted to record class discussions. The one (possible) exception to this will be as a remedy for technological problems, but even then, we may decide that recordings are not a good option.
* Students should not use their last names in their Zoom names, and they should feel free to use a (respectful and professional) pseudonym if they would prefer.

This is an evolving situation and US academic institutions are in uncharted territory. We will be flexible and will consider new approaches or solutions, too.

**Late Policy and Missed Class**

You have a 24 hour “late bank,” that you can use at any time. After that, it’s a letter grade per 24 hours that an assignment is late.

If you miss class, email Prof. Chaudoin to decide on a make-up assignment.

**Readings**

A few notes on the readings:

* Complete all required readings before class.
* The suggested readings serve two purposes. They (a) provide additional material for you to engage with for your longer essays and (b) are of potential interest for people that want to read further on a subject.
* At the end of this syllabus, I have provided a “How To” guide for approaching these readings.
* Most readings can be found through HOLLIS. If not, I’ve uploaded them to our Canvas site.

**WEEK 1: Intro and Syllabus**

1. Posner, Eric A. *The twilight of human rights law*. Oxford University Press, USA, 2014.

* Ch 1-2 (History of HR law). PDF posted on Canvas.

1. Sikkink, Kathryn. *Evidence For Hope*. Princeton University Press, USA, 2017.

* Ch 2 (“Response to the Critics”). Full book available via HOLLIS.
* *What are the major historical trends and developments with respect to human rights?*
* *How do these two histories differ and what is at stake in this disagreement?*

1. Moravcsik, Andrew. "The origins of human rights regimes: Democratic delegation in postwar Europe." *International Organization* 54, no. 2 (2000): 217-252.

* *What is the research design for this article? Focus on precisely answering some of the theory and empirics questions from the reading guide at the end of this syllabus.*

1. Carpenter, Charli. "“You Talk Of Terrible Things So Matter-of-Factly in This Language of Science”: Constructing Human Rights in the Academy." *Perspectives on Politics* 10, no. 2 (2012): 363-383.

* *We will often talk about real people with real experiences from a more detached, social scientific perspective. What from Carpenter’s article should we be most vigilant about moving forward? Did she make any arguments that rang particularly true for this week’s readings?*

Recommended:

* Higher-altitude articles about how we study human rights:
  + Dembour, Marie-Bénédicte. "What are human rights-four schools of thought." Hum. Rts. Q. 32 (2010): 1.
  + Landman, Todd. "The political science of human rights." *British Journal of Political Science* 35, no. 3 (2005): 549-572.
  + Hafner-Burton, Emilie M., and James Ron. "Seeing double: Human rights impact through qualitative and quantitative eyes." *World Politics* 61, no. 2 (2009): 360-401.
  + Dancy, Geoff, and Christopher J. Fariss. "Rescuing Human Rights Law From International Legalism and its Critics." *Human Rights Quarterly* 39, no. 1 (2017): 1-36.
  + Hafner-Burton, Emilie M. "A social science of human rights." *Journal of Peace Research* 51, no. 2 (2014): 273-286.
* Interesting exchange between practitioners:
  + Roth, Kenneth. "Defending economic, social and cultural rights: Practical issues faced by an international human rights organization." *Human Rights Quarterly* 26, no. 1 (2004): 63-73.
  + Rubenstein, Leonard S. "How international human rights organizations can advance economic, social and cultural rights: A response to Kenneth Roth." *Human Rights Quarterly* 26, no. 4 (2004): 845-865.
* Broad view of why we don’t emphasize ‘ism’s in this class
  + Lake, David A. "Why “isms” are evil: theory, epistemology, and academic sects as impediments to understanding and progress." *International Studies Quarterly* 55, no. 2 (2011): 465-480.
  + Lake, David A. "Theory is dead, long live theory: The end of the Great Debates and the rise of eclecticism in International Relations." *European Journal of International Relations* 19, no. 3 (2013): 567-587.
* Methodological piece about linking theory and empirics in IR; useful as a general template.
  + Chaudoin, Stephen, Helen V. Milner, and Xun Pang. "International systems and domestic politics: Linking complex interactions with empirical models in international relations." *International Organization* 69, no. 2 (2015): 275-309.

**WEEK 2: Data, Measurement + Sources of Human Rights Abuse**

1. Cingranelli, David L., and David L. Richards. "The Cingranelli and Richards (CIRI) human rights data project." *Human Rights Quarterly* 32, no. 2 (2010): 401-424.
2. Fariss, Christopher J. "Respect for human rights has improved over time: Modeling the changing standard of accountability." *American Political Science Review* 108, no. 2 (2014): 297-318.

* *What are the most consequential measurement decisions when we measure human rights?*

1. Conrad, Courtenay Ryals, and Will H. Moore. "What stops the torture?." *American Journal of Political Science* 54, no. 2 (2010): 459-476.
2. Slough, Tara, and Christopher Fariss. "Misgovernance and Human Rights: The Case of Illegal Detention without Intent." *American Journal of Political Science* (2019).

* *How do these two articles differ in their explanations for the source of human rights violations?*
* *Thinking about the two readings on measurement, which types of abuses are more likely to come from which source – the one implicit in Conrad and Moore or the one emphasized in Slough and Fariss?*

Recommended:

* Other works that focus on measurement:
  + Wood, Reed M., and Mark Gibney. "The Political Terror Scale (PTS): A re-introduction and a comparison to CIRI." *Human Rights Quarterly* 32, no. 2 (2010): 367-400.
  + Landman, Todd, and Edzia Carvalho. Measuring human rights. Routledge, 2009.
* Other works that build on Fariss’ dynamic argument:
  + Schnakenberg, Keith E., and Christopher J. Fariss. "Dynamic patterns of human rights practices." *Political Science Research and Methods* 2, no. 1 (2014): 1-31.
  + Cingranelli, David, and Mikhail Filippov. "Problems of Model Specification and Improper Data Extrapolation." *British Journal of Political Science* (2017): 1-2.
  + Fariss, Christopher J. "Are Things Really Getting Better? How to Validate Latent Variable Models of Human Rights." *British Journal of Political Science* 48, no. 01 (2018): 275-282.
* Well known articles that lay out causes of “noncompliance.” The debate and contrast between these two arguments is still very influential.
  + Chayes, Abram, and Antonia Handler Chayes. "On compliance." International organization (1993): 175-205.
  + Downs, George W., David M. Rocke, and Peter N. Barsoom. "Is the good news about compliance good news about cooperation?." International Organization (1996): 379-406.

