

Human Rights: From Practice to Policy

Proceedings of a Research Workshop
Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy
University of Michigan
October 2010

Edited by
Carrie Booth Walling
and
Susan Waltz

© 2011 by Carrie Booth Walling and Susan Waltz
ISBN: 978-0-615-60047-5

Printed at the University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

All Rights Reserved

A pdf file of this report is available at <http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/handle/2027.42/8942>.
For information about bound copies, see <http://fordschool.umich.edu/humanrightshistory>
or contact Susan Waltz at swaltz@umich.edu.

Chapter 5

Looking Back and Looking Forward: More Milestones in the Normative History of the Human Rights Movement

Following the first three panels, practitioners were given opportunity to comment on additional important issues that merit exploration to complement topics discussed during this conference.

Susan Waltz introduced the topic.

Susan Waltz: If you were either to rework today's agenda or extend this conversation for another day, are there other milestones and topics that you would have wanted to address? One topic mentioned this morning was the *death penalty*. We might, for example, have asked someone to relate how the human rights movement came to be involved in work to abolish the death penalty and what the impact of that work has been. *Impunity* was another issue that arose in discussion. There may be others. If you were to try to describe the history of the modern human rights movement to people from another space or another age, what would you add to the list of topics that we have considered today? I would be very interested to know if you think there are other important milestones that we might have added to the program. In thinking about the history of the human rights movement and its contribution to normative standards, did we hit all the high points? Did we miss any significant developments?

As a separate issue, today's conversation has heightened my awareness of, shall we say, roads not taken. This came up, for example, in Nigel's presentation on the Torture Convention, and his account of Amnesty International's (AI) initial preference to have it discussed in the UN's crime sector rather than by human rights diplomats. In various ways, this workshop has brought into focus some of the strategy choices made by the human rights movement, and we can begin to appreciate that the path was not always straight or straightforward. Some issues or avenues were initially explored but ultimately dropped. I would like to hear your thoughts about this. We have an impression that the human rights movement in its early years was more focused, and the issues somewhat tidier. But perhaps we are romanticizing about how neat and tidy things were in the early days. After all, that was a time when concepts and strategies were being invented, so there must have been a lot of messiness and false starts. (Whatever human rights work was in the past, it certainly does seem messy now, with a lot of new actors and new issues and fuzzy boundaries.)

I am interested to hear your comments on both of these issues.

Human Rights Violations based on Sexual Orientation and Gender

- **Stephanie Farrior:** Sexual orientation and gender is one area that has caused great discomfort in human rights organizations and, for cultural reasons, within AI's worldwide membership, but we have seen real movement on the issue. At Amnesty International's 1991 International Council Meeting, some of the national delegations arrived with strict instructions to vote against the proposed resolution expanding AI's work on this issue. We had extensive discussions over the course of the week, very frank sharing of views, a lot of education, and ultimately consensus on a new position was reached, and things have continued to evolve since then.

Neglected Populations

- **Kenneth Roth:** Following up on Stephanie's point, the human rights movement has gradually taken on populations who have been neglected traditionally—starting with women but extending to gays and lesbians, refugees and workers. There is a growing consciousness of the need to very self-consciously expand beyond the original political prisoner orientation, which tended to be focused on urban elites. Relatedly, it might be interesting to look at how the movement has dealt with the rights that are most culturally contested. What I have in mind are women's rights, sexual rights, and religious freedom. Those are three areas where at least at the cultural level you don't get buy-in the way you do with many of the other rights that we have discussed. It

requires innovation and strategies for promoting these rights in the areas where they are most contested.

Discrimination

- **Margo Picken:** The concept of discrimination is at the core of the international human rights instruments. The inclusion of discrimination clauses was used to justify jettisoning the minorities system that was established by the League of Nations following World War I. We should examine how discrimination came to be such a focus, and build it much more forcefully into our work.

