

# Terrorism and Human Rights

## Editors' Introduction

James A. Piazza, *The Pennsylvania State University*

James Igoe Walsh, *University of North Carolina at Charlotte*

The articles in this symposium explore the relationships between terrorism and government respect for human rights. These relationships have wide-ranging implications for the study of politics. Terrorism is seen as a major threat to political stability in many countries. Respect for internationally recognized human rights is a fundamental responsibility of national governments. Can governments prevent terrorism while also respecting human rights, or must authorities trade off some human rights to reduce terrorism? If the latter is the case, which human rights can or should be sacrificed for the goal of stopping terrorism?

These issues are at the core of contemporary debates about counterterrorism policy. Consider first the possibility that terrorism leads governments to subsequently restrict human rights. This relationship is debated every time a country becomes the victim of a terrorist campaign. After the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001, many people inside and outside of the government concluded that it was appropriate—indeed, necessary—to respond by limiting rights. The argument was that rights such as freedom of movement and speech made it much easier for terrorists to plan and organize their attacks. Others concluded that such restrictions would undermine American democracy in fundamental ways. Although legal scholars and political philosophers have often debated these issues in abstract terms, too little systematic evidence exists about how governments actually respond to terrorist attacks. An important objective of the articles in this symposium is to develop a better understanding of how and why political authorities respond to terrorist violence.

A second concern is how respect for human rights influences terrorist attacks. On this issue, a remarkable transformation has taken place within the policy community. Until a

few years ago, the dominant conclusion was that limiting rights was a valuable, if unfortunate, tool for suppressing terrorist groups. More recently, the opposite conclusion has gained much prominence in policy circles. A key turning point in the dialogue was the publication of the U.S. military's new counterinsurgency doctrine manual in 2007. A central conclusion of this new doctrine was that respecting the rights of the local population was a critical component of successful counterterrorist and counterinsurgency policies. The rationale for this viewpoint was that violation of internationally recognized human rights creates widespread grievances against American forces and the indigenous governments they are supporting. Shortly thereafter, American and international military forces in Iraq and Afghanistan began placing a much higher priority on the provision of security and economic opportunities. But important unanswered questions about this relationship remain as well. In particular, it is not clear that a strategy aimed at countering insurgency will also be effective in stopping the actions of smaller and more militant terrorist groups who are less reliant on support from the general population.

These concerns span the traditional subfields of political science, and the contributions to this symposium draw on expertise in the areas of comparative politics, international relations, American government, and political philosophy. Our own article begins by summarizing what we do and do not know about the relationships between terrorism and human rights. We highlight two conclusions of recent research. The first is that, contrary to the concerns of many human rights advocates, governments do not always respond to terrorist attacks by restricting rights. It appears instead that the relationship is more complicated, with terrorist attacks prompting restrictions of some rights but not others. The second conclusion is that human rights abuses by governments are a powerful predictor of subsequent terrorist attacks. Our findings are preliminary, however, and in the remainder of the article, we suggest strategies that future research could use to gain a better understanding of how rights relate to terrorism. Our focus is on further disaggregating these two concepts and developing more granular data. In a brief empirical analysis, we show that disaggregating the concept of physical integrity rights into its four components—political imprisonment, torture, extrajudicial killings, and disappearances—allows us to

reach more specific conclusions about which abuses lead to more terrorism.

The following article by Emilie M. Hafner-Burton and Jacob N. Shapiro highlights some of the shortcomings of and contradictions in the extant research in this area, and lays out specific research designs with the goal of moving this work forward. They point out that terrorism and human rights abuses both have many causes, making it difficult to untangle the relationships between them. They are also likely to be endogenous, with terrorism influencing government attitudes toward rights, which in turn affect the behavior of terrorist groups. Untangling these relationships presents important research challenges, and Hafner-Burton and Shapiro suggest innovative ways that scholars could tackle such problems.