**WEEK 3: Sources of abuse cont. + Protests and Dissent**

1. Frantz, Erica, and Andrea Kendall-Taylor. "A dictator’s toolkit: Understanding how co-optation affects repression in autocracies." *Journal of Peace Research* 51, no. 3 (2014): 332-346.

* *Our studies so far have taken particular HR violations in isolation and looked at them (eg “What Stops the Torture.”) How is this work different? Is there any tension between this research and previous arguments?*

1. Ritter, Emily Hencken, and Courtenay R. Conrad. "Preventing and responding to dissent: The observational challenges of explaining strategic repression." *American Political Science Review* 110, no. 1 (2016): 85-99.

* *Useful links for understanding instrumental variables:*
  + [*http://www.rebeccabarter.com/blog/2018-05-23-instrumental\_variables/*](http://www.rebeccabarter.com/blog/2018-05-23-instrumental_variables/)
  + [*https://www.measureevaluation.org/resources/training/capacity-building-resources/workshop-on-impact-evaluation-of-population-health-and-nutrition-programs/instrumental-variables-two-stage-least-squares-2sls-2013-the-basics*](https://www.measureevaluation.org/resources/training/capacity-building-resources/workshop-on-impact-evaluation-of-population-health-and-nutrition-programs/instrumental-variables-two-stage-least-squares-2sls-2013-the-basics)

1. Stephan, Maria J., and Erica Chenoweth. "Why civil resistance works: The strategic logic of nonviolent conflict." *International security* 33.1 (2008): 7-44.
2. Franklin, James C. "Human Rights on the March: Repression, Oppression, and Protest in Latin America." *International Studies Quarterly* 64.1 (2020): 97-110.

* *Thinking about the dissent-repression feedback loop, what types of repression (and dissent) are most likely to feed this cycle?*

Recommended:

* Repression and Dissent
  + Conrad, Courtenay R. "Constrained concessions: Beneficent dictatorial responses to the domestic political opposition." *International Studies Quarterly* 55, no. 4 (2011): 1167-1187.
* Methodological argument related to rainfall
  + De Mesquita, Ethan Bueno, and Scott A. Tyson. "The commensurability problem: Conceptual difficulties in estimating the effect of behavior on behavior." American Political Science Review 114.2 (2020): 375-391.
* Models of protest:
  + Meirowitz, Adam, and Joshua A. Tucker. "People power or a one‐shot deal? A dynamic model of protest." *American Journal of Political Science* 57.2 (2013): 478-490.
  + Baser, Ekrem. “Mobilization, Repression and the Choice between Violent and Nonviolent Tactics.” Working Paper 2019.
  + Gause, LaGina. 2020. “Revealing Issue Salience via Costly Protest: How Legislative Behavior following Protest Advantages Low-Resource Groups.” *British Journal of Political Science.*

**WEEK 4: Domestic Political and Legal Institutions**

1. Davenport, Christian. State repression and the domestic democratic peace. Cambridge University Press, 2007. Chapter 2 on Canvas.
2. Lupu, Yonatan, Pierre-Hugues Verdier, and Mila Versteeg. "The strength of weak review: national courts, interpretive canons, and human rights treaties." *International Studies Quarterly* 63.3 (2019): 507-520.
3. Hu, Shengkuo, and Courtenay R. Conrad. "Monitoring via the Courts: Judicial Oversight and Police Violence in India." International Studies Quarterly (2020).

* *Useful* [*primer*](https://www.publichealth.columbia.edu/research/population-health-methods/difference-difference-estimation) *on difference in difference approaches.*

1. Dancy, Geoff, and Verónica Michel. "Human rights enforcement from below: Private actors and prosecutorial momentum in Latin America and Europe." International Studies Quarterly 60.1 (2016): 173-188.

Recommended:

* On democracy and human rights
  + Davenport, Christian. "State repression and political order." Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci. 10 (2007): 1-23.
  + Hill Jr, Daniel W. "Democracy and the concept of personal integrity rights." *The Journal of Politics* 78, no. 3 (2016): 822-835.
  + Joshi, Devin K., J. S. Maloy, and Timothy M. Peterson. "Popular versus elite democracies and human rights: Inclusion makes a difference." International Studies Quarterly 63.1 (2019): 111-126.
  + Davenport, Christian, and David A. Armstrong. "Democracy and the violation of human rights: A statistical analysis from 1976 to 1996." *American Journal of Political Science* 48, no. 3 (2004): 538-554.
  + Lupu, Yonatan. "Legislative veto players and the effects of international human rights agreements." *American Journal of Political Science* 59, no. 3 (2015): 578-594.
  + De Mesquita, Bruce Bueno, et al. "Thinking inside the box: A closer look at democracy and human rights." International Studies Quarterly 49.3 (2005): 439-457.
  + Hill, Daniel W., and Zachary M. Jones. "An empirical evaluation of explanations for state repression." *American Political Science Review* 108, no. 3 (2014): 661-687.
  + Davenport, Christian, ed. *Paths to state repression: Human rights violations and contentious politics*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2000.
  + Grewal, Sharanbir, and Erik Voeten. "Are New Democracies Better Human Rights Compliers?." *International Organization* 69, no. 2 (2015): 497-518.
  + Conrad, Courtenay R., Daniel W. Hill Jr, and Will H. Moore. "Torture and the limits of democratic institutions." Journal of Peace Research 55.1 (2018): 3-17.
* On domestic legal institutions (often in relation to international courts or treaties)
  + Crabtree, Charles, and Michael J. Nelson. "New evidence for a positive relationship between de facto judicial independence and state respect for empowerment rights." International studies quarterly 61.1 (2017): 210-224.
  + Powell, Emilia Justyna, and Jeffrey K. Staton. "Domestic judicial institutions and human rights treaty violation." *International Studies Quarterly* 53, no. 1 (2009): 149-174.
  + Lupu, Yonatan. "Best evidence: The role of information in domestic judicial enforcement of international human rights agreements." *International Organization* 67, no. 3 (2013): 469-503.
* The effect of foreign courts
  + Lutz, Ellen, and Kathryn Sikkink. "The justice cascade: the evolution and impact of foreign human rights trials in Latin America." *Chi. J. Int'l L.* 2 (2001): 1.
  + Sikkink, Kathryn, and Hun Joon Kim. "The justice cascade: The origins and effectiveness of prosecutions of human rights violations." Annual Review of Law and Social Science 9 (2013): 269-285.
* The effect of media freedom
  + Whitten-Woodring, Jenifer. "Watchdog or lapdog? Media freedom, regime type, and government respect for human rights." *International Studies Quarterly* 53, no. 3 (2009): 595-625.

