

v. 10 • n. 18 • Jun. 2013
Biannual
English Edition

INFORMATION AND HUMAN RIGHTS

● **Sérgio Amadeu da Silveira**

Aaron Swartz and the Battles for Freedom of Knowledge

● **Alberto J. Cerda Silva**

Internet Freedom is not Enough:
Towards an Internet Based on Human Rights

● **Fernanda Ribeiro Rosa**

Digital Inclusion as Public Policy:
Disputes in the Human Rights Field

● **Laura Pautassi**

Monitoring Access to Information from the Perspective
of Human Rights Indicators

● **Jo-Marie Burt and Casey Cagley**

Access to Information, Access to Justice:
The Challenges to Accountability in Peru

● **Marisa Viegas e Silva**

The United Nations Human Rights Council: Six Years On

● **Jérémie Gilbert**

Land Rights as Human Rights:
The Case for a Specific Right to Land

● **Pétalla Brandão Timo**

Development at the Cost of Violations:
The Impact of Mega-Projects on Human Rights in Brazil

● **Daniel W. Liang Wang and Octavio Luiz Motta Ferraz**

Reaching Out to the Needy? Access to Justice and Public Attorneys'
Role in Right to Health Litigation in the City of São Paulo

● **Obonye Jonas**

Human Rights, Extradition and the Death Penalty:
Reflections on The Stand-Off Between Botswana and South Africa

● **Antonio Moreira Maués**

Supra-Legality of International Human Rights Treaties
and Constitutional Interpretation



EDITORIAL BOARD

Christof Heyns University of Pretoria (South Africa)
Emilio García Méndez University of Buenos Aires (Argentina)
Fifi Benaboud North-South Centre of the Council of Europe (Portugal)
Fiona Macaulay Bradford University (United Kingdom)
Flávia Piovesan Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (Brazil)
J. Paul Martin Columbia University (United States)
Kwame Karikari University of Ghana (Ghana)
Mustapha Kamel Al-Sayyid Cairo University (Egypt)
Roberto Garretón Former-UN Officer of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (Chile)
Upendra Baxi University of Warwick (United Kingdom)

EDITORS

Pedro Paulo Poppovic
Oscar Vilhena Vieira

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Maria Brant - Executive Editor
Albertina de Oliveira Costa
Conrado Hubner Mendes
Glenda Mezarobba
Hélio Batista Barboza
Juana Kweitel
Laura Waisbich
Lucia Nader

EDITING

Luz González
Francisca Evrard

REVISION OF TRANSLATIONS

Carolina Fairstein (Spanish)
Ana Godoy (Portuguese)
The Bernard and Audre Rapoport
Center for Human Rights and Justice,
University of Texas, Austin (English)

GRAPHIC DESIGN

Oz Design

ART EDITING

Alex Furini

CIRCULATION

Luz González

PRINTING

Prol Editora Gráfica Ltda.

ADVISORY BOARD

Alejandro M. Garro Columbia University (United States)
Bernardo Sorj Federal University of Rio de Janeiro / Edelstein Center (Brazil)
Bertrand Badie Sciences-Po (France)
Cosmas Gitta UNDP (United States)
Daniel Mato CONICET / National University of Tres de Febrero (Argentina)
Daniela Ikawa International Network on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights / Columbia University (United States)
Ellen Chapnick Columbia University (United States)
Ernesto Garzon Valdes University of Mainz (Germany)
Fateh Azzam Arab Human Rights Fund (Lebanon)
Guy Haarscher Université Libre de Bruxelles (Belgium)
Jeremy Sarkin University of the Western Cape (South Africa)
João Batista Costa Saraiva Regional Jurisdiction for Children and Adolescents of Santo Ângelo/RS (Brazil)
José Reinaldo de Lima Lopes University of São Paulo (Brazil)
Juan Amaya Castro University for Peace (Costa Rica)/VU University Amsterdam (Netherlands)
Lucia Dammert Global Consortium on Security Transformation (Chile)
Luigi Ferrajoli University of Rome (Italy)
Luiz Eduardo Wanderley Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo (Brazil)
Malak El-Chichini Poppovic Conectas Human Rights (Brazil)
Maria Filomena Gregori University of Campinas (Brazil)
Maria Hermínia Tavares de Almeida University of São Paulo (Brazil)
Miguel Cillero University Diego Portales (Chile)
Mudar Kassis Birzeit University (Palestine)
Paul Chevigny New York University (United States)
Philip Alston New York University (United States)
Roberto Cuéllar M. Inter-American Institute of Human Rights (Costa Rica)
Roger Raupp Rios Federal University of Rio Grande do Sul (Brazil)
Shepard Forman New York University (United States)
Victor Abramovich University of Buenos Aires (UBA)
Victor Topanou National University of Benin (Benin)
Vinodh Jaichand Irish Centre for Human Rights, National University of Ireland (Ireland)

SUR - International Journal On Human Rights is a biannual journal published in English, Portuguese and Spanish by Conectas Human Rights. It is available on the Internet at <<http://www.surjournal.org>>

SUR is covered by the following abstracting and indexing services: IBSS (International Bibliography of the Social Sciences); ISN Zurich (International Relations and Security Network); DOAJ (Directory of Open Access Journals) and SSRN (Social Science Research Network). In addition, SUR is also available at the following commercial databases: EBSCO, HEINonline, ProQuest and Scopus. SUR has been rated A1 and B1, in Colombia and in Brazil (Qualis), respectively.

SUR. Revista Internacional de Direitos Humanos / Sur – Rede Universitária de Direitos Humanos – v.1, n.1, jan.2004 – São Paulo, 2004 - .

Semestral

ISSN 1806-6445

Edições em Inglês, Português e Espanhol.

1. Direitos Humanos 2. ONU I. Rede Universitária de Direitos Humanos

CONTENTS

INFORMATION AND HUMAN RIGHTS

SÉRGIO AMADEU DA SILVEIRA	7	Aaron Swartz and the Battles for Freedom of Knowledge
ALBERTO J. CERDA SILVA	17	Internet Freedom is not Enough: Towards an Internet Based on Human Rights
FERNANDA RIBEIRO ROSA	33	Digital Inclusion as Public Policy: Disputes in the Human Rights Field
LAURA PAUTASSI	55	Monitoring Access to Information from the Perspective of Human Rights Indicators
JO-MARIE BURT AND CASEY CAGLEY	75	Access to Information, Access to Justice: The Challenges to Accountability in Peru
<hr/>		
MARISA VIEGAS E SILVA	97	The United Nations Human Rights Council: Six Years On
JÉRÉMIE GILBERT	115	Land Rights as Human Rights: The Case for a Specific Right to Land
PÉTALLA BRANDÃO TIMO	137	Development at the Cost of Violations: The Impact of Mega-Projects on Human Rights in Brazil
DANIEL W. LIANG WANG AND OCTAVIO LUIZ MOTTA FERRAZ	159	Reaching Out to the Needy? Access to Justice and Public Attorneys' Role in Right to Health Litigation in the City of São Paulo
OBONYE JONAS	181	Human Rights, Extradition and the Death Penalty: Reflections on The Stand-Off Between Botswana and South Africa
ANTONIO MOREIRA MAUÉS	205	Supra-Legality of International Human Rights Treaties and Constitutional Interpretation

PRESENTATION



SUR 18 was produced in collaboration with the organizations **Article 19** (Brazil and United Kingdom) and **Fundar** (Mexico). In this issue's thematic dossier, we have published articles that analyze the many relationships between information and human rights, with the ultimate goal of answering the questions: What is the relationship between human rights and information and how can information be used to guarantee human rights? This issue also carries articles on other topics related to today's human rights agenda.