The articles by Will H. Moore and Michael C. Desch explore how characteristics of democratic rule mediate the relationships between human rights and terrorism. We might expect that democracies would be far less likely to engage in repression in response to terrorist threats. Both Moore and Desch show that the relationship is more complicated. Moore discusses recent research that concludes that democracies do regularly violate core human rights, particularly when they face violent threats such as terrorism. At the same time, though, democracies respond with somewhat less repression than do nondemocracies. He argues that the next logical step in comparative research is to disaggregate democracy into its component parts, such as elections and bills of rights, to determine which are the most effective in preserving rights. Desch shows that despite differences in their rhetoric, the administrations of George W. Bush and Barack Obama have both been willing to restrict the rights granted to detainees and have countenanced substantial collateral damage from missile strikes from unmanned aerial vehicles in Pakistan. Desch explains this contradiction between U.S. ideas and actions as the result of a long-standing inability of American liberalism to understand and appreciate the interests of illiberal foes.

Contributions from Jennifer S. Holmes and Linda Camp Keith and from Darius Rejali and Paul Gronke explore how citizens and political leaders conceptualize human rights after terrorist attacks. Both use micro-level data from American politics to explore more general issues about the relationships between terrorism and rights. Holmes and Camp Keith investigate how U.S. asylum policy has changed since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. Using a new dataset, they show that political considerations—such as the presence of Al Qaeda in the applicant's home country or whether or not the applicant speaks Arabic—play an increasingly important role in post-September 11 asylum decisions. Their careful study marks an important contribution to our understanding of how the American political system has changed its treatment of human rights in response to the increased threat from terrorism. Rejali and Gronke analyze the support of American citizens for the use of torture as a counterterrorism policy. Drawing on new and archived survey data, they show that a majority of Americans have not supported the use of torture. This finding is surprising, since the conventional wisdom holds that many Americans are willing to violate individual rights if they believe that doing so will reduce future terrorist attacks. It also suggests that public opinion could become an important influence for restraining the authorities' willingness to violate fundamental human rights in some circumstances.

The final article by Mia Bloom expands on the conclusion that violations of human rights fuel terrorism using descriptive case study based on fieldwork. Bloom investigates how the abuse of women by occupying powers influences local support for insurgents and terrorists. She shows that military occupation frequently leads to the infliction of violence against local civilian women. Such violation of the fundamental rights of women leads to the radicalization of others in the society under occupation, who are then primed to support political violence against occupying forces. Finally, Bloom documents that terrorist groups strategically exploit this phenomenon by recruiting female operatives to undertake attacks and using violence against women as political fodder. ■

---

## SYMPOSIUM AUTHORS

**Mia Bloom** is an associate professor of international studies and women's studies at Penn State University and a research fellow at the International Center for the Study of Terrorism. Her major areas of research include suicide terrorism, women and terrorism, and the deliberate use of rape as a strategy during war. She can be reached at [mub27@psu.edu](mailto:mub27@psu.edu).

**Michael C. Desch** is a professor in and chair of the department of political science at the University of Notre Dame. He is the author, most recently, of *Power and Military Effectiveness: The Fallacy of Democratic Triumphalism* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008). He can be reached [michael.desch.4@nd.edu](mailto:michael.desch.4@nd.edu).

**Paul Gronke** is a professor of political science at Reed College and the director of the Early Voting Information Center. He specializes in early voting,

electoral behavior, public opinion, and social science methodology. He received his PhD from the University of Michigan and has previously taught at Duke University. He can be reached at [gronke@reed.edu](mailto:gronke@reed.edu).

**Emilie Hafner-Burton** is a professor at the School of International Relations and Pacific Studies, University of California, San Diego, and director of the Laboratory on International Law and Regulation. Dr. Hafner-Burton's research examines ways to improve compliance with international law, protections for human rights, and a wide variety of other topics related to law, economics, and regulation. She has published widely on these and other subjects. She can be reached at [ehafner@ucsd.edu](mailto:ehafner@ucsd.edu).

**Jennifer S. Holmes** is an associate professor of political economy and political science at the University of Texas at Dallas. Her major areas of research

are violence and development, with an emphasis on Latin America. She is a member of the Asylum Research Project in the School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences. She can be reached at [jlholmes@utdallas.edu](mailto:jlholmes@utdallas.edu).

