

Human Rights in International Relations

HUMR5531 Autumn 2013

Nils Butenschøn

Outline

- International relations and HR: Some basic approaches.
- How do global challenges impact HR and how do HR impact inter-state relations?
- A relevant case: R2P in Libya.
- A critical issue: HR and the 'Justice vs. Peace'-debate.

Human Rights and the games states play

- Does human rights fit into the International Relations perspective on the world?
 - IR realist perspective: State oriented, unitary actor, national interest, security, state sovereignty. Focus on **relative power** and conflicts of interest in an anarchical world;
 - IR institutionalist/liberal perspective: Interdependence, international organisations, international regimes. Focus on **rules and procedures**, negotiations.
 - The unlikely path of protective mechanisms for individual rights into inter-state politics. HR=domestic matter vs. universal obligations. A normative revolution as a response to the atrocities of WW II. (WW I: self-determination, religious minorities).

HR in inter-state relations

- International relations:
- Explaining inter-state behavior: Grand theory?
- Unit of analysis: state
 - Unitary actor?
 - Hierarchy of interests?
- Independent variables
 - Structure of power?
 - Norms and rules?
 - Institutions?
- Human Rights:
- A set of norms, rules, and institutions
- Proponents are struggling to have states recognise HR as binding obligations on state behaviour
- Why should states bother about HR in their external relations??

Some important authors (classics)

- IR:
- Hans J. Morgenthau
- Kenneth Waltz
- John J. Mearsheimer
- Stephen Krasner
- Graham Allison
- Joseph Nye
- HR & IR:
- Jack Donnelly
- David Forsythe
- Thomas Risse
- Peter Baehr
- R.J. Vincent

HR in international relations:

Topical issues

- Challenges: Aspects of globalisation: How are HR affected?
 - Global financial crises (MDG)-> ?
 - Globalisation of conflicts (WoT/R2P) ->?
 - TNCs relative strength (CSR)->?
 - Global climate change (Kyoto)->?
- On which level in the international system should such problems be solved? How do HR come into the equation from a policy perspective?

How do HR impact international politics?

- HR obligations: Do they carry any weight? How do we know?
 - UN procedures (UPR, Treaty bodies, etc.)
 - ICC
 - ECHR/ECtHR
 - NGOs, public opinion (Risse et.al.).
 - State obligations vs. democratic legitimacy? (PluriCourts project)

R2P: The cases of Libya and Syria

- The principle. UNSC res 1970/1973 (R2P)
- Sovereignty vs HR. The weight of experience. Cases: Biafra 1969, Rwanda 1993, Sebrenica 1995, Kosovo 1999, Darfur, Gaza 2009, Libya, Syria.
- Responsibility to protect is about three things (Ignatieff 2004):
 - Prevent, react, rebuild.
- R2P: An agenda to be misused by powerful states? Can it be prevented by developing rules monitored by UNSC?
- The Syria backlash.

Peace vs Justice. A particular dilemma

The Questions

- What is the role of human rights in peace building?
- Does strengthening human rights make peace more attainable?
- Is peace the best guarantee for human rights protection?
- What comes first – peace or justice?

The dilemma in Kofi Annan's words

- “[T]here cannot be real peace without justice. Yet the relentless pursuit of *justice may sometimes be an obstacle to peace*. If we insist, at all times, and in all places, on punishing those who are guilty of extreme violations of human rights, it may be difficult, or even impossible, to stop the bloodshed and save innocent civilians. If we always and everywhere insist on uncompromising standards of justice, a delicate peace may not survive.
- But equally, if we ignore the demands of justice *simply to secure agreement*, the foundations of that agreement will be fragile, and we will set bad precedents.” (Kofi Annan, 25.09.2003).

Controversial Questions of 'Peace vs. Justice' in Peace Negotiations

- (1) Addressing massive human rights violations
 - Should leaders be held responsible for crimes committed during the conflict and for example be handed over to ICC?
 - Should they be accorded impunity for such crimes?
 - Is a formal process of reconciliation an alternative that could be justified from a human rights perspective?
- (2) Addressing core political issues of the conflict
 - Should the core issues be addressed on the basis of international human rights and humanitarian law standards?
 - Should negotiations focus on reaching an agreement on the basis of the Parties' negotiating positions?