Thematic dossier: Information and Human Rights

Until recently, many human rights organizations from the Global South concentrated their activities on the defense of freedoms threatened by dictatorial regimes. In this context, their main strategy was whistleblowing, closely linked to the constant search for access to information on violations and the production of a counter narrative capable of including human rights concerns in political debates. Since they found no resonance in their own governments, the organizations very often directed their whistleblowing reports to foreign governments and international organizations, in an attempt to persuade them to exert external pressure on their own countries.*

Following the democratization of many societies in the Global South, human rights organizations began to reinvent their relationship with the State and with the system's other actors, as well as how they engaged with the population of the countries where they were operating. But the persistence of violations even after the fall of the dictatorships and the lack of transparency of many governments from the South meant that the production of counter narratives continued to be the main working tool of these organizations. Information, therefore, was still their primary raw material, since combating human rights violations necessarily requires knowledge of them (locations where they occur, the main agents involved, the nature of the victims and the frequency of occurrences etc.). Their reports, however, previously submitted to foreign governments and international organizations, were now directed at local actors, with the expectation that, armed with information about the violations and endowed with voting power and other channels of participation, they themselves would exert pressure on their governments. Furthermore, after democratization, in addition to combating abuses, many human rights organizations from the Global South aspired to become legitimate actors in the formulation of public policies to guarantee human rights, particularly the rights of minorities that are very often not represented by the majority voting system.

In this context, the information produced by the public authorities, in the form of internal reports, became fundamental for the work of civil society. These days, organizations want data not only on rights violations committed by the State, such as statistics on torture and po-

lice violence, but also activities related to public management and administration. Sometimes, they want to know about decision-making processes (how and when decisions are made to build new infrastructure in the country, for example, or the process for determining how the country will vote in the UN Human Rights Council), while at other times they are more interested in the results (how many prisoners there are in given city or region, or the size of the budget to be allocated to public health). Therefore, access to information was transformed into one of the main claims of social organizations working in a wide range of fields, and the issue of publicity and transparency of the State became a key one. This movement has scored some significant victories in recent years, and a growing number of governments have committed to the principles of Open Government** or approved different versions of freedom of information laws.***

This legislation has played an important role in the field of transitional justice, by permitting that human rights violations committed by dictatorial governments finally come to light and, in some cases, that those responsible for the violations are brought to justice. In their article **Access to Information, Access to Justice: The Challenges to Accountability in Peru**, Jo-Marie Burt and Casey Cagley examine, with a focus on Peru, the obstacles faced by citizens pursuing justice for atrocities committed in the past.

As the case of Peru examined by Burt and Cagley demonstrates, the approval of new freedom of information laws no doubt represents important progress, but the implementation of this legislation has also shown that it is not enough to make governments truly transparent. Very often, the laws only require governments to release data in response to a freedom of information request. They do not, therefore, require the State to produce reports that

**The Open Government Partnership is an initiative created by eight countries (South Africa, Brazil, South Korea, United States, Philippines, Indonesia, Mexico, Norway and United Kingdom) to promote government transparency. The Declaration of Open Government was signed by the initial eight members in 2011, and by the end of 2012 the network had been joined by 57 nations (Available at: <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2012/09/198255.htm>). The initiative takes into account the different stages of public transparency in each of the member countries, which is why each country has its own plan of action for implementing the principles of open government. More information on the initiative is available at: <http://www.opengovpartnership.org>.

***In 1990, only 13 countries had some form of Freedom of Information legislation (Cf. Toby Mendel. 2007. Access to information: the existing State of affairs around the world. In. VILLANUEVA, Ernesto. *Derecho de la información, culturas y sistemas jurídicos comparados*. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México). By 2010, however, approximately 70 countries had adopted such a law. (Cf. Roberts, Alasdair S. 2010. A Great and Revolutionary Law? The First Four Years of India's Right to Information Act. *Public Administration Review*, vol.70, n. 6, p. 25-933.). Among them, South Africa (2000), Brazil (2012), Colombia (2012), South Korea (1998), India (2005), Indonesia (2010), Mexico (2002) and Peru (2003).

*K. Sikkink coined the term "boomerang effect" to describe this type of work by civil society organizations from countries living under non-democratic regimes.

make the existing data intelligible, nor to release the information on their own accord. The problem is exacerbated when the State does not even produce the data that is essential for the social control of its activities. Another area in which transparency is deficient is information on private actors that are subsidized by public funding, such as mining companies, or that operate public concessions, such as telecommunications providers.

Many organizations from the South have spent time producing reports that translate government data into comprehensible information that can inform the working strategies of organized civil society or the political decisions of citizens. Human rights organizations have also pressured their governments to measure their performance against indicators that can help identify and combat inequalities in access to rights. This is the topic of the article by Laura Pautassi, entitled **Monitoring Access to Information from the Perspective of Human Rights Indicators**, in which the author discusses the mechanism adopted recently by the Inter-American System of Human Rights concerning the obligation of States-Parties to provide information under article 19 of the Protocol of San Salvador.

The relationship between information and human rights, however, is not limited to the field of government transparency. The lack of free access to information produced in the private sphere can also intensify power imbalances or even restrict access to rights for particularly vulnerable groups. The clearest example of this last risk is the pharmaceutical industry, which charges astronomical prices for medicines protected by patent laws, effectively preventing access to health for entire populations. The privatization of scientific production by publishers of academic journals is another example. The issue gained notoriety recently with the death of Aaron Swartz, an American activist who allegedly committed suicide while he was the defendant in a prolonged case of copyright violation. Sérgio Amadeu da Silveira opens this issue of SUR with a profile of Swartz (**Aaron Swartz and the Battles for Freedom of Knowledge**), linking his life to the current struggles for freedom of knowledge given the toughening of intellectual property laws and the efforts of the copyright industry to subordinate human rights to the control of the sources of creation.

Since the internet has taken on a crucial role in the production and dissemination of information, it is natural for it to have become a battleground between the public interest and private interests, as illustrated by the Swartz case. On this point, civil society and governments have sought to adopt regulations intended to balance these two sides of the scale, such as so-called Internet Freedom, the subject of another article in this issue. In **Internet Freedom is not Enough: Towards an Internet Based on Human Rights**, Alberto J. Cerda Silva argues that the measures proposed by this set of public and private initiatives are not sufficient to achieve their proposed goal, which is to contribute to the progressive realization of human rights and the functioning of democratic societies.

The importance of the internet as a vehicle of communication and information also means that internet access is now a key aspect of economic and social inclusion. To correct inequalities in this area, civil society organizations and governments have created programs aimed at the so-called "digital inclusion" of groups that face difficulty accessing the web. Fernanda Ribeiro Rosa, in another article from this issue's dossier on Information and Human Rights, **Digital Inclusion as Public Policy: Disputes in the Human Rights Field**, defends the importance of address-

ing digital inclusion as a social right, which, based on the dialogue in the field of education and the concept of digital literacy, goes beyond simple access to ICT and incorporates other social skills and practices that are necessary in the current informational stage of society.

Non-thematic articles

This issue also carries five additional articles on other relevant topics for today's human rights agenda.

In **Development at the Cost of Violations: The Impact of Mega-Projects on Human Rights in Brazil**, Pétalla Brandão Timo examines a particularly relevant contemporary issue: the human rights violations that have occurred in Brazil as a result of the implementation of mega development projects, such as the Belo Monte hydroelectric complex, and preparations for mega-events like the 2014 World Cup.

Two articles address economic and social rights. In **Land Rights as Human Rights: The Case for a Specific Right to Land**, Jérémie Gilbert offers arguments for the incorporation of the right to land as a human right in international treaties, since to date it still only appears associated with other rights. In **Reaching Out to the Needy? Access to Justice and Public Attorneys' Role in Right to Health Litigation in the City of São Paulo**, Daniel W. Liang Wang and Octavio Luiz Motta Ferraz analyze legal cases related to the right to health in São Paulo in which the litigants are represented by public defenders and prosecutors, in order to determine whether the cases have benefited the most disadvantaged citizens and contributed to the expansion of access to health.