**Linda Camp Keith** is an associate professor of political science at the University of Texas at Dallas. Her major areas of research are global human rights and judicial behavior. She is a member the Asylum Research Project in the School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences. She can be reached at [linda.keith@utdallas.edu](mailto:linda.keith@utdallas.edu).

**Will H. Moore** is a professor of political science at Florida State University. He studies violent political conflict addressing such topics as dissent and repression, forced migration, states' respect for human rights, and, most recently, oppositional terror and the

---

---

ability of courts to constrain states. He is currently co-directing, with Courtenay Ryals Conrad, the *Ill Treatment and Torture data project*, and his research can be found in the *American Journal of Political Science*, *International Studies Quarterly*, and *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, among others. He can be reached at [will.moore@fsu.edu](mailto:will.moore@fsu.edu).

**James A. Piazza** is an associate professor in the Department of Political Science at Pennsylvania State University. His recent research has examined suicide terrorism, state failure and terrorism, and poverty and regime type as predictors of patterns of terrorist activity. His published work has appeared in the *Journal of Politics*, *International Studies Quar-*

*terly*, *Comparative Political Studies*, *Security Studies*, *Terrorism and Political Violence*, and *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*. He can be reached at [jap45@psu.edu](mailto:jap45@psu.edu).

**Darius Rejali** is a professor of political science at Reed College and an internationally recognized expert on government torture and interrogation. He is the author of *Torture and Democracy* (Princeton, 2007), winner of the 2007 APSA Human Rights Book of the Year Award. He can be reached at [Rejali@reed.edu](mailto:Rejali@reed.edu).

**Jacob N. Shapiro** is an assistant professor of politics and international affairs at Princeton University. His primary research interests include political violence,

aid, and security policy. His research has been published in *International Security*, *International Studies Quarterly*, *Security Studies*, *Foreign Policy*, *Military Operations Research*, and a number of edited volumes. He can be reached at [jns@princeton.edu](mailto:jns@princeton.edu).

**James Igoe Walsh** is an associate professor in the political science department at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. His research interests include terrorism, human rights, and national security. He is the author of *The International Politics of Intelligence Sharing* (Columbia University Press, 2010). He can be reached at [jwalsh@uncc.edu](mailto:jwalsh@uncc.edu).

## Minority Fellows Program

The APSA Minority Fellows Program, established in 1969, has designated more than 580 fellows and contributed to the successful completion of doctoral political science programs for over 100 individuals. The Minority Fellows Program designates up to 12 stipend Minority Fellows each year. Additional applicants who do not receive funds from the Association may also be recognized and recommended for admission and financial support to graduate political science programs.

Fellows with stipends receive a \$4,000 fellowship disbursed in two \$2,000 payments—one at the end of their first graduate year and one at the end of their second—provided that they remain in good academic standing. APSA can also dispense some funds at the start of the academic year on request of the student. Awards are based on students' undergraduate course work, GPA, extracurricular activities, GRE scores, and recommendations from faculty.

### Eligibility

The APSA Minority Fellows Program is primarily designed for African American, Asian Pacific American, Latino/a, and Native American students who are entering a doctoral program in political science for the first time. Applicants must be:

- College/university seniors, college/university graduates, or students currently enrolled in a master's program applying for doctoral study at another political science program/institution
- Citizens of the United States.

Applicants must also show strong academic achievement in prior political science and related courses, demonstrate an interest in teaching and potential for research in political science, and demonstrate financial need.

### Application

See [www.apsanet.org/mfp](http://www.apsanet.org/mfp) for more information and application details. Applications must be postmarked to APSA by Friday, October 8, 2010 and must include the following materials in one packet:

- A completed application form;
- Three letters of recommendation from academic sources;
- Official transcripts for all collegiate institutions attended;
- GRE scores; and
- A personal statement.

### Selection

Awards will be announced at the end of November, and students will need to formally accept by December. Recipient profiles will be published in the April 2011 issue of *PS: Political Science & Politics*.

[www.apsanet.org/mfp](http://www.apsanet.org/mfp)