**WEEK 5: NGOs + Naming and Shaming**

1. Keck, Margaret, and Kathryn Sikkink. "Activists beyond borders: Transnational activist networks in international politics." *Itaca, NY: Cornell University Press* (1998).
   * Ch 1, On Canvas.
   * (Don’t need to read: Ch2 on historical precursors; Ch 3 HR in LA; Ch 5 VAW)
2. Murdie, Amanda M., and David R. Davis. "Shaming and blaming: Using events data to assess the impact of human rights INGOs." *International Studies Quarterly* 56, no. 1 (2012): 1-16.

* *What are the main theoretical roles played by NGOs? What are the most persuasive pieces of empirical evidence about their effectiveness?*

1. Bakke, Kristin M., Neil J. Mitchell, and Hannah M. Smidt. "When States Crack Down on Human Rights Defenders." International Studies Quarterly 64.1 (2020): 85-96.
2. Meernik, James, Rosa Aloisi, Marsha Sowell, and Angela Nichols. "The impact of human rights organizations on naming and shaming campaigns." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 56, no. 2 (2012): 233-256.

* *If these Bakke et al are correct, are we likely to over- or under-estimate the effects of naming and shaming on state practices?*
* *What about if Meernik et al are correct?*

**Possible real world presentation:** Read a selection of naming and shaming examples. Do you see evidence of our academic journal articles in these data? Are there things that stand out to you that are unexplained or inconsistent with the articles we read?

* AI’s Press Releases: <https://www.amnesty.org/en/press-releases/>
* AI’s Urgent Actions https://www.amnestyusa.org/take-action/urgent-action-network/

Recommended:

* NGOs
  + Bob, Clifford. "Merchants of morality." *Foreign policy* (2002): 36-45.
  + Stroup, Sarah and Amanda Murdie. "There’s no place like home: Explaining international NGO advocacy." *The Review of International Organizations* 7, no. 4 (2012): 425-448.
  + Wong, Wendy H. *Internal affairs: How the structure of NGOs transforms human rights*. Cornell University Press, 2012.
  + Cooley, Alexander, and James Ron. "The NGO scramble: Organizational insecurity and the political economy of transnational action." *International Security* 27, no. 1 (2002): 5-39.
  + Bush, Sarah Sunn, and Jennifer Hadden. "Density and Decline in the Founding of International NGOs in the United States." *International Studies Quarterly* 63.4 (2019): 1133-1146.
  + Glasius, Marlies, Jelmer Schalk, and Meta De Lange. "Illiberal Norm Diffusion: How Do Governments Learn to Restrict Nongovernmental Organizations?." *International Studies Quarterly* 64.2 (2020): 453-468.
  + Hall, Nina, Hans Peter Schmitz, and J. Michael Dedmon. "Transnational advocacy and NGOs in the digital era: New forms of networked power." *International Studies Quarterly* 64.1 (2020): 159-167.
  + Ciplet, David. "Means of the Marginalized: Embedded Transnational Advocacy Networks and the Transformation of Neoliberal Global Governance." *International Studies Quarterly* 63.2 (2019): 296-309.
  + Stroup, Sarah S., and Wendy Wong. "Come together? Different pathways to international NGO centralization." *International Studies Review* 15, no. 2 (2013): 163-184.
  + Kim, Dongwook. "International nongovernmental organizations and the global diffusion of national human rights institutions." International Organization (2013): 505-539.
* NGO’s, not necessarily about human rights
  + Sell, Susan K., and Aseem Prakash. "Using ideas strategically: The contest between business and NGO networks in intellectual property rights." International Studies Quarterly 48, no. 1 (2004): 143-175.
  + Prakash, Aseem, and Mary Kay Gugerty, eds. Advocacy organizations and collective action. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
  + Hadden, Jennifer. "Explaining variation in transnational climate change activism: the role of inter-movement spillover." Global Environmental Politics 14, no. 2 (2014): 7-25.
  + Hadden, Jennifer, and Lorien Jasny. "The power of peers: how transnational advocacy networks shape NGO strategies on climate change." British Journal of Political Science (2017): 1-23.
* Naming and Shaming
  + Hafner-Burton, Emilie M. "Sticks and stones: Naming and shaming the human rights enforcement problem." *International Organization* 62, no. 4 (2008): 689-716.
  + Krain, Matthew. "J'accuse! Does Naming and Shaming Perpetrators Reduce the Severity of Genocides or Politicides?." *International Studies Quarterly* 56, no. 3 (2012): 574-589.
  + Hendrix, Cullen S., and Wendy H. Wong. "When is the pen truly mighty? Regime type and the efficacy of naming and shaming in curbing human rights abuses." *British Journal of Political Science* 43, no. 3 (2013): 651-672.
  + DeMeritt, Jacqueline HR. "International organizations and government killing: Does naming and shaming save lives?." *International Interactions* 38, no. 5 (2012): 597-621.
  + Murdie, Amanda, and Dursun Peksen. "The impact of human rights INGO shaming on humanitarian interventions." *The Journal of Politics* 76, no. 1 (2013): 215-228.
  + Franklin, James C. "Shame on you: the impact of human rights criticism on political repression in Latin America." *International Studies Quarterly* 52, no. 1 (2008): 187-211.
  + Murdie, Amanda, and Tavishi Bhasin. "Aiding and abetting: Human rights INGOs and domestic protest." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 55, no. 2 (2011): 163-191.
  + Terman, Rochelle. "Islamophobia and media portrayals of Muslim women: A computational text analysis of US news coverage." *International Studies Quarterly* 61.3 (2017): 489-502.
  + Terman, Rochell and Jamie Gruffyd-Jones. “Don’t tell us what to do: Human rights shaming and nationalist backlash.” Working paper. 2018.

**WEEK 6: Norms and Socialization**

1. Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. "International norm dynamics and political change." *International organization* (1998): 887-917.