Another article looks at the principal UN mechanism for the international monitoring of human rights. In **The United Nations Human Rights Council: Six Years on**, Marisa Viegas e Silva critically examines the changes introduced to this UN body in the first six years of its work.

In **Human Rights, Extradition and the Death Penalty: Reflections on the Stand-Off between Botswana and South Africa**, Obonye Jonas examines the deadlock between the two African nations concerning the extradition of Botswana citizens who are imprisoned in South Africa and accused in their country of origin of crimes that carry the death penalty.

Finally, Antonio Moreira Maués, in **Supra-Legality of International Human Rights Treaties and Constitutional Interpretation**, analyzes the impacts of a decision in 2008 by the Supreme Court on the hierarchy of international human rights treaties in Brazilian law, when the court adopted the thesis of supra-legality.



This is the sixth issue of SUR published with funding and collaboration from the Carlos Chagas Foundation (FCC). We would like to thank the FCC once again for its crucial support of Sur Journal since 2010. We would also like to express our gratitude to Camila Asano, David Banisar, David Lovatón, Eugenio Buccì, Félix Reategui, Ivan Estevão, João Brant, Jorge Machado, Júlia Neiva, Luís Roberto de Paula, Marcela Viera, Margareth Arilha, Marijane Lisboa, Maurício Hashizume, Nicole Fritz, Reginaldo Nasser and Sérgio Amadeu for reviewing the articles submitted for this issue of the journal. Finally, we would like to thank Laura Trajber Waisbich (Conectas) for the insights on the relationship between information and human rights that provided the foundation for this Presentation.



MARISA VIEGAS E SILVA

Marisa Viegas e Silva is a lawyer with a Masters in Political Science from the Federal University of Pernambuco (2001), a specialization in Fundamental Rights from the Carlos III University of Madrid, a specialization in Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law from the Externado University of Colombia (2007), a Masters (2008) and a Doctorate in Advanced Studies in Human Rights from the Carlos III University of Madrid (2011). She currently works as a lawyer at the NGO Justiça Global.

Email: marisa@global.org.br

ABSTRACT

In 2006, the Human Rights Council was established within the United Nations to replace the Commission on Human Rights, which had been in existence since 1946. The creation of the new body was justified by the need to combat some of the weaknesses of the Commission, particularly its excessive “politicization”, and to establish a body that could respond more quickly to situations of human rights violations. This article aims to critically analyze the impact of the changes introduced in these early years of the Council’s work, while also questioning the validity of politicization as an argument for the dissolution of the UN’s main human rights body. The article is based on the conclusions of the author’s doctoral thesis on the same subject, defended in December 2011 at the Carlos III University of Madrid.

Original in Portuguese. Translated by Barney Whiteoak.

Received in March 2013. Accepted in May 2013.

KEYWORDS

UN Human Rights Council – International protection systems – Politicization – Institutional transition



This paper is published under the *creativecommons* license.

This paper is available in digital format at www.surjournal.org.

THE UNITED NATIONS HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL: SIX YEARS ON*

Marisa Viegas e Silva

1 Introduction

As is widely known, the United Nations human rights protection system in 2006 underwent major institutional reform: the Commission on Human Rights was dissolved and in its place the Human Rights Council was created.

The Commission on Human Rights had functioned for 60 years as the principal body concerned with the defense of human rights within the universal protection system. It was essentially a political and intergovernmental body, which gained ground and expanded its functions over the years. It was responsible for the creation of the principal human rights treaties (such as the Universal Declaration) and the development of the non-conventional human rights protection mechanisms, including the 1503 complaint procedure and the special procedures (special rapporteurs, working groups, among others).

Despite the recognized achievements of the Commission over the course of its tenure, in its later years the body was the target of numerous criticisms. These were primarily related to the excessive political interference in decision making, which is known in UN lingo as “politicization.” These criticisms culminated in the UN reform process and in the need to establish a body with a greater capacity to react to human rights violations. This was the context that led to the replacement of the Commission with a Council, in 2006.

The first years of the Council’s work involved an initial stage of institution-building, when the mechanisms and procedures of the new system were defined, the subsidiary bodies were dissolved and renewed, the mandates of the special rapporteurs were reviewed and a new procedure was put in place – the Universal Periodic Review, which is frequently described as the major distinction of the new

*This article summarizes the main ideas defended in the doctoral thesis “El Consejo de Derechos Humanos de las Naciones Unidas”, defended at the Carlos III University of Madrid, Spain, in December 2011.

system. The document resulting from this restructuring process was Human Rights Council Resolution A/HRC/5/1 of 2007. This document, together with Resolution 60/251 of 2006, establishes the foundations for the work of the newly-created body.

Observing the provisions of Resolution 60/251, in the first half of 2011 the Council submitted itself to a double review process, which included an internal review of its work and functioning in its first five years of existence and a review by the General Assembly of the pertinence of raising the status of the Council to a subsidiary body of the UN.

The UN Human Rights Council maintained its headquarters in the city of Geneva, in Switzerland (in the same offices as the Commission), and began its activities in the same year it was created. It was tasked with consolidating a system of human rights protection based on the advances of the Commission, while overcoming the problems that hindered its predecessor. Consequently, the Council differs from the Commission in the following ways, among others:

- 1) Concerning its *structure*, the Council was created as a *subsidiary body of the General Assembly*, not of the Economic and Social Council like the Commission. This modification is directly related to the proposal for the Human Rights Council to be a principal organ of the UN;
- 2) The Council began to enjoy a *semi-permanent status*, in the sense that the regular sessions of the body are split up, so the Council can meet several times a year instead of just once, as was the custom for the former body. Therefore, the Council holds three regular sessions per year, with a total duration of at least ten weeks, and it also has the flexibility to hold a special session at any time. This change is related to the need to establish a body that can provide quicker responses to situations of human rights violations;
- 3) The new body also suffered a *slight modification in the number of members and in the selection criteria of its members*. The number of members was reduced from fifty-three at the time of the Commission to the current number of forty-seven. Similarly, a direct, individual and secret ballot system was established to select these members; the number of seats per regional group was modified; the number of reelections was restricted to prevent the existence of *de facto* permanent members, a problem which was common in the Commission; State candidates were encouraged to make voluntary campaign commitments and pledges; the obligation was established for Council members to be the first to submit to the Universal Periodic Review; and the possibility was introduced to suspend member States that commit serious human rights violations;
- 4) The subsidiary bodies that existed at the time of the Commission on Human Rights were either dissolved or renewed, most notable being the dissolution of the Commission's primary technical advisory body: the Sub-Commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights;
- 5) In relation to the non-conventional mechanisms, General Assembly Resolution

60/251 that created the Council provided for a review and improvement of the system of Special Procedures and of Procedure 1503 (complaint procedure);

- 6) Concerning the functions of the Council, the new body has basically the same mandate as the Commission, which consisted of activities related to drafting resolutions, promotion and protection, with the addition of the Universal Periodic Review;
- 7) Finally, a mechanism was introduced called the Universal Periodic Review, to examine the human rights situation of all UN Member States. This universal examination was conducted over a four-year period in the first cycle and, for the second cycle, it is expected to take four and a half years. The objective of the review is to permit all States to be treated equally and to avoid partiality when it comes to deciding which countries will have their human rights situations evaluated by the Council, a matter directly related to the debate on combating politicization.

In this article, we shall not revisit the details of the already much-debated institutional transition from Commission to Council. Instead, we shall move directly to a reflection on the impact of the modifications introduced by the Council in its early years of activity, in order to demonstrate both *the weakness of the politicization argument as a justification to dissolve the Commission and the inadequacy of the remedies used to achieve the proposed objective to combat politicization*. Let us, then, analyze these modifications.