Impunity and Accountability

- **Kenneth Roth:** Initially there was quite a bit of resistance within the human rights movement against the idea of urging prosecution of anyone. Human rights activists historically were supposed to favor the defendant or at least monitor the way the defendant was treated. The idea of actually working to put somebody in the dock was counterintuitive. That evolution of the attitude toward accountability is interesting.

Making Comparisons between Types of Human Rights Organizations

- **José (Pepé) Zalaquett:** I think it is important to compare the different types of human rights organizations—staff-driven organizations, membership movements, official and unofficial organizations—and how those differences play out with regard to the work of human rights.

National Security and Human Rights

- **José (Pepé) Zalaquett:** We need to focus on the issue of security. Security has been a bad word for the human rights movement because it is in the name of national security that so many atrocities have been committed. Yet decent people, who are our base of support value security, and if human rights isn't about peace in the streets and security at home, they don't know what it's about. We need to be able to articulate these concerns. After September 11, half a dozen organizations prepared reports on human rights and terrorism. And basically they all said, "Terrorism is terrible. Now here are the 500 things that you cannot do to fight terrorism." I'm exaggerating, but the response was rather knee-jerk reluctance to recognize the reality of new and greater threats to security. I'm not saying that anything should go, but this issue of how to approach security concerns from a human rights standpoint has not been properly addressed.

New Media and Technology

- **Eric Stover:** Human rights advocates really need to understand the pros and cons of new media and technology and how it is affecting the human rights movement either for the good or the bad. The more human rights advocates move into areas where they are dealing with large displaced or threatened populations, they need to have the skills to interpret quantitative data, such as mortality and morbidity surveys. They need to be trained to determine what makes a survey rigorous and valid, or riddled with biases. Otherwise, we will be drawing conclusions based on poor methodologies and making interpretations that actually distort the real picture. In addition, we need to be able to step back and be self-critical, to question our own received wisdom about what strategies work (e.g. the massive "Save Darfur campaigns" that generated a lot of heat but came up short on results), and, if necessary, gorge a few sacred cows.

- Nigel Rodley: I would not restrict Eric's idea to just the new media. I think it is worth analyzing the media in general. The media always has been a tool for human rights activism but we have not examined what the media has done to human rights activism in terms of the demands it has made on it. I'm sure that media had an important role to play in Amnesty changing its policy with regard to NGEs for example.

International-Local Connections between Human Rights Organizations

- **Christopher Avery:** I would be interested in looking at the evolution of the role of local and national NGOs, particularly in the global South. Specifically, it would be interesting to consider how their relationships with international human rights NGOs may have evolved over time, and whether or not and how effectively they have used the United Nations and international mechanisms themselves, directly.
- Nigel Rodley: I would like to look at national human rights institutions, specifically the human rights Government-sponsored NGOs (GONGOs) and how they relate both to genuine and national NGOs and international NGOs, as well as of course the official intergovernmental system.

Professionalization and Building Constituencies for Human Rights

- Margo Picken: I would like to think about the process of building constituencies for human rights. One of my concerns is that the professionalization of human rights has also taken human rights advocacy away from ordinary people who feel that they don't understand the work anymore, whereas in fact they are the driving force for human rights. I think that is a problem. In the past we had strong connections with church groups and trade unions, which meant we had a very broad membership in different countries of the world. Now, trade unions are weaker for all sorts of reasons, and the churches are not as engaged as they used to be. That is a huge loss. In terms of looking at broad constituencies to support human rights throughout the world, are we actually better off now or worse off?

Effectiveness of New Human Rights Instruments

- Margo Picken: As I prepared for this meeting I asked myself whether the plethora of different instruments we now have within the UN are effective. We have many special Rapporteurs, but they are under-resourced. There is a lot of cosmetic activity at the UN. It looks as if much is happening but it might in actual fact be only be one person in the Secretariat. Is that real progress or is it cosmetic? And would it have been better to do what René Cassin said in his Nobel speech in 1968 when he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize? He said, "Don't keep looking for new mechanisms. Just build on what we have." He was actually talking then about the International Bill of Human Rights (the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights). Sometimes I wonder if we would have been better off if we had actually taken that approach because that was a route that was possible, I think. I would have liked to have some discussion about that.