The Answers

- Three conflicting positions:
 - (1) Human rights promoters: Compliance with international standards must be secured at all levels!
 - (2) Realists: Let them fight it out!
 - (3) Peace pragmatists: Reaching agreement is the overriding aim!
- Human rights promoters tend to be squeezed between realists and pragmatists. The challenge: How to strengthen the HR position?

Human Rights Promoters 1

- Basic argument: Rebellion and war is normally caused by injustice; The peace process must address the injustices.
 - References can be made to UDHR Preamble and Article 55 of the UN Charter.

Human Rights Promoters 2

- UDHR, Preamble:
 - “- whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebellion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law;”

The logic here is that if human rights are effectively protected, we will not have tyranny and oppression, and people will not rebel. Or simply: “No peace without justice”.

UN Charter, Article 55

- With a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being **which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations** based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, the United Nations shall promote:
- A) higher standards of living, full employment, and *conditions of economic and social progress and development*;
- B) solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems; and *international cultural and educational cooperation*; and
- C) universal respect for, and observance of, *human rights and fundamental freedoms* for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Opposition to the Human Rights

Position: Realists 1

- **Realists**: Peace must be based on *relative strength*, a balance of power, that reflects *real* relations of power. Conflicts erupt when parties fight to establish a balance of power favourable to themselves.
 - The function of war: A decisive test of strength that creates clear winners and losers, establishing a new balance of power and thus peace and stability. "War is nothing but a duel on a larger scale" (Carl von Clausewitz).

Opposition to the Human Rights

Position: Realists 2

- Carl von Clausewitz: “[w]ar is thus an art of force to compel our enemy to do our will...Attached to force are certain self-imposed, imperceptible limitations hardly worth mentioning, known as international law and custom, but they scarcely weaken it. Force – that is, physical force, for moral force has no existence save as expressed in the state and the law – is thus the *means* of war; to impose our will on the enemy is its *object*. To secure that object we must render the enemy powerless; and that, in theory, is the true aim of warfare.” (GWB, Jan 02).

Opposition to the Human Rights

Position: Realists 3

- Realists' solution: Let them fight it out! Invoking or imposing humanitarian law or human rights standards on the warring parties or on negotiations for a peace settlement will only function as distractions from defining the parameters of a stable solution because such standards normally seeks to protect and thus strengthen the weaker party. (US Isolationists).

Opposition to the Human Rights Position: Peace Pragmatists 1

- **Pragmatists:** Peace understood as agreement between conflict parties to end hostilities and establish peaceful relations.
- “...linking of human rights protections with peace-building is often challenged as partisan and/or idealistic. The view that human rights law provides negotiable minimum universal standards is often presented as in tension with the need for a pragmatic peace involving compromise, including compromise on human rights.” (Bell 2000:5).

Opposition to the Human Rights Position: Peace Pragmatists 2

- Derogating from human rights standards or ignoring humanitarian law might be *essential* in order to achieve a peace agreement. This might relate to both legal and political issues in the negotiations.
 - Ignore demands for extradition of leaders to criminal courts;
 - Avoid questions of retributions for past crimes;
 - Avoid or postpone any political questions that might lead to the breakdown of negotiations.

Opposition to the Human Rights Position: Peace Pragmatists 3

- Example Bosnia: Vance-Owen/Vance-Stoltenberg-plans versus the Dayton Agreement.
- “...thousands of people are dead who should have been alive – because moralists were in quest for the perfect peace.” ... “What had the critics done between 1993 and 1995: Had they prolonged the war and multiplied the deaths? Are their victories to be found in the graveyards of Bosnia? What lessons should the human rights community learn from this sorry tale?” (Anonymous, Human Rights Quarterly 18, 1996).

