Contact information

Office hours: I am generally on campus from about 9am to 4pm Monday to Friday (and often longer), and tend to be in my office most of the time between 9-11 and 1-3 when I’m not with you. Let me know if you’d like to talk and we can set up an appointment if you don’t want to take a stab at just catching me in my office.

Office phone: 895-4300. A great way to figure out whether I’m there!

Email: dyamanishi@cornellcollege.edu. The best way to reach me.

Consulting Librarian: Greg Cotton, 315 Cole Library, x4454, gcotton@cornellcollege.edu.

Writing Studio: 125 Cole Library, x4462, hours: Monday-Thursday, 8am-11pm; Friday, 8am-5pm; Sunday, 1-11pm. I have discussed each assignment with Laura Farmer in particular, but Laura, Shawn Doyle, and the student workers can all be helpful.

I’m here to help, as are Greg and the Writing Studio folks. Please take advantage of us.

Overview

The seminar will introduce the experience, philosophy, politics, and empirics of human rights abuse and protection. We will discuss (in part):

- The abuses that actually occur, from “ordinary” torture to ethnic cleansing. In particular, we will look at genocide in Rwanda, political abuses under military rule in Argentina, and the bureaucratic management of the Holocaust, along with numerous other examples of abuse and protection addressed by our texts.
- The meaning and scope of human rights.
- Why we should or shouldn’t protect human rights, and certain types of human rights.
- How to detect and measure human rights abuse.
- Whether increasing globalization has lead to a rise or fall in human rights abuse.
- The history of the international movement to protect human rights.
• The growing issue of non-state or para-state abuse (by paramilitaries in Colombia, for example).
• Whether there are different classes of human rights or human rights are a cohesive, mutually reinforcing whole.
• Whether human rights are universal (or whether there are, for example, “Asian values” that are different from Western rights).
• Whether group rights, such as the right of an immigrant group to receive education in its own language, are justified.
• How to resolve conflicts between rights, for example whether our government should torture those suspected of terrorist activities in order to protect others.
• When, if ever, human rights abuses justify international intervention.
• What motivates the individuals who perpetrate human rights abuses, who do things that they must know to be “evil.”

Disabilities

If you have a disability registered with the college that will require special accommodations for the quizzes or other assignments, please let me know by Wednesday, October 27.

If you have a disability that is not registered with the college that will require special accommodations for any assignments, please register it (!) and then let me know by Wednesday, October 27.

Feedback

I am very interested in your suggestions for improvement of this class and my teaching generally. Please email comments to me as you think of them or share them with me at my office, if you would like to see your thoughts have immediate effect. I also pay very close attention to end-of-course evaluations.

Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>every day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>every day for which there’s reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First test</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Monday, November 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second test</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Monday, November 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third test</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Monday, November 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the particular things I’m looking for vary to some degree by assignment, in general an A on an assignment means that your work is outstanding in terms of:

- addressing the assigned question and avoiding digression,
- having a well-structured argument,
- expressing your argument clearly and effectively,
- making appropriate and properly cited use of material on the syllabus and other well-selected sources,
- and demonstrating thoughtful integration and interpretation of the course material and discussions.

Lower grades mean that you have not done all of these things or have done one or more of them less well that you could have. The order of items on the above list should not be taken to indicate their order of importance in determining your grade on an assignment, nor should you suppose that the items will carry equal weight on an assignment or invariant weight across assignments. Moreover, I expect your work to improve during the course and across courses.

To simplify communication about grades, I grade all assignments using the same marks that appear on your academic transcripts: letter grades. When I combine assignment grades to produce your course grade, I will do so using the same numbers that the college uses to determine your GPA (A = 4.0, A- = 3.7, B+ = 3.3, etc.). I will always round-up from the midpoint between grades (for example, a 3.85 rounds to an A, while a 3.84 does not). I may raise grades from what the raw numbers indicate in deserving cases, but I will never change the rank order of students’ grades in the class in doing so.

**Instructions for assignments**

**Participation:** Participation includes oral participation and unannounced quizzes. If you punctually attend every class, appear to me to be paying attention and never make a contribution to our common discussion, you will receive a C for oral participation. To get a grade higher than a C for oral participation, you must participate orally in our common discussion. I assess oral participation more by thoughtfulness and attentiveness to the flow of the conversation than by quantity of oral communication. I do, however, expect you to contribute regularly. Office visits will help your oral participation grade, but are not a substitute for class attendance and participation. There may also be unannounced
quizzes that address basic factual points from the readings. Attendance and participation for the presentations and other special events may be weighted more heavily than that on other days.