* *What are the empirically testable predictions in the above works?*

1. Stimmer, Anette. "Beyond internalization: Alternate endings of the norm life cycle." *International Studies Quarterly* 63.2 (2019): 270-280.
2. Risse-Kappen, Thomas, Stephen C. Ropp, and Kathryn Sikkink, eds. *The power of human rights: International norms and domestic change*. Vol. 66. Cambridge University Press, 1999.
   1. Ch 1 (Intro, spiral model), 5 (Spiral model in PH), 8 (Conclusions) [Rquested an arab spring ch in persistent power; also requested Ch 1 in PoHR]
3. [A substantive focus chapter, either the PH one from PoHR or the Arab Spring one from PPoHR.]
   1. Note that PPoHR is an extension to the previous book where they want to take a deeper look at the spiral model.

**Possible real world presentation:** A University of Minnesota professor, Tanisha Fazal, recently tweeted “*Friends: can anyone recommend an Intro IR-appropriate reading (for 1st year undergrads) that uses the boomerang model to analyze BLM/protests from earlier this summer?”* After several days, there was no reply, even though most agreed that this was a great question. What arguments from our academic readings on norms and transnational activism explain part of the US experience with BLM in 2020? If our academic arguments from this week are *not* useful for understanding the BLM movement, why not? One potentially useful starting point for further reading is [here](https://www.justsecurity.org/70906/how-inter-state-procedures-in-human-rights-treaties-can-support-the-black-lives-matter-movement/).

Recommended:

* Risse, Thomas, Stephen C. Ropp, and Kathryn Sikkink, eds. The persistent power of human rights: From commitment to compliance. Vol. 126. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
* Finnemore, Martha. "National interests in international society." (1996). (In past, assigned Ch 1,3,5)
* Norms
  + Shor, Eran. "Conflict, terrorism, and the socialization of human rights norms: The spiral model revisited." *Social Problems* 55, no. 1 (2008): 117-138.
  + Zarakol, Ayşe. "What made the modern world hang together: socialisation or stigmatisation?." *International Theory* 6, no. 2 (2014): 311-332.
  + Risse, Thomas. "“Let's argue!”: communicative action in world politics." *International organization* 54, no. 1 (2000): 1-39.
  + Risse, Thomas. "International norms and domestic change: Arguing and communicative behavior in the human rights area." *Politics & Society* 27, no. 4 (1999): 529-559.
  + Simmons, Beth A., and Hyeran Jo. "Measuring Norms and Normative Contestation: The Case of International Criminal Law." Journal of Global Security Studies 4.1 (2019): 18-36.
  + Kim, Hun Joon, and Jason C. Sharman. "Accounts and accountability: Corruption, human rights, and individual accountability norms." International Organization 68.2 (2014): 417-448.
  + Beber, Bernd, Michael J. Gilligan, Jenny Guardado, and Sabrina Karim. "Peacekeeping, Compliance with International Norms, and Transactional Sex in Monrovia, Liberia." *International Organization* 71, no. 1 (2017): 1-30.
* Persuasion and Socialization
  + Deitelhoff, Nicole. "The discursive process of legalization: Charting islands of persuasion in the ICC case." *International organization* 63, no. 1 (2009): 33-65.
  + Hawkins, Darren. "Explaining costly international institutions: Persuasion and enforceable human rights norms." *International Studies Quarterly* 48, no. 4 (2004): 779-804.
  + Park, Susan. "Socialisation and the liberal order." *International Politics* 51, no. 3 (2014): 334-349.
  + Goodman, Ryan, and Derek Jinks. "How to influence states: Socialization and international human rights law." *Duke Law Journal* (2004): 621-703.
  + Hafner-Burton, Emilie M., and James Ron. "Human rights institutions: Rhetoric and efficacy." Journal of Peace Research 44.4 (2007): 379-384.
* Diffusion
  + Lake, David A., and Wendy Wong. "The politics of networks: interests, power, and human rights norms." (2007).
  + Greenhill, Brian. "The company you keep: International socialization and the diffusion of human rights norms." *International studies quarterly* 54, no. 1 (2010): 127-145.
  + Greenhill, Brian, and Yonatan Lupu. "Clubs of clubs: Fragmentation in the network of intergovernmental organizations." *International Studies Quarterly* 61, no. 1 (2017): 181-195.
  + Zhukov, Yuri M., and Brandon M. Stewart. "Choosing your neighbors: Networks of diffusion in international relations." *International Studies Quarterly* 57, no. 2 (2013): 271-287.
  + Greenhill, Brian. *Transmitting rights: international organizations and the diffusion of human rights practices*. Oxford University Press, 2016.

**WEEK 7: External Economic Pressure**

1. Velasco, Kristopher. "A growing queer divide: The divergence between transnational advocacy networks and foreign aid in diffusing LGBT policies." *International Studies Quarterly* 64.1 (2020): 120-132.
2. Garriga, Ana Carolina. "Human rights regimes, reputation, and foreign direct investment." *International Studies Quarterly* 60, no. 1 (2016): 160-172.
3. Hafner-Burton, Emilie M. "Trading human rights: How preferential trade agreements influence government repression." *International Organization* 59, no. 3 (2005): 593-629.
4. Kelley, Judith G., and Beth A. Simmons. "Politics by number: Indicators as social pressure in international relations." *American journal of political science* 59.1 (2015): 55-70.

**Possible real world presentation:** The United States and other countries have threatened to use trade sanctions in response to China’s Hong Kong Security Law. What have “Western” countries done or threatened? Do you think these efforts will be effective?

Recommended:

* Economics as a correlate of human rights conditions
  + (We didn’t cover this topic, but domestic economic conditions can affect human rights. Here are cites to get you started down this trail.)
  + Dreher, Axel, Martin Gassebner, and Lars-HR Siemers. "Globalization, economic freedom, and human rights." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 56, no. 3 (2012): 516-546.
  + Hafner-Burton, Emilie M. "Right or robust? The sensitive nature of repression to globalization." Journal of Peace Research 42.6 (2005): 679-698.
* Investment
  + Barry, Colin M., K. Chad Clay, and Michael E. Flynn. "Avoiding the spotlight: human rights shaming and foreign direct investment." *International Studies Quarterly* 57, no. 3 (2013): 532-544.
  + Narine, Marcia. "From Kansas to the Congo: Why Naming and Shaming Corporations Through the Dodd-Frank Act's Corporate Governance Disclosure Won't Solve a Human Rights Crisis." *Regent UL Rev.* 25 (2012): 351.
  + Hong, Mi Hwa, and Gary Uzonyi. "Deeper Commitment to Human Rights Treaties: Signaling and Investment Risk Perception." International Interactions 44.6 (2018): 1040-1064.
* Trade/Sanctions
  + Nielsen, Richard A., and Beth A. Simmons. "Rewards for Ratification: Payoffs for Participating in the International Human Rights Regime?." *International Studies Quarterly* 59, no. 2 (2015): 197-208.
  + Kreutz, Joakim. "Human rights, geostrategy, and EU foreign policy, 1989-2008." International Organization (2015): 195-217.
  + Murdie, Amanda, and Dursun Peksen. "The impact of human rights INGO activities on economic sanctions." *The Review of International Organizations* 8, no. 1 (2013): 33-53.
  + Hafner-Burton, Emilie M. *Forced to be good: Why trade agreements boost human rights*. Cornell University Press, 2013.
* Foreign Aid
  + Carnegie, Allison, and Nikolay Marinov. "Foreign aid, human rights, and democracy promotion: Evidence from a natural experiment." American Journal of Political Science 61.3 (2017): 671-683.
  + Nielsen, Richard A. "Rewarding human rights? Selective aid sanctions against repressive states." International Studies Quarterly 57, no. 4 (2013): 791-803.
* Special issue on performance indicators (several articles in this issue):
  + Kelley, Judith G., and Beth A. Simmons. "Introduction: The power of global performance indicators." *International Organization* 73.3 (2019): 491-510.
* Other (not sure how to classify these):
  + Efrat, Asif, and Abraham L. Newman. "Defending core values: Human rights and the extradition of fugitives." Journal of Peace Research (2020): 0022343319898231.

**WEEK 8: Treaties**

1. Simmons, Beth A. *Mobilizing for human rights: international law in domestic politics*. Cambridge University Press, 2009. Ch 4-5. On Canvas
2. Hafner-Burton, Emilie M., and Kiyoteru Tsutsui. "Human rights in a globalizing world: The paradox of empty promises." *American journal of sociology* 110, no. 5 (2005): 1373-1411.
3. Buzas, Zoltan. "Is the Good News About Law Compliance Good News About Norm Compliance? The Case of Racial Equality." International Organization 72.2 (2018).

**Possible real world presentation:** In the wake of violence in India, activists are calling for the country to ratify the Convention Against Torture. (Eg this [NYT article](https://www.nytimes.com/aponline/2020/08/16/world/asia/ap-as-india-police-brutality.html).) What effects do you think this would have?

Recommended:

* Classic debate on the effect of treaties:
  + Simmons, Beth A. "International law and state behavior: Commitment and compliance in international monetary affairs." American Political Science Review (2000): 819-835.
  + Von Stein, Jana. "Do treaties constrain or screen? Selection bias and treaty compliance." American Political Science Review (2005): 611-622.
  + Simmons, Beth A., and Daniel J. Hopkins. "The constraining power of international treaties: Theory and methods." American Political Science Review (2005): 623-631.
* Methodological articles about how we study the effects of institutions/treaties:
  + Chaudoin, Stephen, Jude Hays, and Raymond Hicks. "Do We Really Know the WTO Cures Cancer?." *British Journal of Political Science* (2016): 1-26.
  + Hill Jr, Daniel W. "Estimating the effects of human rights treaties on state behavior." *The Journal of Politics* 72, no. 4 (2010): 1161-1174.
  + Lupu, Yonatan. "The informative power of treaty commitment: using the spatial model to address selection effects." *American Journal of Political Science* 57, no. 4 (2013): 912-925.
* General work on human rights treaties
  + - (Some of these are about multiple human rights treaties)
  + Hathaway, Oona A. "Why do countries commit to human rights treaties?." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 51, no. 4 (2007): 588-621.
  + Hathaway, Oona A. "Do human rights treaties make a difference?." *The Yale Law Journal* 111, no. 8 (2002): 1935-2042.
  + Simmons, Beth. "Treaty compliance and violation." *Annual Review of Political Science* 13 (2010): 273-296.
  + Hafner-Burton, Emilie M. "International regimes for human rights." *Annual Review of Political Science* 15 (2012): 265-286.
  + Hafner-Burton, Emilie M., David G. Victor, and Yonatan Lupu. "Political science research on international law: the state of the field." *American Journal of International Law* 106, no. 1 (2012): 47-97.
  + Neumayer, Eric. "Do international human rights treaties improve respect for human rights?." *Journal of conflict resolution* 49, no. 6 (2005): 925-953.
  + Fariss, Christopher J. "The changing standard of accountability and the positive relationship between human rights treaty ratification and compliance." *British Journal of Political Science* (2017): 1-33.
  + Hafner-Burton, Emilie M., and Kiyoteru Tsutsui. "Justice lost! The failure of international human rights law to matter where needed most." *Journal of Peace Research* 44, no. 4 (2007): 407-425.
  + Hafner-Burton, Emilie M., Laurence R. Helfer, and Christopher J. Fariss. "Emergency and escape: explaining derogations from human rights treaties." International Organization 65.4 (2011): 673-707.
  + Von Stein, Jana. "Exploring the universe of UN human rights agreements." Journal of Conflict Resolution 62.4 (2018): 871-899.
* General models of international legal bodies:
  + Gilligan, Michael J., and Leslie Johns. "Formal models of international institutions." *Annual Review of Political Science* 15 (2012): 221-243.
  + Carrubba, Clifford J. "Courts and compliance in international regulatory regimes." The Journal of Politics 67.3 (2005): 669-689.
  + Chaudoin, Stephen. "Audience features and the strategic timing of trade disputes." International Organization 68.4 (2014): 877-911.
  + Abebe, Daniel, and Tom Ginsburg. "The Dejudicialization of International Politics?." International Studies Quarterly 63.3 (2019): 521-530.
* CAT
  + Vreeland, James Raymond. "Political institutions and human rights: Why dictatorships enter into the United Nations Convention Against Torture." *International Organization* 62, no. 1 (2008): 65-101.
  + Creamer, Cosette D., and Beth A. Simmons. "Do self-reporting regimes matter? Evidence from the convention against torture." *International Studies Quarterly* 63.4 (2019): 1051-1064.
  + Goodliffe, Jay, and Darren G. Hawkins. "Explaining commitment: States and the convention against torture." *The Journal of Politics* 68, no. 2 (2006): 358-371.
  + Conrad, Courtenay R., and Emily Hencken Ritter. "Treaties, tenure, and torture: The conflicting domestic effects of international law." *The Journal of Politics* 75, no. 2 (2013): 397-409.
  + Conrad, Courtenay R. "Divergent incentives for dictators: domestic institutions and (international promises not to) torture." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 58, no. 1 (2012): 34-67.
  + Hollyer, James R., and Peter Rosendorff. "Domestic politics and the accession of authoritarian regimes to human rights treaties." *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 6, no. 3-4 (2011): 275-327.
* CEDAW
  + Hill Jr, Daniel W., and K. Anne Watson. "Democracy and Compliance with Human Rights Treaties: The Conditional Effectiveness of the Convention for the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women." International Studies Quarterly 63.1 (2019): 127-138.
* ICCPR
  + Cole, Wade M. "Mind the gap: State capacity and the implementation of human rights treaties." International Organization (2015): 405-441.
* International Humanitarian Law
  + Kinsella, Helen M., and Giovanni Mantilla. "Contestation before Compliance: History, Politics, and Power in International Humanitarian Law." *International Studies Quarterly* (2020).
  + Morrow, James D. "When do states follow the laws of war?." American Political Science Review (2007): 559-572.