2 On the status as a subsidiary body of the General Assembly

Although the Human Rights Council has maintained the same subsidiary nature as the Commission on Human Rights, it was created as a subsidiary body of the General Assembly instead of the Economic and Social Council in order to increase its legitimacy and importance. Even though this did not represent a major change in the status of the new body from a purely formal point of view, it was significant from a political perspective (BOYLE, 2009, p. 12).

This is due to the authority of the General Assembly as the primary UN forum, as well as being the only one where all member nations are represented, which gives human rights a new visibility, an essential requirement for the international protection of these rights. In this sense, the change of name from Commission to Council was a political strategy, and not simply nominal, to bring the Human Rights Council closer to the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council.

It is important to put into context the debate that called for the Human Rights Council to be a principal organ of the United Nations. A central part of what prompted the reform of the human rights institutions in the UN can be attributed to the growing importance that these rights had been acquiring in the organization over the decades, until they were recognized as one of the pillars of the UN system, together with development and security. According to this logic, if the other two pillars have their own councils (Security Council and Economic and Social Council) recognized in the United Nations Charter as principal organs, then human rights should likewise have their own council, also with the status of a principal organ.

In formal terms, it is worth noting that Resolution 60/251, which created the Human Rights Council, stipulated that the subsidiary status was to be reviewed after five years, in order to decide whether to elevate its status to a principal organ of the UN. The difficulty of such an upgrade lies not only in the political consequences of the decision, but also in formal issues, such as the difficulty of modifying the United Nations Charter, a fundamental condition for creating a new principal organ.

In its 2011 review, *the General Assembly decided to retain the Council as a subsidiary body, while providing for a new debate in the future*, which shall occur between 10 and 15 years after this first review. Therefore, despite the unquestionable consistency of the claims that human rights, just like development and security, should have their own principal organ within the UN system, it can be concluded based on the 2011 review process that the outlook of the various different UN Member States has not evolved substantially in recent years. In this respect, without overlooking the importance of giving human rights the institutional status they deserve in the UN, we do not believe, from a practical point of view, that raising the status of the Council to a principal organ is either crucial for the effective functioning of the body or to correct the weaknesses that affected its predecessor.

This is because if we look at the work of the Commission on Human Rights, in its role as a subsidiary body of the Economic and Social Council, there is little denying that it was an operative and functional body that achieved many important results over its sixty-year existence. Indeed, the Commission amassed so many positive results over the years that a movement emerged to weaken it as a system. In this context, its status as a subsidiary body of a principal organ of the UN does not appear to have posed a serious obstacle to the performance of its functions. Neither can it be said that elevating the status of the Council to a principal organ would help achieve the declared objective of the reform: to combat politicization.

As Alston argues, in the first decades of its existence, a period when it exerted a more technical function and avoided taking major political decisions, the Commission could work without being criticized for being overly political. With time, as it expanded its functions, its number of members increased and thus it started to reflect in a more realistic manner the international tensions and struggles for power, the attacks began (ALSTON, 1992, p. 129-130). Also Humphrey points out that the politicization argument began to be used only when States started taking the work of the Commission more seriously (HUMPHREY, 1989, p. 203). In addition, the concept of politicization varied depending on the group employing the term (CHETAIL, 2007, p. 140). These reasons, among others, indicate that the argument of politicization has been used to weaken the Commission.

3 The semi-permanence of the Human Rights Council

The second aspect of the Council that was considered an improvement in its legal and institutional nature was the duration of the sessions and their distribution over the course of the year. The Commission on Human Rights only met once a year for a period of six weeks, meaning that all the important issues were concentrated in one session, which resulted in that these issues were often left aside for the rest of the year (KALĪN; JIMENEZ, 2003, p. 14).

In addition to the difficulties of time management due to the concentration of its activities in a single session, there were also difficulties in reacting to serious situations that occurred in the period between the sessions as well as shortcomings when it came to following up on existing situations (SCANNELA; SPLINTER, 2007, p. 46).

With this concern in mind, Resolution 60/251 stipulated that the Council would meet at least three times over the course of the year, including a main session, for a total duration of no less than ten weeks. Moreover, the new body was given the flexibility to hold special sessions at any time, so it can quickly address issues related to imminent and particularly serious crises. Although the structure of the new body was intended to be semi-permanent, *in practice it functions like a permanent body*, due to the frequency with which it meets.

During the review process in the first half of 2011, although proposals were made to reduce the number of regular sessions to two a year instead of the originally stipulated three, no such change was made.

The fact is that the semi-permanent nature of the body has effectively resulted in an *important increase in its activity* compared to the Commission, enabling *a more immediate response to emergency human rights situations*, as we can observe in the resolutions approved by the Council on matters such as the coup in Honduras, the earthquake in Haiti, and the human rights situations in Libya and Syria.

Among the downsides of the new semi-permanent status, we can highlight the dilution of the publicity and attention that used to surround the single session, which brought together numerous actors from different parts of the world to exchange ideas and lodge complaints. Another important factor is the increased costs for the participants – whether non-governmental organizations, national human rights institutions or small and medium States – that come mainly from other parts of the world and find it difficult to regularly attend the sessions of the Council. (INTERNATIONAL SERVICE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, 2010, 2011)

4 The composition of the Human Rights Council

As we have already mentioned, one of the most criticized aspects of the former Commission was its composition, since one of the main justifications for dissolving the Commission was the alleged “bad quality” of some of its members that had a track record of bad conduct in the application of human rights (ALMQVIST, GOMEZ ISA, 2006, p. 42).

It is important to note that the debates on the composition of the Council centered in large part on quantitative aspects. More specifically, they focused on the number of members and the geographical distribution of the seats. However, the debates also concerned qualitative aspects of the Council.

In relation to the *quantitative aspects*, the two main suggestions on the matter (to universalize the composition of the Council, on one hand, and to reduce the number of members considerably, on the other) were disregarded, and the Council was created with practically the same number of seats as the Commission, with a slight reduction to 47 members.

In relation to the *qualitative aspects*, the dilemma revolved around whether the Human Rights Council should be comprised of members selected based on

their genuine commitment to the work of the body or, in contrast, on the principle of sovereign equality of States. This issue was first raised during the times of the Commission and it became more pronounced in the debate over the new body.

In the first place, it is interesting to mention that this dilemma is the result of the implicit recognition of the value and evolution of the work of the Commission on Human Rights, since such a concern did not exist beforehand (ALSTON, 2006, p. 191). At the start of its activities, the Commission limited itself to drafting international human rights instruments, avoiding for many years any political review of internal human rights situations or similar topics. Over time, however, the Commission extended its field of action and gradually incorporated new activities, such as the non-conventional protection mechanisms and the analysis of human rights situations in individual countries, which led some States to attempt to weaken the work and the authority of the body. One way of doing this was for States to use their participation on the Commission as protection from criticism, exploiting their member status and weakening the credibility of the body (NACIONES UNIDAS, 2005, para. 182).

The final outcome of this debate on the structure of the Council was, as we have seen, the approval of eligibility criteria for membership, the establishment of commitments for elected Member States, a restriction on the number of reelections (to prevent the existence of *de facto* permanent members) and the possibility of suspending members based on serious human rights violations (NACIONES UNIDAS, 2006, para. 7, 8 e 9).

Although the establishment of a firm commitment to cooperate was a positive sign, the legal provision is too abstract and vague. In order to make the formulation more objective, Member States were required to participate in the Universal Periodic Review during their mandate and the possibility was created to suspend members of the Council that commit gross and systematic human rights violations during the time they serve as members, a possibility that was used in the case of Libya (NAÇÕES UNIDAS, 2011).

To suspend a member of the Council, a two-third majority of the members present and voting in the General Assembly is required, while the election of members requires a two-third majority. The denounced human rights situation must be truly serious and a large margin of votes is required for the suspension to occur. Moreover, there is no provision, under any circumstances, for the expulsion of members, only their suspension. Nevertheless, the mere recognition of this possibility by Resolution 60/251 should be viewed as something positive.