Migration and Immigration

- Michael McClintock: We haven't talked about migration very much. It is a relatively new area of concern—politically speaking—and refugee flows can be considered a sub-set of the more general migration issue. We are looking at Fortress Europe and Fortress North America today. In the past, migration was seen as a somewhat separate area of human rights work, but it is becoming more integral to the whole sphere.

Building a Credible US Human Rights Foreign Policy

- Curt Goering: I would like to examine what steps can be taken now to build a credible U.S. human rights foreign policy given the damaged reputation of the US on human rights . Another related topic would be the extent to which human rights considerations actually inform U.S. foreign policy.

Reliability of Human Rights Data

- José (Pepé) Zalaquett: We also need to look at data reliability. In the US, DNA techniques have uncovered some 250 cases of wrongful conviction. The unreliability of witness testimony is notorious. And when open societies break down and authoritarian governments take over, the problem of data reliability is only exacerbated: the governments deny everything and the opposition to these regimes may inflate the figures of victimization. It ends up being left to a truth commission, after the demise of dictatorial governments, to account for the reality of the human rights violations of the recent past. In Argentina, for instance, Western journalists are obliged to describe the number of disappeared as “an estimate between 9,000 and 30,000” because if they write a number less than 30,000 they will be blacklisted—and the groups of relatives won't talk to them again. It is a completely impossible figure—30,000. People in Argentina know that but no one dares to speak about it, so there is a kind of emotional blackmail. There is a similar emotional blackmail in the area of impunity. For example, if you talk openly about the possibility of measures that may make some degree of distinction between crimes against humanity and other human rights violations, many organizations will take aim at you by calling you a “forgiver” or by saying that you favor impunity.

The Status of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

- José (Pepé) Zalaquett: Another topic is the question of the justiciability of social and economic rights. For many years there has been a divide between those who don't consider social and economic rights to be justiciable and those who think they must be fulfilled like any other right. Only very recently have there been efforts to bridge these two positions, and it will be a slow process to move on further in that direction.

And then there are some dilemmas, the gray areas, the trade-offs. The UN has proclaimed the indivisibility and interdependence of all human rights and that often leads to facile responses to such dilemmas. Not that rights aren't indivisible. But the term has little meaning beyond the assertion that you cannot invoke the need to protect some rights in order to violate others. The point is that life is full of dilemmas, and you have to make choices. For instance, concerning the satisfaction of social and economic rights, say public education, health or housing, nations constantly face the need to make choices as to priorities and budget allocations.

The Role of the Judiciary in the Human Rights Project

- José (Pepé) Zalaquett: Another topic would be the role of the judiciary. We now expect everything from judges, and judges, who were once considered bad guys, have become superheroes. From the politicization of the judiciary, we have now come to the judicialization of politics, which is a bit unnerving. Judges are expected to decide on budget priorities, on social policy, on everything.

Innovating Techniques

- José (Pepé) Zalaquett: And finally, we should consider the possibilities that new techniques afford. In politics, there are new possible ways to mobilize people for demonstrations or to fundraise for a political campaign through small donations and such. How can these possibilities be applied to human rights work.

Chapter 6

Human Rights Scholars Respond: The Conversation Broadens

In a final session moderated by Carrie Booth Walling, human rights scholars Ann Marie Clark, Julie Mertus, and Kathryn Sikkink shared their reflections about the normative history of the human rights movement, as reflected in presentations by the practitioners. They identified themes that emerged across panels and drew attention to gaps and absences in our discussions. They asked probing questions about the conceptual content of human rights, the defining characteristics of the human rights movement and its collaborative relationships, and the tools of human rights change. Their observations sparked a lively conversation in much of the same spirit as the panel sessions that preceded them. A summary of the remarks is provided here.