**WEEK 9: Transitional Justice, Ad Hoc Institutions**

Brief, easy-read primers on: the [International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia](https://www.icty.org/en/about), the [International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda](https://unictr.irmct.org/en/tribunal).

1. Loyle, Cyanne E., and Christian Davenport. "Transitional injustice: Subverting justice in transition and postconflict societies." *Journal of Human Rights* 15, no. 1 (2016): 126-149.
2. McAlister, Jacqueline. “Deterring Wartime Atrocities: Hard Lessons from the Yugoslav Tribunal.” *International Security* 44:3 (2020).
3. Dancy, Geoff, et al. "Behind Bars and Bargains: New Findings on Transitional Justice in Emerging Democracies." *International Studies Quarterly* 63.1 (2019): 99-110.
4. Zvobgo, Kelebogile. "Demanding Truth: The Global Transitional Justice Network and the Creation of Truth Commissions." *International Studies Quarterly* (2019).

**Possible real world presentation:** In December 2018, protests in Sudan set off a series of events that would lead to the ouster of Omar al-Bashir, after 30 years in power. The current Prime Minister of (north) Sudan has called for transitional justice mechanisms. What does our academic research suggest about the promise and prospects of that for Sudan?

OR

The BLM protests in the US have led to calls for truth and reconciliation commissions pertaining to racial violence and disparities. (Eg this [Politico article](https://www.politico.com/news/magazine/2020/08/16/does-america-need-a-truth-and-reconciliation-commission-395332)). What does our academic research suggest about the promise and prospects of that type of initiative?

Recommended:

* Non-academic books/resources:
  + (These are books that cover genocide and related tribunals. They chronicle people’s real world experiences and practices. They can be fascinating and horrifying.)
  + Gourevitch, Philip. We wish to inform you that tomorrow we will be killed with our families. Vol. 24. Pan Macmillan, 2015.
  + Del Ponte, Carla, and Chuck Sudetic. Madame prosecutor: confrontations with humanity's worst criminals and the culture of impunity. Other Press, LLC, 2011.
  + Hochschild, Adam. King Leopold's ghost: A story of greed, terror, and heroism in colonial Africa. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 1999.
  + Dallaire, Roméo. Shake hands with the devil: The failure of humanity in Rwanda. Vintage Canada, 2009.
  + Controversial BBC documentary on the Rwandan genocide: <https://vimeo.com/107867605>

* Truth Commissions and domestic prosecutions
  + Dukalskis, Alexander. "Interactions in transition: How truth commissions and trials complement or constrain each other." *International Studies Review* 13, no. 3 (2011): 432-451.
  + Kim, Hunjoon, and Kathryn Sikkink. "Explaining the deterrence effect of human rights prosecutions for transitional countries." International Studies Quarterly 54.4 (2010): 939-963.
* Tribunals
  + Hillebrecht, Courtney. "The power of human rights tribunals: Compliance with the European Court of Human Rights and domestic policy change." European Journal of International Relations 20.4 (2014): 1100-1123.
  + Peskin, Victor. "Beyond Victor's Justice? The Challenge of Prosecuting the Winners at the International Criminal Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and Rwanda." Journal of Human Rights 4, no. 2 (2005): 213-231.
  + McLeod, Laura. "Investigating “Missing” Women: Gender, Ghosts, and the Bosnian Peace Process." *International Studies Quarterly* 63.3 (2019): 668-679.
  + Goddard, Stacie E. "Brokering peace: networks, legitimacy, and the Northern Ireland peace process." *International Studies Quarterly* 56, no. 3 (2012): 501-515.
  + Snyder, Jack, and Leslie Vinjamuri. "Trials and errors: Principle and pragmatism in strategies of international justice." International security 28.3 (2004): 5-44.

**WEEK 10: Permanent international institutions**

Brief, easy-read primers on: the [International Criminal Court](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-11809908), the [Universal Periodic Review](https://www.ohchr.org/en/hrbodies/upr/pages/basicfacts.aspx) (which is a process under the UN [Council on Human Rights](https://www.hrw.org/topic/united-nations/human-rights-council)) and the [Inter American Court of Human Rights](https://www.oas.org/en/iachr/mandate/what.asp).

1. Jo, Hyeran, and Beth A. Simmons. "Can the International Criminal Court Deter Atrocity?." *International Organization* 70, no. 3 (2016): 443-475.
2. Chaudoin, Stephen. "How Contestation Moderates the Effects of International Institutions: The International Criminal Court and Kenya." *The Journal of Politics* 78, no. 2 (2016): 557-571.
3. Carraro, Valentina. "Promoting Compliance with Human Rights: The Performance of the United Nations’ Universal Periodic Review and Treaty Bodies." *International Studies Quarterly* 63.4 (2019): 1079-1093.
4. Staton, Jeffrey K., and Alexia Romero. "Rational remedies: the role of opinion clarity in the Inter-American Human Rights System." *International Studies Quarterly* 63.3 (2019): 477-491.

**Possible real world presentation:** Pick one of the following ICC situations (or potential situations) – Myanmar, Syria, the Philippines, Afghanistan, Georgia, or Colombia. What will the case’s main effects be?