Opposition to the Human Rights Position: Peace Pragmatists 4

- Solution: The function of negotiations is to identify a possible common ground as the political foundation of a peace agreement. Demands for strict human rights compliance might deter and distract the parties from finding this common ground. Bad guys who command important political influence should be included in order to strengthen the outcome.

Realists and HR promoters: A meeting point?

- We can see one similarity in the reasoning as represented by Realists and Human Rights Promoters, respectively: They both argue for solutions that go to the root of the problem, *as they see it*: The Realists want a *decisive test of strength*, the HR Promoters want to root out *injustices*. The two positions may argue for conflicting solutions, but there is a parallel in thinking: They both want to find a *'cure for the illness'*, not only address the *symptoms* as the Pragmatists allegedly do.

Meeting point 2: Neo-Cons?

- If we combine Realists with Human Rights Promoters, what do we get?
 - Voila: **Neo-cons!** (– at least on the face of it). Many US liberals converted to this position post 9/11. (Ignatieff).
 - But the question is: Is military force and strategies of ‘regime change’ applied by neo-cons in order to promote human rights – or is the ideology of democracy and human rights used in order to promote a military power?

The Challenge

- For discussion:
 - International law, including IHRL and IHL, is a very weak legal system; compliance is largely a question of States' self-binding.
 - How can the international human rights regime be strengthened with a view to having a greater impact in international relations?

References

- Akhavan, P. 1998, “Justice in the Hague, Peace in the Former Yugoslavia?”, *Human Rights Quarterly* 20:737-816.
- Anonymous 1996, “Human Rights in Peace Negotiations”, *Human Rights Quarterly* 18:249-258.
- Bell, Christine 2000, *Peace Agreements and Human Rights*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Boyl, Kevin 1996, “Negotiating Human Rights in Peace Negotiations”, *Human Rights Quarterly* 18:515-516.
- Cassese, Antonio 2001, *International Law*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clausewitz, Carl von (1832) 1984, *On War*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Hannum, Hurst 2006 a), “Human Rights in Conflict Resolution: The Role of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in UN Peacemaking and Peacebuilding”, *Human Rights Quarterly* 28:1-85.
- Hannum, Hurst 2006 b), “Peace versus Justice: Creating Rights as well as Order out of Chaos”, *International Peacekeeping* 13:582-895.
- Ignatieff, M. 2004, *The Lesser Evil*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kegley Jr., Charles W. 1995, *Controversies in International Relations Theory. Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge*, New York: ST. Martin’s Press.
- Keohane, Robert O. 1984, *After Hegemony. Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

References cont.

- Koskenniemi, Marri 2002, *The Gentle Civilizer of Nations: The Rise and Fall of International Law*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McGoldrick, Dominic 2004, *From '9-11' to the Iraq War 2003*, Oxford and Portland, Oregon: Hart Publishing
- Monshipouri, M. 2001, “Human Rights in International Relations by David P. Forsythe; Realism and International Relations by Jack Donnelly”, *Human Rights Quarterly* 23:213-227.
- Månsson, Katarina 2006, “Integration of Human Rights in Peace Operations: Is There an Ideal Model?”, *International Peacekeeping* 13:547-563.
- Nystuen, Gro 2003, *Striking a balance between achieving peace and protecting human rights: Conflicts between norms regarding ethnic discrimination in the Dayton Peace Agreement*, PhD dissertation, Norwegian Centre for Human Rights, Faculty of Law, University of Oslo.
- Putnam, Tanya L. 2002, “Human Rights and Sustainable Peace” in Stedman, Stephen J. et al. (eds.), *Ending Civil Wars: The Implementation of Peace Agreements*, Boulder CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Risse, Thomas, Stephen C. Ropp, and Kathryn Sikknik (eds.) 1999, *The Power of Human Rights. International Norms and Domestic Change*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Türk, Danilo 2003, “Reflections on human rights, sovereignty of states and the principle of non-intervention” in Bergsmo, Morten, *Human Rights and Criminal Justice for the Downtrodden. Essays in Honor of Asbjørn Eide*, Leiden and Boston: Martinus Nijhoff.