Julie Mertus: The human rights movement should be understood as both evolutionary and revolutionary, but there is an urgent need for it to become more revolutionary. The human rights movement has the potential to be both an instigator and source of revolutionary ideas. Human rights are powerful because they change people from being an object in their own life to being a subject in their own life. It is a sign of the success of the human rights movement that cultures are changing such that people want to be seen as rights holders. During the panel discussions yesterday, we failed to talk about discrimination and identity in the context of human rights. We do not yet have a human rights culture that supports all parts of the population. The movement risks an intellectual incoherence if it doesn't talk about and address identity rights.

Ann Marie Clark: There was a surprising consensus among participants about what Amnesty International (AI) does, how it does it, and how it gets results. Both law and people-pressure were identified as important for the work of Amnesty International, but less attention was devoted to describing how those two factors interact with one another. I suggest that AI operates under an information-principle dynamic. AI needs information about human rights violations. Then, AI mobilizes action around the principle that relates to that information. Finally, AI uses legal norms to press for state accountability. Questions were raised earlier about the necessity of law whether law is necessary and whether it serves as a useful tool all of the time. If new information can lead to the changing content of human rights, are legal norms necessary? Legal norms are helpful in consolidating human rights gains so that activists do not need to keep reinventing principles—they help complete the accountability cycle. Information and principles are what enable mobilization around human rights. Legal norms, then, are the reference point for that process.

Some questions remain. If success for the human rights movement lies partly in generating pressure, what kind of pressure is effective? And how much is necessary? Human rights scholars could ask better questions if they knew what human rights practitioners want to know about. What would you try to figure out if you had more time?

Kathryn Sikkink: During the three panel sessions several practitioners commented on the role of allies in the human rights movement. Nigel Rodley described the human rights movement as going through three phases. In the first phase the human rights movement was insecure and it surrounded itself with allies. In the second phase the human rights movement became aloof as it sought to establish its own identity. In the third phase when the human rights movement gained confidence it began to reach out once again to create new allies. José Zalaquett argued that human rights movement had allies at all levels: domestic, regional and international. These allies included informed public opinion as well as the media or press. Margo Picken identified church groups and labor unions as close allies in the early days of the movement but who became less central later. Instead, the primary relationships were among multiple human rights organizations, creating a division of labor within the movement. There also appears to be a revolving door within the human rights movement as practitioners moved from early organizations like Amnesty International to other human rights

NGOs (non-governmental organizations) and then became involved in building institutions like the United Nations or had joined national governments and academia. And the content of the our discussions indicated that initially the human rights movement was intimately connected to victims of human rights violations but over time the distance between organizations and victims increased.

There are a number of questions I wish we'd had time to discuss. Should the success of the human rights movement be measured by its ability to set agendas, build institutions, create law, or change culture? How do we define and measure success and explain lack of success? The movement has not produced the kind of cultural change in the USA necessary for people to rise up and defeat calls for torture in the wake of September 11, for example. Statistics tell us that human rights violations are constant—that human rights performance remains flat—despite the existence of the human rights movement. If we accept those statistics, the human rights movement has not been successful because it did not change the behavior of governments. What is the sense of human rights practitioners? Is the world as bad today as when the movement started? Or is the movement a victim of its own success because it has drawn so much attention and human rights violations are now more recognized? The media plays an important role in the dissemination of information, mobilization of public opinion, and naming and shaming activities of the human rights movement. What does it mean for the future of the human rights movement if the press is increasingly fragmented or unreliable?

Competition among the human rights organizations was one of the themes that emerged from our informal discussions (not the formal presentations). Can organizations within the human rights movement be simultaneously competitive and complementary? What is the cause of competition between organizations? Is it based on funding issues? Motivated by press coverage? Substantive differences?

Discussion: The Conversation Broadens

In this final round of discussion, human rights practitioners respond to the summary observations and questions raised by the participating human rights scholars.