Recommended:

* The ICC:
  + Kelley, Judith. "Who keeps international commitments and why? The International Criminal Court and bilateral nonsurrender agreements." *American Political Science Review* 101, no. 3 (2007): 573-589.
  + Mueller, Susanne D. "Kenya and the International Criminal Court (ICC): politics, the election and the law." *Journal of Eastern African Studies* 8, no. 1 (2014): 25-42.
  + Appel, Benjamin J. "In the Shadow of the International Criminal Court: Does the ICC Deter Human Rights Violations?." *Journal of conflict resolution* (2016): 0022002716639101.
  + Prorok, Alyssa K. "The (In) compatibility of Peace and Justice? The International Criminal Court and Civil Conflict Termination." *International Organization* 71, no. 2 (2017): 213-243.
  + Gilligan, Michael J. "Is enforcement necessary for effectiveness? A model of the international criminal regime." *International Organization* 60, no. 4 (2006): 935-967.
  + Simmons, Beth A., and Allison Danner. "Credible commitments and the international criminal court." *International Organization* 64, no. 2 (2010): 225-256.
  + Chapman, Terrence L., and Stephen Chaudoin. "Ratification patterns and the international criminal court." *International Studies Quarterly* 57, no. 2 (2013): 400-409.
  + Dancy, Geoff, and Eric Wiebelhaus-Brahm. "The impact of criminal prosecutions during intrastate conflict." *Journal of Peace Research* 55.1 (2018): 47-61.
  + Dancy, Geoff, and Florencia Montal. "Unintended Positive Complementarity: Why International Criminal Court Investigations May Increase Domestic Human Rights Prosecutions." Am. J. Int'l L. 111 (2017): 689.
  + Hashimoto, Barry. "Autocratic Consent to International Law: The Case of the International Criminal Court's Jurisdiction, 1998–2017." International Organization 74.2 (2020): 331-362.
  + Putnam, Tonya L. "Mingling and Strategic Augmentation of International Legal Obligations." International Organization 74.1 (2020): 31-64.
  + Escribà-Folch, Abel, and Joseph Wright. "Human rights prosecutions and autocratic survival." International Organization (2015): 343-373.
  + Dukalskis, Alexander, and Robert C. Johansen. "Measuring acceptance of international enforcement of human rights: The United States, Asia, and the International Criminal Court." Human Rights Quarterly (2013): 569-597.
* The European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR)
  + - (This week doesn’t currently have an assignment about the [European Court of Human Rights](https://ijrcenter.org/european-court-of-human-rights/), but this link has a primer if your research covers the ECtHR.)
  + Helfer, Laurence R., and Erik Voeten. "International courts as agents of legal change: Evidence from LGBT rights in Europe." *International Organization* 68, no. 1 (2014): 77-110.
  + Lupu, Yonatan, and Erik Voeten. "Precedent in international courts: A network analysis of case citations by the European court of human rights." *British Journal of Political Science* 42, no. 2 (2012): 413-439.
* UPR, The UN Commission on Human Rights // UN Human Rights Council
  + Lebovic, James H., and Erik Voeten. "The politics of shame: the condemnation of country human rights practices in the UNCHR." *International Studies Quarterly* 50, no. 4 (2006): 861-888.
  + Terman, Rochelle, and Erik Voeten. "The relational politics of shame: Evidence from the universal periodic review." The Review of International Organizations (2017): 1-23.

**WEEK 11: Public Opinion**

1. Hafner-Burton, Emilie, and James Ron. "The Latin bias: Regions, the Anglo-American media, and human rights." *International Studies Quarterly* 57, no. 3 (2013): 474-491.
2. Zvobgo, Kelebogile. "Human rights versus national interests: Shifting US public attitudes on the international criminal court." *International Studies Quarterly* 63.4 (2019): 1065-1078.
3. Chapman, Terrence and Stephen Chaudoin. “Public Reactions to International Legal Institutions: the ICC in a Developing Democracy.” 2020. *Journal of Politics.*
4. Anjum, Gulnaz, Adam Chilton, and Zahid Usman. "United Nations endorsement and support for human rights: An experiment on women’s rights in Pakistan." *Journal of Peace Research* (2016).

*The first two articles concern public opinion in larger, more developed countries. The second two focus on countries outside of the “West.” Why might opinions be similar or different in these two groups of countries? Why is it important to study both?*

**Possible (not) real world presentation:** I want you to see “how the sausage is made” for academic journal articles. Read the reviewers’ comments about the Chapman and Chaudoin article, as well as the authors’ response memo. Explain the peer-review process to the class, then describe what stood out to you or surprised you about this process.

Recommended:

* Developed countries:
  + Chilton, Adam S., and Mila Versteeg. "International law, constitutional law, and public support for torture." Research & Politics 3, no. 1 (2016).
  + Wallace, Geoffrey PR. "International law and public attitudes toward torture: An experimental study." International Organization (2013): 105-140.
  + Peksen, Dursun, Timothy M. Peterson, and A. Cooper Drury. "Media-driven Humanitarianism? News Media Coverage of Human Rights Abuses and the Use of Economic Sanctions." *International Studies Quarterly* 58, no. 4 (2014): 855-866.
  + Dietrich, Nick, and Charles Crabtree. "Domestic demand for human rights: Free speech and the freedom-security trade-off." *International Studies Quarterly* 63.2 (2019): 346-353.
  + Wallace, Geoffrey PR. "Martial law? Military experience, international law, and support for torture." International Studies Quarterly 58.3 (2014): 501-514.
* Less developed countries:
  + Lupu, Yonatan, and Geoffrey PR Wallace. "Violence, nonviolence, and the effects of international human rights law." *American Journal of Political Science* 63.2 (2019): 411-426.
  + Dancy, Geoff, et al. "What Determines Perceptions of Bias toward the International Criminal Court? Evidence from Kenya." Journal of Conflict Resolution (2020).

**WEEK 12: Student Chosen Papers**

* Stiansen, Øyvind (2019). Delayed but not derailed: Legislative compliance with European Court of Human Rights judgments. The International Journal of Human Rights, 23(8), 1221-1247.
* Hafner-Burton & McNamara (2019): United States Human Rights Policy: The Corporate Lobby ([link here](https://muse-jhu-edu.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/article/716363/pdf))
* Baisley, Elizabeth. "Reaching the tipping point: emerging international human rights norms pertaining to sexual orientation and gender identity." Hum. Rts. Q. 38 (2016): 134.
* Carisch, Enrico, Loraine Rickard-Martin, and Shawna R. Meister. "Emerging Threats and Sanctions: Abuses of Digital and Information Technologies." The Evolution of UN Sanctions. Springer, Cham, 2017. 133-162.
* Bush, Sarah Sunn. "International politics and the spread of quotas for women in legislatures." International Organization (2011): 103-137.

