

| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| 1. Record Nr. | UNINA9910781719103321 |
| Autore | De Londras Fiona |
| Titolo | Detention in the 'War on Terror' : can human rights fight back? // Fiona de Londras [[electronic resource]] |
| Pubbl/distr/stampa | Cambridge : , : Cambridge University Press, , 2011 |
| ISBN | 1-139-09751-2 1-107-21496-3 1-139-10088-2 1-139-10154-4 1-139-09885-3 0-511-99638-1 1-139-09953-1 |
| Descrizione fisica | 1 online resource (x, 316 pages) : digital, PDF file(s) |
| Classificazione | POL035010 |
| Disciplina | 344.7305/3250269 |
| Soggetti | Human rights - International cooperation Detention of persons Terrorism - Prevention - Law and legislation |
| Lingua di pubblicazione | Inglese |
| Formato | Materiale a stampa |
| Livello bibliografico | Monografia |
| Note generali | Title from publisher's bibliographic system (viewed on 05 Oct 2015). |
| Nota di bibliografia | Includes bibliographical references and index. |
| Nota di contenuto | Introduction -- Panic, fear and counter-terrorist law-making -- The right to be free from arbitrary detention -- Counter-terrorist detention : the executive approach -- Legislating for counter-terrorist detention -- International human rights law's resilience in the face of panic -- Judicial responses to counter-terrorist detention : rights-based resistance? -- Conclusion. |
| Sommario/riassunto | In this book, Fiona de Londras presents an overview of counter-terrorist detention in the US and the UK and the attempts by both states to achieve a downward recalibration of international human rights standards as they apply in an emergency. Arguing that the design and implementation of this policy has been greatly influenced by both popular and manufactured panic, Detention in the 'War on Terror' addresses counter-terrorist detention through an original analytic framework. In contrast to domestic law in the US and UK, de |

Londras argues that international human rights law has generally resisted the challenge to the right to be free from arbitrary detention, largely because of its relative insulation from counter-terrorist panic. She argues that this resilience gradually emboldened superior courts in the US and UK to resist repressive detention laws and policies and insist upon greater rights-protection for suspected terrorists.