The Role of Law and People Pressure in Human Rights Change

- **José (Pepé) Zalaquett:** Law deals with what ought to be while human rights organizations are dealing with the reality of the actual crimes. We must realize that law follows real life changes rather than leading them. Human rights organizations and their practitioners often act according to the “law in the making.” Practitioners invoke human rights norms before they are fully crystallized. The emergence of new human rights law is the result of a process whereby activists (or norm entrepreneurs) gradually generate consensus in favor of a principle or value that has to be protected by the law. In general, human rights law is catching up belatedly with reality. This is similar to academic life, which also tends to trail behind practice.
- **Wilder Tayler:** Law tends to be at the center of every successful human rights campaign but human rights campaigns also push the development and application of law.
- **Nigel Rodley:** International law doctrine speaks not only established law, but also of law in the making. Customary international law may be *lex lata*—the law as it exists—or it may be *lex ferenda*—law in the making or what the law ought to crystallize into. It is important to think about what kinds of normative action may be appropriate in a given case. Treaty law is binding but only on the parties to the treaty. Declarations create standards which can be used to invoke and somewhat push norms forward. With an established international standard it is possible to hold states to it. Standards give human rights practitioners the ability to say these are your standards that we are seeking to hold you to, not ours. This cuts right across the cultural relativism argument.

Advocacy Strategies and Effective Pressure

- **Wilder Tayler:** Pressure and persuasion are both important tools for the human rights movement—they are necessary for success—but they are tools and techniques, not the goal itself. Pressure is related to public advocacy; it is the result of publicity generated by campaigning. Persuasion, on the other hand, is private advocacy. Sometimes human rights organizations put their arguments forward discreetly, not publicly, to secure a real commitment from the target actor. I recall once trying to explain the concept of enforced disappearance to a Japanese diplomat. We wanted Japan's support on a UN measure, but the diplomat didn't understand the concept. We drew diagrams on a paper and we passed it back and forth. It was humorous—but through this process Japan was *persuaded* to support the effort. Pressure and persuasion are the two main tools of the human rights movement. Apart from them there is not much more.

Measuring the Success of the Human Rights Movement

- **Wilder Tayler:** It is hard to say what the human rights movement has achieved, and even knowing what to talk about is difficult, because the definition of success is driven in part by the relationship between donors and human rights organizations. When human rights organizations ask for funding, they do not go to funders and say that they are changing cultural parameters through a process that will require decades of work. They would never be funded! Success must be measured in multiple ways by human rights organizations. In normative terms, I think that the human rights movement's success with the issue of impunity has been real. On the issue of human rights defenders, we have primarily been successful with the concept.
- **Nigel Rodley:** The human rights movement has been successful in making torture unspeakable; but acts of torture continue. Human rights practitioners go into prisons and see it happening. It is true that after 9/11 a brutal administration used brutal rhetoric justifying torture, but the fight back started soon after. The accountability is not fully there but the norm is still there. The debate about torture revolves around innocent versus guilty victims; but Amnesty International made the death penalty retreat and it did so through the process of elite persuasion.

It is interesting to explore how far human rights NGOs are seeking to change culture and how far they are seeking to change elite behavior. Think of cases like the death penalty, sexual minorities and civil rights. There has been an explosion of freedom (expression, assembly, conscience) but is it a success of human rights? There are big forces at play but this includes a human rights consciousness.

Collaboration between Scholars and Practitioners

- **José (Pepé) Zalaquett:** In answer to a question about how to help human rights scholars ask better questions and produce more useful research: Human rights scholars need to go directly to practitioners and activists and talk to them about their needs. Some academics are really trying to be relevant to practitioners but there is also a danger that some academics are drifting too far afield.

Allies of the Human Rights Movement

- **Margo Picken:** Churches continue to play an important role in the human rights movement domestically in countries where they have the courage and power to promote and protect human rights. But internationally, they are not as active as they once were. Moreover, governments have become incredibly sophisticated in advancing arguments to protect themselves; the human rights movement needs to be far more strategic. The spirit of the times is such that the United Nations is

not conducive to pushing human rights forward, and the real dynamic is at the domestic level. International organizations still have an important role, however.