**Journals:** Each day of the course that we have readings (that is to say, days 2-15), you should submit a journal entry by 9am via email. You might consider one or more of the reading note questions that I’ve distributed, or reflect upon how the readings for the day relate to earlier material and/or current events in the news. Feel free to offer your personal reactions to each piece, but I do want you to offer some interpretation or analysis of some kind in each journal entry. You should aim for 250 to 400 words per day. Journals will be graded according to (thoughtful) completion. That is to say: if you finish all of them and take them seriously, you will receive an A for the journal component of the course grade. You should also write an additional journal for Thursday, October 28, after our visit from John Murray, for a total of fifteen required journals. I may permit extra journals for extra credit (or to replace missing journals) after relevant campus events. Some are listed on the schedule of readings and assignments already, while others may not come to my attention till later.

**Tests:** The test questions will include essay questions and identification questions. I will hand out reading notes for each day’s readings to give you an indication as to what issues we will discuss at the next day’s class. The essay test questions will be similar to the questions in the reading notes. I may hand out test questions in advance, if doing so doesn’t appear to damage participation by reducing the incentive to do the readings.

**Paper, generally:** The goal of your paper is to ask and answer a question about human rights in light of the existing scholarly discussion of your topic. You should choose a human rights incident, policy decision, or problem that has been addressed by scholars representing at least two competing perspectives. You should run your topic by me as soon as you come up with an idea (in part to avoid duplication with topics chosen by other students), and you should begin searching for relevant literature right away in order to ensure that it exists. Very recent situations can be problematic as puzzles for this paper, because the scholarly literature won’t have had time to catch up. Your research paper should have five parts: an introduction, a contextual section, a literature review, an analysis, and a conclusion. To wit:

- The introduction should state your problem clearly in the first sentence, briefly describe your overall conclusion, and outline the logic of your argument both in favor of your own conclusion and against those views you reject. It’s also helpful to suggest why your topic should interest readers.
- The contextual section should flesh out your question by describing the facts that you mean to explain. You should not draw any conclusions in this section.
- The literature review should relate how other scholars have explained the facts that you mean to explain. You should not criticize or analyze their views in this section.
• The analysis should advance your own argument based on the facts. You should begin by explicitly addressing the views of other scholars that you’ve described in the literature review. You should build your own argument on the pros and cons of others’ arguments.
• The conclusion should restate your question and briefly summarize the logic of your analysis. If you would like to offer pleas for the practical importance of dealing with your problem, suggestions for further work, or other flowery thoughts, this is the place.

Problem statement paper: Your problem statement will precede your research paper to indicate what puzzle you will address in your larger project and how you will go about addressing it. The problem statement should make the facts of your puzzle clear, avoiding explanation of causes. I will grade this assignment according to three principal criteria: the quality of your statement of your central puzzle, the quality of the selection and presentation of facts that you offer to make the context of your puzzle clear, and the coherence with which you establish a clear thesis and make each part of your paper make sense in terms of that thesis. We will select problems in class so as to avoid duplication. Although it is nearly equivalent to the first two of the five parts of the overall paper, you should write your problem statement as a coherent paper, not a set of bullet points. Please submit your problem statement by email in a Word or RTF attachment. Your problem statement should not exceed 750 well-chosen words.

Outline/annotated bibliography: Your outline should indicate how you will structure your paper, as well as any changes you intend to make to the first two sections on the basis of my comments on your problem statement paper. Your outline should be in complete sentences, not just a list of subjects. You should write roughly a sentence per anticipated paragraph to indicate how you will order your literature review and analysis. Your bibliography should offer proper citations for the sources that you’ve identified and several sentences to explain what each has to say and how you think each will help you. Your key concern should be to describe how each author explains the causal processes at work with respect to your problem.

Research paper: The research paper should present your puzzle (building upon the problem statement paper), explain how competing scholars understand the phenomenon in question (building upon the literature review), and analyze the competing explanations to identify the roots of disagreement and to assess why one or more perspectives are right and the other(s) wrong. I will grade the research paper according to three principal criteria: the quality of your discussion of how your problem has been and/or might be explained by scholars from different perspectives, the quality of your analysis of what fundamentally unites and distinguishes the competing perspectives that you address, and the coherence with which you establish a clear thesis and make each part of your paper make sense in terms of that thesis (including improvements in the material drawn from your problem statement paper). Your
research paper, including any of the problem statement recycled in it, should not exceed 3500 well-chosen words.