5 The Advisory Committee as the technical assistance body of the Human Rights Council

As we mentioned earlier, Resolution 60/251 determined that the Human Rights Council assume and review the mandates and responsibilities of the Council's subsidiary and technical assistance bodies. As we have seen, this provision resulted in the dissolution of the Sub-Commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights and in the creation of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee.

The Committee was created with a smaller number of members – just 18, a significant reduction compared to the 26 members that existed at the time of the Commission – and with the authority to hold two sessions per year, with a maximum of

10 days each – instead of the single three-week annual session of the Sub-Commission. As far as the selection of the members is concerned, the process is still exclusively intergovernmental, despite several proposals to include other actors in this system.

Concerning its functions, the Advisory Committee maintained the mandate to generate knowledge for the Council through studies and reports. As such, in its first six years of activity, the Committee has examined a wide range of issues, resulting in an extensive normative production that includes the preparation of draft declarations and guidelines, final studies, as well as analysis of a variety of other topics of a substantive nature.

It is essential to recall that Resolution A/HRC/RES/5/1 of 2007 (NACIONES UNIDAS, 2007) explicitly limited the role of the Committee, requiring it to work exclusively on cases requested by the Human Rights Council. In other words, it eliminated the right of initiative that was created and consolidated within the Sub-Commission and that, as is commonly known, contributed so much to the evolution of international human rights protection.

Another important modification was the ban on the establishment of subsidiary bodies (those that existed at the time of the Sub-Commission were dissolved or transformed into subsidiary bodies of the new Human Rights Council) and the adoption of its own resolutions or decisions (NACIONES UNIDAS, 2007, para. 77, 81). Therefore, we can conclude that, at least in the case of the Advisory Committee, the transition from Commission to Council resulted in a significant reduction of the body's prerogatives and capacity for action, influencing the production of an independent and high quality academic reflection within the UN's main human rights body.

6 The special procedures in the early years of the Council's activity

As we have already mentioned, and as was to be expected given the importance of these mechanisms in the Commission on Human Rights, the resolution that created the Council maintained the special procedures, and also provided for a review and improvement of the system.

As such, a process of review, creation and extinction of mandates marked the initial stage of the special procedures in the Council. Concerning the review of the mandates, this did not involve a real reflection of the content and effectiveness of the mandates, since in general terms the system remained largely the same, with the extinction of some mandates, such as the mandate of the Democratic Republic of Congo, and the creation of others, such as the mandate on the right to safe drinking water and sanitation and the mandate on contemporary forms of slavery.

The review of the *thematic mandates* ran relatively smoothly, with the exception of some issues, such as freedom of religion and belief, the situation of human rights defenders, freedom of opinion and expression, torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment and extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, in which there was tension and hostility against the experts. The case of the country mandates, one of the most controversial topics since the time of the Commission, was also fraught with tension, as was to be expected.

In relation to the *country situations*, it is worth noting that these were also addressed at the special sessions of the Council, which were frequent in these early years. In this period, therefore, the Council examined the human rights situation in Palestine and Other Occupied Arab Territories, in Sudan, in the Democratic Republic of Congo, in Ivory Coast, in Libya and in Syria, among others. Of these, the issue that most occupied the attention of the Council in this period, just like during the times of the Commission, was Palestine and Other Occupied Arab Territories, which was the subject of the majority of the special sessions and of a large number of resolutions, decisions and studies.

In relation to the special procedures' *protection* tasks, they consisted of continuing the practice of establishing interactive dialogue with mandate holders, defining and establishing a new process for nominating and selecting the experts, as well drafting and approving a Code of Conduct for them. In this respect, the new nomination process has the advantage of being more transparent compared to the process used by the Commission, and of permitting both greater State participation and greater political control over the decision of the President of the Council. However, as is to be expected in a body of eminently political nature, as is the Council's case, political negotiations play an undeniable role in the nomination process.

With respect to the Code of Conduct for the special procedures, the drafting of this document generated, from the outset, a great deal of controversy, particularly given the concern that it would be used as a means to weaken the system. As experience has shown, despite the advantage of lending predictability to the performance of the special procedures, taking a step forward in their institutionalization, the document also runs the risk of serving as a means to restrict the independence of the special procedures mandate holders. As a result, in the work of the Council, all the renewed mandates started to include a reference to the Code, and in its second year of activities the Council established a formal instrument for vetoing the automatic re-nomination of a mandate holder in the event of suspected non-compliance with the Code of Conduct. Similarly, in its 11th session, the Council once again approved a resolution reminding mandate holders of the obligation to perform their functions in strict compliance with this document. Moreover, in these early years of the Council's work, reference to the Code of Conduct was practically obligatory in resolutions to create or renew mandates and it has been used as a means to criticize the work of the experts, in cases of disagreement with the content of a study or with a particular practice adopted by a mandate holder.

7 The complaint procedure in the early years of the Council's activity

Just as occurred with the special procedures, the Human Rights Council maintained a complaints procedure albeit under a "new" guise. However, that procedure is quite similar to the previous system, principally because it maintains the questionable principle confidentiality. Confidentiality meant that only the names of the countries that were being examined or ceased being investigated through procedure 1503 were made public, meaning that not even the author of a denunciation could follow the process. With the institutional transition to a Council, in addition to the name change to "new" complaint procedure, definitively leaving out any

reference to “procedure 1503”, the new developments that have been introduced to the system include the easing of admissibility requirements, the greater frequency of meetings of the working groups responsible for analyzing the cases, the amount of information that must be provided to the complainant (slightly more, despite the limits of confidentiality), the possibility for the complainant to request that their identity not be revealed to the State, the establishment of time frames (both for the State to present information and for the Council to review the case) and the possibility for the Council to recommend, as a final solution, that the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights provide technical assistance to the State concerned.

In relation to the complaint procedure *in practice*, after an initial structuring period, the Council was relatively productive in analyzing and deciding on the situations presented through this mechanism. Given the lack of public data to evaluate whether the modifications introduced through the “new” procedure have effectively improved the complaint mechanism (for example, whether the more flexible admissibility requirements have in fact resulted in an increase in the number of complaints submitted, or whether the fact that the complainants are being informed more frequently about the steps of the procedure has resulted in a greater degree of satisfaction with the system), based on the information available in the annual reports of the Council, we can only affirm that most of the cases it examined were discontinued.

Generally speaking, it can be concluded that the lack of public data – a direct consequence of confidentiality – has resulted in a general disinterest in the procedure, which can be clearly observed in what little NGO and academic research is available on the topic. During the first six years of the Council, it was virtually impossible to find any reference to procedure 1503 going beyond a mere description of the general character of the transition. This is true not only of reports written by organizations such as Human Rights Watch, International Service for Human Rights and Conectas, all of whom regularly follow the work of the Commission, but also of numerous scholars who studied the issue and even of the Council’s own annual reports. Even though the new complaint procedure has addressed – at least partially – two important problems of procedure 1503 (namely the lengthiness of the complaint process and the lack of information for the complainant), from our point of view a real improvement in the procedure must necessarily involve relaxing the confidentiality, a change that does not seem very likely at the moment, given the lost opportunity during the review of the work and functioning of the Council, completed in March 2011, which kept the complaint procedure intact.

8 The Universal Periodic Review

The Universal Periodic Review (UPR) is considered a new development because it did not exist at the time of the Commission. For this reason, and also because it was proposed as one of the main mechanisms to combat politicization – if not the main one – its introduction into the UN human rights protection system was widely celebrated. Among its most important characteristics, we can highlight: the analysis

of the human rights situation of all UN Member States in cycles of four years (first cycle) and four and a half years (from the second cycle onwards), the cooperative and strongly intergovernmental nature of the review, the full participation in the review by the State under examination and the non-binding nature of the recommendations, among others.