Evolution of Human Rights Concepts and the Human Rights Movement

- **Susan Waltz:** Kathryn's observations about academic research on human rights performance raise questions about the *definition* and *content* of human rights. Who owns the conceptual definition of human rights and how has that definition changed over time? The answer to that question has implications for whether you see things improving, worsening, or staying the same. In the early days of the human rights movement, the content and focus of human rights problems were defined from within the movement itself-- prisoners of conscience, torture, disappearances. More recently, the human rights definitions and the human rights agenda have been shaped by ideas that originate from outside the human rights movement--from academics, to the experiences of women, to actors in the corporate world.

I think it's important to recognize that what we're seeing and defining as a human rights problem has not remained constant over time. There is a temporal dimension to the *idea* of human rights as well as the *practice* of human rights. We may want to consider not only what kinds of human rights violations have emerged, but whether any have started to disappear. Why, for example, is Amnesty International producing fewer prisoner cases than it used to? What is the relevant dynamic here?

- **Michael McClintock:** Susan alludes to the premise of success--the claim by some that Amnesty International's work on prisoners of conscience was so good that it led to increases in "disappearance." This is not necessarily the case--it seems far more likely that in many cases the "disappearances" and outright murders were always there, but went unrecorded. It was in any case easier to respond to the cases of acknowledged prisoners, where there was no question of who did what to whom--and AI's original mandate expressly limited our work to these cases. The countries in which massive shifts to these secret and illegal methods occurred *since* the 1960s are not, in any case, the countries in which AI's work for individual prisoners of conscience achieved the greatest resonance. The global reduction in prisoners of conscience responded to many factors, not least the improvement of global communications and the internationalization of human rights standards. These made it more costly for governments openly to imprison their critics on spurious grounds. AI's efforts on their behalf were one dimension of this trend. In this regard, it's hard to think of a country with large scale political imprisonment that shifted to murder and "disappearance" in which the political cost of that imprisonment was a significant factor.

Today's need for work for prisoners of conscience should not be understated--there are probably more than we think, albeit in a far smaller group of countries. Amnesty's work in this area today, however, probably requires greater resources than in the past, if only because the dangers of being wrong have increased. Human rights organizations are under a microscope--they have to be right when they say that a particular individual does not belong in jail.

- **Margo Picken:** The membership component of Amnesty International is absolutely crucial. Individual adoption (local) groups are important and so is building solidarity with a constituency. What distinguishes Amnesty is that it has always had to bring its membership along with it as its purpose and activities have evolved. Process is important as a means to get to the end. The means that are used do matter and I worry that the professionalization of the human rights movement is leaving the victims and public behind. That is a problem.
- **Nigel Rodley:** I believe in professionalization. It is better to do human rights work by knowing what you are doing. Professionalism is good but careerism is a concern. As human rights become more

prominent it attracts people who are interested in the political prominence that goes with it. I prefer the discipline of professionalization to the emergence of careerism.

Participants

Chris Avery is the Founder and Director of the Business and Human Rights Resource Centre, which tracks the human rights impacts of more than 5,000 companies in 180 countries. He formerly served as Legal Advisor and then Deputy Director of Research at Amnesty International's International Secretariat.

Ann Marie Clark is an Associate Professor of Political Science, Purdue University. Her research focuses on the development of human rights norms and the influence of NGOs on state behavior. She is the author of *Diplomacy of Conscience: Amnesty International and Changing Human Rights Norms*.

Stephanie Farrior is a Professor of Law and Director of International and Comparative Law Programs at the Vermont Law School. She was formerly Director of the Legal Program and General Counsel for Amnesty International. Her scholarly research focuses on the role and functioning of international organizations in protecting human rights, issues relating to identity-based discrimination, and state accountability for human rights abuses by non-state actors.

Curt Goering is Senior Deputy Executive Director of Amnesty International USA and has recently served as representative of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in Gaza. Goering has been involved with Amnesty International at many levels for nearly twenty-five years. He has participated in numerous field research missions for Amnesty International during human rights crises.

Michael McClintock has worked in the human rights field for more than 30 years. He was formerly the Director of Research at Human Rights First and currently serves as a consultant and advisor to HRF's Fighting Discrimination Program. He previously worked for both Amnesty International as a researcher and Deputy Head of Research and Human Rights Watch as Deputy Program Director.