**Final paper rewrite:** I will return your graded papers with comments as quickly as possible, so that you may improve your paper according to my suggestions (and perhaps your own further reflection upon it). Your grade on the rewrite will be no lower than your grade on the original paper so long as you make a serious effort to address my comments; if you make merely cosmetic changes, your grade on the rewrite may be lower than the original grade.

**Presentation:** Your presentation will address your paper project. You should present your puzzle, the competing perspectives that you have discovered about it, and your analysis of their advantages and shortcomings in about 10 minutes. After each presentation, I will select another student (or students) in the class to serve as a discussant who will briefly summarize the presentation and ask one or more critical questions about it. I may ask you to serve as a discussant more than once. After the discussant(s) speaks, other students may ask questions and make comments (which will count as ordinary class participation, not part of the presentation grade). Your presentation grade will depend on your effectiveness in presenting your argument in a clear way to the class and your facility and thoughtfulness in answering questions about your work, as well as quality of your formal discussion of another student’s presentation.

**Attendance and lateness policy**

To avoid a penalty on your participation grade for missing class, you must ask the campus clinic (in a health emergency) or the dean of students or other relevant campus official (in other types of emergencies) to send me an excuse on your behalf. You may miss no more than one class without providing a documented excuse.

I will lower the grade on work submitted late by one percent of the maximum grade per hour late (thus, a paper that would have earned a 3.0 (a B) will earn a 2.96 (a lower B) if one hour late, a 2.84 (a high B-) if four hours late). Work submitted late that meets the minimum expectations of the assignment will receive at least a D regardless of lateness, so you should submit all assignments even if you are extremely late. I will not accept any work after 5pm on the last day of the block.

Except in cases of documented disability or emergency, or documented co-curricular activity (athletic competition, theater or musical performance, etc.), I will not, on grounds of fairness, offer an extension to one student without offering it to everybody, and given the tightness of the block plan schedule, I simply can’t afford to do that. Please do not experiment with my generosity.
To drop on the 15th day, you must complete every assignment due by the end of the 14th day of class and meet the attendance condition noted above (that is to say, you must miss no more than one class without a documented excuse). In other words, if you are likely to sleep through class on more than one occasion, you should drop now, because you will not be able to do so later.

Books to buy

All five books are required and available at the Commons bookstore.


Jacobo Timerman (2002), *Prisoner without a Name, Cell without a Number*, Wisconsin. isbn 0299182444.

Philip Gourevitch (1998), *We wish to inform you that tomorrow we will be killed with our families: Stories from Rwanda*, Picador USA. isbn 0312243359.


Reading and assignment schedule

Excerpts are on the Moodle site for the class.

Monday, October 25 9am  *Judgment at Nuremberg*

1pm  *Judgment at Nuremberg*

Tuesday, October 26 1pm  Introductions and administrivia


**Wednesday, October 27**

11am *Recommended: Public talk by John Murray, global health care expert: “9 Million Child Deaths: Where, Why, and What Can Be Done?”* (Hedges) (you may complete an extra journal for extra credit)

1pm Donnelly, pp. 7-53 and 204-225

*Universal Declaration of Human Rights*

**Thursday, October 28**

11am *Recommended: Public talk by Kate Biederman, ACM/Mellon postdoctoral fellow in philosophy: “Moral Responsibility and Assessment: The Case of George W. Bush”* (Hedges) (you may complete an extra journal for extra credit)

1pm Timerman, pp. vii-80

**Friday, October 29**

1pm Timerman, pp. 81-164


6pm *Problem statement paper due*

**Monday, November 1**

9am *First test*

1pm Gourevitch, pp. 3-109

**Tuesday, November 2**

1pm Gourevitch, pp. 110-241

(Go VOTE!)

**Wednesday, November 3**

9am *Hotel Rwanda*

1pm Gourevitch, pp. 242-353

**Thursday, November 4**

1pm Arendt, pp. 3-150

**Friday, November 5**

1pm Arendt, pp. 151-298

6pm *Annotated bibliography and outline due*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, November 8</td>
<td>9am</td>
<td><em>Second test</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1pm</td>
<td><em>Schindler’s List</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, November 9</td>
<td>9am</td>
<td><em>Schindler’s List</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>Waller, pp. 3-169 (you do not need to know the details of the anecdotal sections)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, November 10</td>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>Waller, pp. 171-278 (you do not need to know the details of the anecdotal sections)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, November 11</td>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>Donnelly, pp. 57-123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, November 12</td>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>Donnelly, pp. 127-181 and 242-260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6pm</td>
<td>Final paper due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, November 15</td>
<td>9am</td>
<td><em>Third test</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, November 16</td>
<td>9am</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, November 17</td>
<td>1pm</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6pm</td>
<td>Final paper rewrite due</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Honesty in academic work (from the Compass)**

The College considers Cornell students to be responsible persons whose maturity will develop in a community that encourages free inquiry. The College expects the highest
degree of personal integrity in all relationships. Any form of dishonesty is a violation of this spirit and of College rules.