In relation to the practical application of the UPR during the first cycle, it was marked by the indefiniteness that typically accompanies newly-established mechanisms of a body that itself is equally young. Concerning the formulated recommendations, which are individual in nature, these were characterized by heterogeneity (recommendations of all kinds were presented: objective, overly general, empty and even some that conflicted with human rights norms)¹ and abundance (the number of recommendations was quite high).² Equally varied were the responses to the recommendations by States that, besides either rejecting or accepting each one, also frequently used the tactic of postponing their assessment of a recommendation until a later date or subtly rejecting it. This means that the aspects supposedly presented as positive (such as the large number of formulated recommendations and the high percentage of accepted recommendations) are only relative indicators of the effectiveness of the procedure.

Concerning the development of the UPR, in the interactive dialogue that occurs during the review process, the following trends, among others, have been observed: the presence of “friendly States” to issue favorable comments during the review, thereby avoiding a more in-depth debate on the other issues of real interest; the shortage of truly critical comments and the predominance of complimentary comments;³ and the tendency among States to concentrate on topics of their own interest instead of concentrating on the human rights problems of the State under examination.

It is worth noting that the purpose of the UPR is not to duplicate the work already performed by the human rights treaty bodies and by the special procedures, but to complement it. In this sense, the UPR differs from these other mechanisms in a number of ways, such as its essentially inter-State character, i.e. the recommendations are issued by States individually and not by the Council as a body; the possibility for the State under review to accept or reject each recommendation, with the consequence that only accepted recommendations need to be implemented; and, the universality of the review and of the rights under review. Moreover, during these early years of activity, there have been instances of positive exchanges of information between the UPR and the other mechanisms – for example, some recommendations formulated during the UPR have been used by the human rights treaty bodies or by the special procedures and, conversely, several States have used their participation in the UPR to comment on their activities before these mechanisms, or to make recommendations to other countries related to these mechanisms.⁴ We can also affirm that the Universal Periodic Review has, to some extent, served as an incentive to implement the obligations of the special procedures and the treaty bodies.⁵

As positive aspects of these early years of the UPR, we would highlight, among other things, the possibility of reviewing the human rights situation in all

UN Member States; the broad participation of States in the process; the possibility of establishing dialogue between States and NGOs; and, the creation of a sense of connection with the UN human rights protection system. As shortcomings, we would emphasize the insufficiency and misdistribution of time for the review; the excessive number of recommendations and their heterogeneity; the lack of assistance from human rights experts during the process (TARDU, 2007, p. 975); the limited opportunity for participation by such non-State actors as NGOs; and, the questionable financial sustainability of the mechanism (INTERNATIONAL SERVICE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, 2009, p. 7-8).

In relation to the first issue, if one observes the time offered to member states and observers during the review process, one can see that demand exceeded opportunities to intervene. In China's review during the first cycle, for example, 115 delegations registered to speak during the interactive dialogue; in Cuba's case, there were 110 requests to speak; and, in the case of the Russian Federation, there were 73. The participation of all those who enrolled to speak was clearly unfeasible, taking into account that the procedure allowed for two hours of debate. In relation to the excessive number of recommendations, until the 8th UPR session, in May 2010, 12.384 recommendations had been made, an average of 1.548 recommendations per session.

Concerning the reduced room for participation of other non-state actors, it is worth noting that ONGs cannot intervene directly in the UPR interactive dialogue. Their contribution is restricted to the option of presenting a report of up to five pages, whose content may be used to support the OHCHR when it writes a document which will serve as a basis for the examined state. The other opportunity for collaboration occurs during 20 minutes in the debate about the final report in the Council. The limited opportunities for NGO participation makes direct lobby the most obvious work strategy, especially with "friendly delegations", so as to achieve that they intervene in other States reviews regarding themes that the organizations work on.

The second cycle of the UPR began in May 2012 and included some new procedures introduced after the 2011 review of the work and functioning of the Council. As a result, the length of the sessions increased by half an hour (with an extra 10 minutes for the State under examination and an additional 20 minutes for the other States) and new rules were put in place for the list of speakers. The number of recommendations remained high throughout the first and second cycle, without this resulting in greater precision or clarity of the recommendations.

Finally, as the main challenge for the mechanism's future, we would point to the need to strike a balance between the notion of cooperative dialogue and the application of constructive criticism and, more importantly, the imperative to eliminate the practice employed by a large number of States to use the Universal Periodic Review as a political instrument to defend their own interests and not as an instrument to promote and protect human rights, which is the function for which it was created. Another crucial issue, and in our opinion decisive for assessing the real success of the UPR in the future, is the need to ensure effective follow-up to the recommendations formulated during the previous review cycle.

9 Some thoughts on politicization as a justification for dissolving the Commission and creating the Council

We appreciate that a proper analysis of the results of the modifications introduced by the Council is not possible without addressing the matter of politicization, which was the reason (at least the alleged reason) for making the change. In this respect, we consider it questionable that combating politicization was one of the main justifications given for dissolving the Commission and creating the Council, and we also argue that the remedies created to mitigate the problem are inadequate.

On this point, it is essential to recall that both the Commission and the Council were created as intergovernmental political bodies comprised of representatives of various UN Member States. This confers an essentially political nature on their activities, which cannot be eliminated merely with formal modifications to the structure.

Therefore, it is no coincidence that the same criticisms that were leveled at the Commission are now being leveled at its successor (“business as usual”). The accusation of politicization is due, in essence, to the political nature of the body and this cannot be automatically resolved by a few essentially formal institutional fixes. Even though, when the Commission was dissolved, there was a unanimous agreement that the political influence on its work was excessive, the same unanimity did not apply to the reasons why each group reached this diagnosis, with opinions varying between those that believed that politicization was due to excessive interference and selective involvement by the Commission in countries and those that, in contrast, defended that the Commission ought to have a more active inspection role. In a context such as this, any attempt to end politicization in a body like the Human Rights Council is unrealistic, if not naïve or fallacious.

This political option has been obvious from the initial decision in 1946 to establish the Commission on Human Rights as an intergovernmental body through to the decision of the UN General Assembly in 2006 to maintain this same structure for the Human Rights Council. On this point, it is worth noting that the fact that the Council is an intergovernmental body is not necessarily bad. As we know, the decisions adopted by a body comprised by State representatives has the advantage of being already equipped with an important dose of political realism, and they have more chance of being implemented than decisions adopted by bodies comprised exclusively by experts. Indeed, the Commission on Human Rights serves as a good example, since it was an intergovernmental body that, despite all the criticism it received and the restrictions of its mandate, played an important part in the evolution of International Human Rights Law. There is nothing to stop the same thing from happening with the Council, although any such assertion at this stage would be premature.

If the objective of the reform had really been to lessen the impact of political influence on the work of the new body, the approach should have been to introduce more participation by experts in the work of the Council, through measures to strengthen the activities of the Advisory Committee or the special procedures system, which did not happen. Instead, what actually occurred, in the case of the Advisory Committee, was a significant reduction of its prerogatives and capacity for action,

and, in the case of the special procedures, the fear of a possible restriction of its independence through the newly approved code of conduct.

Another example of the persistence of the excessive political influence on the work of the Council is the Universal Periodic Review. Considered the major innovation of the new body and the primary mechanism created to combat politicization, one of the main characteristics of the UPR is its excessively intergovernmental nature and the near absence of human rights experts. Moreover, as we have mentioned, during the first cycle of the new procedure, the practice emerged of avoiding criticism of the States under review through an alliance with friendly States, which were urged to participate in the review with favorable comments. In other words, political negotiations predominate in the UPR, a mechanism that is supposedly intended to reduce them. This is one of the reasons why it is difficult to defend with any conviction that the institutional transition served the political ends it claimed to pursue.

10 Conclusions

This brief analysis gives us a general overview of the impact of the main modifications that occurred on account of the dissolution of the Commission on Human Rights and the creation of the Human Rights Council to replace it. Without discrediting the importance of some truly positive aspects and bearing in mind that it is still too early to conclusively assess the Human Rights Council (taking into account that the Commission took six decades to develop its mechanisms for the promotion and protection of human rights), we contend that the impact of the modifications introduced in these early years of the Council's activity leave a good deal to be desired.