Julie Mertus is a Professor and co-Director of the Ethics, Peace and Global Affairs Program at the School of International Service, American University. She is the author of several books on human rights including *Bait and Switch: Human Rights and US Foreign Policy*, *Human Rights Matters: Local Politics and National Human Rights* and *The United Nations and Human Rights*.

David Petrasek is an Associate Professor at the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Ottawa. He has worked on human rights research and policy at Amnesty International, the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, and the International Council on Human Rights Policy, and served as Director of Policy at the Geneva-based Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue. With Irene Khan, he recently co-authored *Unheard Truths: Human Rights and Poverty*.

Margo Picken is a visiting fellow at the Centre for the Study of Human Rights of the London School of Economics and Political Science. She directed the Cambodia office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, worked for the Ford Foundation as program officer responsible for the international human rights program, and headed Amnesty International's first UN office.

Nigel Rodley is a Professor of Law and Chair of the Human Rights Centre, University of Essex. He is a member of the United Nations Human Rights Committee and formerly Special Rapporteur on Torture for the UN Commission on Human Rights. Rodley was the first Legal Advisor of the International Secretariat of Amnesty International. He is the author of several books related to human rights, including *The Treatment of Prisoners under International Law* (3rd edition 2009), with Matt Pollard.

Kenneth Roth is the Executive Director of Human Rights Watch. As a former federal prosecutor he worked on the Iran-Contra investigation. Roth has written extensively on a range of human rights issues including international justice, counterterrorism, the foreign policies of major powers, and the work of the United Nations.

Kathryn Sikkink is the Arleen Carlson Chair of Political Science and a McKnight Distinguished University Professor, University of Minnesota. Her research is in the area of international human rights norms and law, international institutions and transnational advocacy networks. She is the author of *The Justice Cascade: How Human Rights Prosecutions are Changing World Politics*, *Mixed Signals: US Human Rights Policy and Latin America* and *Activists Beyond Borders: Transnational Advocacy Networks in International Politics*.

Eric Stover is Faculty Director of the Human Rights Center at the University of California at Berkeley. He formerly served as Executive Director of Physicians for Human Rights and was a founding member of the International Campaign to Ban Land Mines. He has participated in several mass graves investigations and as an “Expert on Mission” to the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia. He is the author of several books including *The Witnesses: War Crimes and the Promise of Justice in the Hague*.

Wilder Tayler is Secretary General of the International Commission of Jurists and a member of the UN Sub-Committee on the Prevention of Torture. He previously worked as Legal and Policy Director at Human Rights Watch and as a Legal Advisor and then Program Director with the Americas Program at Amnesty International. Tayler is the former Executive Director of the Institute for Legal and Social Studies (IELSUR) in Uruguay, a legal NGO that specializes in litigating human rights cases.

Carrie Booth Walling is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Albion College and a former Postdoctoral Fellow with the Michigan Society of Fellows, University of Michigan. Her research focuses on international responses to mass atrocity crimes including humanitarian intervention and human rights trials and how human rights norms are reshaping conceptions of state sovereignty. Her forthcoming book analyzes how human rights norms are shaping UN Security Council decisions about humanitarian intervention.

Susan Waltz is a Professor of Public Policy at the Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy, University of Michigan. Her recent research has focused on the political history of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenants. Waltz formerly served on Amnesty International's International Executive Committee. She is author of *Human Rights and Reform: Changing the Face of North African Politics*

José Zalaquett is a Chilean human rights lawyer and academic. He is currently Professor of Human Rights at the School of Law, University of Chile and Co-Director of its Human Rights Center. Zalaquett helped to create and then lead Chile's Vicaría de la Solidaridad, an organization sponsored by the Catholic Church that defended those detained by the Pinochet regime and filed habeas corpus documents on behalf of the missing. He served on Chile's National Commission for Truth and Reconciliation and has worked for, served on the board and consulted for numerous human rights organizations. He recently completed a term as President of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States.