A student is expected to explicitly acknowledge ideas, claims, observations, or data of others, unless generally known. When a piece of work is submitted for credit, a student is asserting that the submission is her or his work unless there is a citation of a specific source. If there is no appropriate acknowledgement of sources, whether intended or not, this may constitute a violation of the College's requirement for honesty in academic work and may be treated as a case of academic dishonesty.

Dishonesty in academic work includes both cheating and plagiarism.

*Cheating* refers to the use of unauthorized sources of information on examinations or any attempt by students to deceive the evaluator of an examination, paper, or project.

*Plagiarism* is the act of taking the work of another and presenting it as one's own, without acknowledgement of the original source.

There is not one set of rules for the acknowledgement of sources that is appropriate across all disciplines. For this reason, students are always encouraged to consult their professors and guidelines included in their syllabi. However, in general the appropriate acknowledgement of sources involves meeting the following requirements:

*Quotations and Paraphrasing.* All direct quotations, even if mingled with original words and ideas, must be placed within quotation marks and accompanied by a specific citation for the source of the quotation. Unless the information is generally known, all phrases that are not original to the author - even two or three words - must be placed in quotation marks and cited. If an existing idea is used but paraphrased or summarized, both the original author's words and sentence structure must be changed and a specific citation for the source must still be made. It is always the responsibility of the student to provide precise sources for all ideas, information, or data he or she has borrowed or adapted. Simply listing sources in a bibliography is not sufficient. Students who use information from the World Wide Web are expected to follow these same guidelines for the citation of sources.

Failure to cite sources properly constitutes academic dishonesty, whether the omission is intentional or not.

*Ideas and Data.* All students are required to acknowledge the ideas of others. Every student is expected to do her or his own work in the completion of an assignment or an examination unless either (a) the sources for these ideas are explicitly cited, or (b) the instructor explicitly allows such collaboration. In addition, a person giving unauthorized assistance to another on an examination is just as guilty of cheating as the person who accepts or solicits such aid.
Submitting revisions of academic work previously submitted, either in the current course or in previous courses, qualifies as academic dishonesty unless the student obtains the explicit permission of all of the instructors involved.

All data sources must be cited accurately. It is dishonest to fabricate or alter research data included in laboratory reports, projects, or other assignments.

A safe guide is to provide a full citation for every source consulted. Sources may include, but are not limited to, published books, articles, reviews, Internet sites, archival material, visual images, oral presentations, or personal correspondence. In addition, students should always keep previous drafts of their work in order to provide documentation of their original work. Finally, due to disciplinary differences, students should consult their professor, a librarian, and/or the Teaching and Learning Center for specific instructions on properly providing citations for sources.

Procedures for dealing with dishonesty in academic work (from the Compass)

If an instructor judges that a student has violated the College's policies on academic honesty, the student may be charged with academic dishonesty and assigned an F either for the particular examination, paper, report, or project, or for the course. The instructor shall notify the student in writing of the charge and the penalty and shall include a statement of the circumstances which precipitated the action. A copy of the instructor's letter along with a copy of the paper shall be sent to the Registrar. The Registrar shall then advise the student in writing of the right to appeal. Within ten (10) days of notification, the student may appeal the charge and/or the penalty by submitting a letter to the Dean of the College requesting that he or she appoint an ad hoc committee consisting of three (3) faculty members, one of whom may be nominated by the student. The recommendation of this committee is advisory only and is not binding upon the instructor.

All material and information relative to the charge of academic dishonesty shall be kept by the Registrar in a special file during the period in which the student is enrolled at Cornell College, serving only as a statement of record if the student is charged a second time with academic dishonesty. In the case of an appeal after the first offense, the file shall be destroyed if the committee finds the student not guilty and the instructor concurs; otherwise, the recommendation of the committee shall be inserted into the special file. If there are no further charges, the file will be destroyed at the time of the student's graduation from Cornell.

Should a subsequent charge of academic dishonesty be brought against a student, the Registrar shall notify the Dean of the College who shall convene a committee consisting of the Dean of the College, the Dean of Students, and the Chair of the Academic
Standing Committee, who shall determine the status of the student. The normal penalty for a second offense is indefinite suspension from the College.