On the one hand, the Council embodies changes that we consider positive, such as its semi-permanent status, the adjustments to the process of selecting members and the possibility of suspending them, the UPR itself and the possibility of reviewing the human rights situation of all UN Member States. On the other hand, as we have already mentioned, it is repeating the same problems that existed under the Commission and that justified the reform – namely politicization and the use of double standards. Furthermore, and most importantly, the intergovernmental nature of the body was strengthened and a tendency to restrict the role of civil society can be observed.

In relation to the politicization and the use of double standards, as we have already indicated, these are political problems that are largely associated with the intergovernmental nature of the body, but also with the same fundamental paradox that has accompanied international human rights protection since the outset: it involves asking States to monitor the human rights violations they themselves have committed, by action or omission.

These considerations allow us to affirm that the argument of ending politicization as the primary justification for extinguishing the Commission on Human Rights is an empty one. It is a product of the political interests that prevailed in the Commission at the time of the approval of the reform.

In these early years of activity, the occasions when the Council has adopted a decisive and active posture, such the suspension of Libya's membership of the body, have been a consequence of the political will and the work of some State

delegations to achieve a Human Rights Council that is more committed to the implementation of its mandate.

Based on the long evolution of the Commission on Human Rights, the short history of the Human Rights Council, the fact that the political environment in the Council corresponds to the reality of international relations in recent years and that the formal and structural conditions of the body, while relevant, may be molded to fit the dominant political will of the time, it is natural to conclude that the way in which the Council will be remembered in history will depend, ultimately, on the evolution of politics and international relations in the years to come.

REFERENCES

Bibliography and other sources

- ABRAHAM, Meghna. 2006. **A new chapter for human rights: a handbook on issues of transition from the Commission on Human Rights to the Human Rights Council.** Geneva, Switzerland: International Service for Human Rights (ISHR); Friedrich Ebert Stiftung (FES). Available at: <<http://www.ishr.ch/guides-to-the-un-system/handbook>> and <<http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/bueros/genf/04375.pdf>>. Last accessed on: May, 2013.
- ALMQVIST, Jessica; GOMEZ ISA, Felipe. **El Consejo de Derechos Humanos: oportunidades y desafíos.** Bilbao: Universidad de Deusto, 2006. (Cuardenos Deusto de Derechos Humanos, 40).
- ALSTON, Philip. "The Commission on Human Rights", In P. Alston (ed.), **The United Nations and Human Rights. A critical appraisal.** Nova York/Oxford: Clarendon Press/Oxford University Press.
- _____. 2006. Reconceiving the UN Human Rights regime: challenges confronting the New UN Human Rights Council. **Melbourne Journal of International Law**, v. 7, No. 1, p. 185-224, may.
- BOYLE, Kevin. 2009. The United Nations Human Rights Council: origins, antecedents, and prospects. In: BOYLE, Kevin (Ed.). **New institutions for human rights protection.** Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2009. p. 11-47.
- CHETAİL, Vincent., 2007. "Le Conseil des Droits de l'home des Nations Unies : réformer pour ne rien changer ?", En V. Chetail (edit), **Conflicts, sécurité et coopération : liber amicorum Victor-Yves Ghebali/ Conflicts, security and cooperation : liber amicorum Victor-Yves Ghebali**, Bruylant, Bruselas,
- HUMPHREY, John J. 1989. *No distant millennium. The International Law of Human Rights.* Paris: UNESCO,
- INTERNATIONAL SERVICE FOR HUMAN RIGHST. 2009. **Human Rights Monitor**, n. 67/2009.

- _____. 2010a. **Human Rights Monitor Quarterly**, Issue 2/3, Geneva, July.
- _____. 2010b. "Human Rights Council Review. What you need to know", **Human Rights Monitor Quarterly**, Issue 2/3, Geneva, New York, July.
- _____. 2010c. **Human Rights Monitor Quarterly**, Issue 3/3, Geneva, October.
- _____. 2011a. **Human Rights Monitor Quarterly**, Issue 1/4, Geneva, January.
- _____. 2011b. **Human Rights Monitor Quarterly**, Issue 2/4, Geneva, April.
- _____, 2011c. **Human Rights Monitor Quarterly**, Issue 3, Geneva, July.
- KALĪN, Walter; JIMENEZ, Cecilia. 2003. **Reform of the UN Commission on Human Rights**. Study Commissioned by the Swiss Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Political Division IV). Bern; Geneva, Switzerland: Institute of Public Law, University of Bern, 30 August 2003.
- LAUREN, Paul Gordon. 2007. To preserve and build on its achievements and to redress its shortcomings: the journey from the Commission on Human Rights to the Human Rights Council. **Human Rights Quarterly**, Baltimore, MD, v. 29, No. 2, p. 307-345, may.
- LEMPINEN, Miko; SCHEININ, Martin. 2007. **The New Human Rights Council: the first two years**. Substantive Report of the Workshop organized by the European University Institute, Istituto Affari Internazionali, and The Institute for Human Rights at Åbo Akademi University. Villa Schifanoia, La Cappella: European University Institute, 7-8 Noviembre. Available at: <<http://www.eui.eu/Documents/DepartmentsCentres/AcademyofEuropeanLaw/Projects/HRCReport.pdf>>. Last accessed on: May, 2013.
- MARIE, Jean-Bernard. 1975. **La Commission des Droits de l'Homme de l'ONU**. Paris: Pedone, 1975.
- MCMAHON, Edward R. 2010. **Herding Cats and Sheep: Assessing State and Regional Behaviour in the Universal Periodic Review Mechanism of the United Nations Human Rights Council**. July 2010. Available at: <http://www.upr-info.org/IMG/pdf/McMahon_Herding_Cats_and_Sheeps_July_2010.pdf>. Last accessed on: May, 2013.
- MÜLLER, Lars; LUTZ, Christian. 2007. **The first 365 days of the United Nations Human Rights Council**. Geneva, Switzerland: Lars Müller.
- NACIONES UNIDAS. 2005. Asamblea General. **Un concepto más amplio de libertad: desarrollo, seguridad y derechos humanos para todos. Informe del Secretario General**. Doc. ONU. A/59/2005, de 21 de marzo de 2005, párr. 182.
- _____. 2006. **Resolución de la Asamblea General de la ONU n. A/RES/60/251, de 03 de abril de 2006**.
- _____. 2007. Consejo de Derechos Humanos. **Construcción institucional del Consejo de Derechos Humanos**. Doc. ONU. A/HRC/RES/5/ de 5 de junio de 2007.
- _____. 2008. Consejo de Derechos Humanos. Examen Periódico Universal. **Informe del Grupo de Trabajo sobre el Examen Periódico Universal. Bahrein**. Doc. ONU n. A/HRC/8/19, de 22 de mayo de 2008.

- _____. 2009a. Consejo de Derechos Humanos. Examen Periódico Universal. **Informe del Grupo de Trabajo sobre el Examen Periódico Universal. Afganistán.** Doc. ONU A/HRC/12/9, de 20 de julio de 2009, párrafos 29 y 96 recomendación 13;
- _____. 2009b. Consejo de Derechos Humanos. Examen Periódico Universal. **Informe del Grupo de Trabajo sobre el Examen Periódico Universal. Alemania.** Doc. ONU n A/HRC/11/15, de 4 de marzo de 2009.
- _____. 2010. Asamblea General de la ONU. Aplicación efectiva de los instrumentos internacionales de derechos humanos, incluidas las obligaciones en materia de presentación de informes de conformidad con esos instrumentos. Doc. ONU n. A/65/190, de 6 de agosto de 2010, Anexo II, párrafo 41.
- NADER, Lucia. 2007. O papel das ONGs no Conselho de Direitos Humanos da ONU. **SUR.** São Paulo, v. 4, n. 7, p. 7-25. Available at: <http://www.surjournal.org/conteudos/pdf/7/nader.pdf>. Last accessed on: May, 2013.
- SCANNELLA, Patrizia; SPLINTER, Peter. 2007. The United Nations Human Rights Council: a promise to be fulfilled. **Human Rights Law Review**, v. 7, n. 1, p. 41-72.
- TARDU, Maxime. 2007. Le nouveau conseil des droits de l'homme aux Nations Unies: decadence ou résurrection? *Reviste Trimestrielle des droits de l'homme*, 72/2007.
- TISTOUNET, Eric. From Commission on Human Rights to Human Rights Council: itinerary of a reform process. In: KÄLIN, Walter et al. **International law, conflict and development: the emergence of a holistic approach in international affairs.** Leiden; Boston: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2010. p. 325-354.