**WEEK 13: Student Chosen Papers**

* Koesel, Karrie J., and Valerie J. Bunce. "Diffusion-proofing: Russian and Chinese responses to waves of popular mobilizations against authoritarian rulers." Perspectives on Politics (2013): 753-768.
* Harrelson-Stephens, Julie, and Rhonda L. Callaway. "You say you want a revolution: The Arab Spring, norm diffusion, and the human rights regime." Human Rights Review 15.4 (2014): 413-431.
* Breuer, Anita, Todd Landman, and Dorothea Farquhar. "Social media and protest mobilization: Evidence from the Tunisian revolution." Democratization 22.4 (2015): 764-792.
* Taylor, Owen, Sandrine Loubière, and Pascal Auquier. "Homelessness, Housing First, and the Right to Housing—Confronting Right and Reality." Human Rights Review (2020): 1-17.

Other nominations from Fall 2020:

Unsorted:

* Fariss, Christopher J., Michael R. Kenwick, and Kevin Reuning. "Estimating One-Sided Killings from a Robust Measurement Model of Human Rights." (2020).
* Hinton, Alexander. The justice façade: Trials of transition in Cambodia. Oxford University Press, 2018.
* De Burca, Grainne. "Human rights experimentalism." American Journal of International Law 111.2 (2017): 277-316.

Social media and human rights:

* Singh, Shannon Raj. "Move fast and break societies: the weaponisation of social media and options for accountability under international criminal law." Cambridge International Law Journal 8.2 (2019): 331-342.
* PLUS Douek. Evelyn. “Facebook’s role in the genocide in Myanmar.” Lawfare. 2018. <https://www.lawfareblog.com/facebooks-role-genocide-myanmar-new-reporting-complicates-narrative>

Corporations and human rights:

* Deitelhoff, Nicole, and Klaus Dieter Wolf. "Business and human rights: How corporate norm violators become norm entrepreneurs." The persistent power of human rights: From commitment to compliance (2013): 222-238.
* https://www.business-humanrights.org/en/blog/progress-in-the-newest-un-draft-treaty-on-business-and-human-rights/

**A Note on Methods**

This course assigns the appropriate papers regardless of their methodological sophistication. There’s not really any way around this. Modern political science heavily uses formal and quantitative methods and it wouldn’t do much good to only teach old things for which I could find “non-tech’ed up” versions. That said, some students may not have had game theory and/or quantitative methods. Try to read as much as you can and spend time trying to work through mathematical concepts, even if they are hard or unfamiliar. The questions below will help you be a smart consumer of material even if it is methodologically over your head.

**Critical Reading Questions**

These are questions you should ask of everything you read or write, in this class and beyond. The writing of all papers involves making choices. This is a guide to how you can critically evaluate the author’s choices.

Research Question:

* **What is the underlying research question?**
  + “What is the effect of this on that?”
  + “What explains variation in this?”
* **What is the underlying variation being explained?**
  + Why is that variation inherently important?

Theory:

* **What are the assumptions?** All theories are a collection of simplifying assumptions. Our assumptions usually pertain to: Who are the actors in the model, what do they want, and what choices are they making to try and get what they want? What information do they have available as they make these decisions?
* **What is the key result(s) of the theoretical model?** These are usually in one of two forms:
  + “There exists”: A model might demonstrate the existence of an equilibrium with certain features.
  + “Comparative statics”: These are predictions about the relationship between two variables that are derived from the model. They relate an exogenous (explanatory, independent, etc.) variable to an endogenous choice (outcome, dependent variable, decision, action, etc.).
* **How might alternative assumptions lead to different results?**
  + In reading models, it is never a useful criticism to say “The model made this assumption, which clearly isn’t right.” It’s a model. By definition, it “isn’t right.”
  + It is a useful criticism to say “The model assumed this, but if we assumed that then result [x] might be different.”

Empirics:

* **What is the laboratory** – i.e. the collection of real world phenomena – in which the author has chosen to test their argument?
  + You could also call this the population from which the sample will be drawn.
  + Good laboratories are (a) big: if you can test your argument in a more important real-world setting, that’s better than testing it on something obscure (b) fit: the real-world phenomenon match closely the assumptions made in your theory and (c) defend: against potential threats to inference. More on threats to inference later.
* **Who are the subjects** in the lab (or what is the sample)? What are the units of observation, over what time period, etc.
* **How does the paper measure the key independent and dependent variables?**
  + Are these good measurements? Do they map well onto the theoretical concept they purport to measure?
* **What is the key relationship in the data that the paper finds (or doesn’t find)?**
  + Quantitative and qualitative data analysis and everything in between are, at their core, *the exact same thing*. They are the search for relationships in data. The only differences are that one approach writes down models of these relationships mathematically and uses numerical data.
  + Does the relationship predicted by the theory find support?
  + How large, substantively, is the relationship? E.g. “A 1% increase in the number of unionized workers is associated with a 30% increase in tariffs.”
* **Threats to inference:**
  + Omitted stuff: Things the author should have included but did not *and which affect the relationship between the independent and dependent variable.* Note, this argument is useless without the second part, in italics.
  + Endogeneity: “There is something else that affects the independent and dependent variable which creates the illusion of a relationship between the two but really it’s this other thing that’s doing the work.”
  + If you looked at a different sample, you’d find something else.
  + Something about what you’ve done has made you overconfident about the relationship you’ve found and your result may really be spurious.
  + And many, many more.

Impact:

* **Why should I care about this paper?**
  + How much better do I understand a particular real-world phenomenon after reading this than before?
  + How important is that phenomenon in the first place?
  + If this paper is right, then who is wrong? Was the literature headed in one particular direction and this paper changed the literature’s course?
  + Are there other real-world phenomena that this argument could help us understand?

Note that not all papers will fit this template. Some will be theory only, while others will be empirical. That’s ok. This will still be a helpful guide.

Prof Chaudoin notes to self for syllabus prep:

Ask them to subscribe to HRW and AI daily reports? Morning multilateralism?