NOTES

1. See Naciones Unidas (2009a), paragraph 95; A/HRC/8/48, of June 5, 2008, paragraph 58.
2. Until the 13th session, 2,479 recommendations had been proposed. Cfr. <http://www.upr-info.org/database/statistics/>, consulted on May 7, 2013.
3. See: Naciones Unidas (2008), paragraphs 19 (Palestine), 20 (India), 21 (Pakistan), 22 (Qatar), 23 (Tunisia), 24 (United Arab Emirates), 25 (Saudi Arabia), 26 (Turkey), 27 (Malaysia) and 30 (Libya), among others.
4. See Naciones Unidas (2009b), paragraph 81, recommendation 33.
5. See the final document of the 17th meeting of special rapporteurs/representatives, experts and chairs of working groups of the special procedures with the chairs and members of treaty bodies, (Naciones Unidas, 2010, Annex II, paragraph 41)

RESUMO

No ano de 2006, estabeleceu-se no seio da ONU um Conselho de Direitos Humanos, em substituição à Comissão de Direitos Humanos, que existia desde 1946. A criação do novo órgão justificou-se pela necessidade de combater algumas debilidades existentes na época da Comissão, em especial a excessiva “politização”, e de contar com um órgão que respondesse mais ágilmente às situações de violação de direitos humanos. O artigo busca analisar de forma crítica o impacto das mudanças introduzidas nesses primeiros anos de atuação, questionando também a validade da politização como argumento para a extinção do principal órgão de defesa dos direitos humanos na ONU. O artigo se baseia nas conclusões da tese de doutorado da autora sobre este mesmo tema, defendida em dezembro de 2011 na Universidade Carlos III de Madri.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE

Conselho de Direitos Humanos da ONU – Sistemas Internacionais de Proteção – Politização – Transição institucional

RESUMEN

En 2006, se estableció en el seno de la ONU un Consejo de Derechos Humanos, en lugar de la Comisión de Derechos Humanos, que existía desde 1946. La creación de este nuevo órgano se justificó por la necesidad de combatir algunas debilidades que existían en la época de la Comisión, especialmente la excesiva “politización”, y por la necesidad de contar con un órgano que respondiera más ágilmente a las situaciones de violación de los derechos humanos. Este artículo busca analizar de forma crítica el impacto de los cambios incorporados en estos primeros años de funcionamiento, cuestionando también la validez de la politización como argumento para la extinción del principal órgano de defensa de los derechos humanos de la ONU. Este artículo se basa en las conclusiones de la tesis de doctorado de la autora sobre el mismo tema, defendida en diciembre de 2011 en la Universidad Carlos III de Madrid.

PALABRAS CLAVE

Consejo de Derechos Humanos de la ONU – Sistemas Internacionales de Protección – Politización – Transición Institucional

PREVIOUS NUMBERS

Previous numbers are available at <www.surjournal.org>.

SUR 1, v. 1, n. 1, Jun. 2004

EMILIO GARCÍA MÉNDEZ
Origin, Concept and Future of Human Rights: Reflections for a New Agenda

FLAVIA PIOVESAN
Social, Economic and Cultural Rights and Civil and Political Rights

OSCAR VILHENA VIEIRA AND A. SCOTT DUPREE
Reflections on Civil Society and Human Rights

JEREMY SARKIN
The Coming of Age of Claims for Reparations for Human Rights Abuses Committed in the South

VINODH JAICHAND
Public Interest Litigation Strategies for Advancing Human Rights in Domestic Systems of Law

PAUL CHEVIGNY
Repression in the United States after the September 11 Attack

SERGIO VIEIRA DE MELLO
Only Member States Can Make the UN Work Five Questions for the Human Rights Field

SUR 2, v. 2, n. 2, Jun. 2005

SALIL SHETTY
Millennium Declaration and Development Goals: Opportunities for Human Rights

FATEH AZZAM
Reflections on Human Rights Approaches to Implementing the Millennium Development Goals

RICHARD PIERRE CLAUDE
The Right to Education and Human Rights Education

JOSÉ REINALDO DE LIMA LOPES
The Right to Recognition for Gays and Lesbians

E.S. NWAUCHE AND J.C. NWOBIKE
Implementing the Right to Development

STEVEN FREELAND
Human Rights, the Environment and Conflict: Addressing Crimes against the Environment

FIONA MACAULAY
Civil Society-State Partnerships for the Promotion of Citizen Security in Brazil

EDWIN REKOSH
Who Defines the Public Interest?

VÍCTOR E. ABRAMOVICH
Courses of Action in Economic, Social and Cultural Rights: Instruments and Allies

SUR 3, v. 2, n. 3, Dec. 2005

CAROLINE DOMMEN
Trade and Human Rights: Towards Coherence

CARLOS M. CORREA
TRIPS Agreement and Access to Drugs in Developing Countries

BERNARDO SORJ
Security, Human Security and Latin America

ALBERTO BOVINO
Evidential Issues before the Inter-American Court of Human Rights

NICO HORN
Eddie Mabo and Namibia: Land Reform and Pre-Colonial Land Rights

NLERUM S. OKOGBULE
Access to Justice and Human Rights Protection in Nigeria: Problems and Prospects

MARÍA JOSÉ GUEMBE
Reopening of Trials for Crimes Committed by the Argentine Military Dictatorship

JOSÉ RICARDO CUNHA
Human Rights and Justiciability: A Survey Conducted in Rio de Janeiro

LOUISE ARBOUR
Plan of Action Submitted by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

SUR 4, v. 3, n. 4, Jun. 2006

FERNANDE RAINE
The measurement challenge in human rights

MARIO MELO
Recent advances in the justiciability of indigenous rights in the Inter American System of Human Rights

ISABELA FIGUEROA
Indigenous peoples versus oil companies: Constitutional control within resistance

ROBERT ARCHER
The strengths of different traditions: What can be gained and what might be lost by combining rights and development?

J. PAUL MARTIN
Development and rights revisited: Lessons from Africa

MICHELLE RATTON SANCHEZ
Brief observations on the mechanisms for NGO participation in the WTO

JUSTICE C. NWOBIKE
Pharmaceutical corporations and access to drugs in developing countries: The way forward

CLÓVIS ROBERTO ZIMMERMANN
Social programs from a human rights perspective: The case of the Lula administration's family grant in Brazil

CHRISTOF HEYNS, DAVID PADILLA AND LEO ZWAAK
A schematic comparison of regional human rights systems: An update

BOOK REVIEW

SUR 5, v. 3, n. 5, Dec. 2006

CARLOS VILLAN DURAN
Lights and shadows of the new United Nations Human Rights Council

PAULINA VEGA GONZÁLEZ
The role of victims in International Criminal Court proceedings: their rights and the first rulings of the Court

OSWALDO RUIZ CHIRIBOGA
The right to cultural identity of indigenous peoples and national minorities: a look from the Inter-American System

LYDIAH KEMUNTO BOSIRE
Overpromised, underdelivered: transitional justice in Sub-Saharan Africa

DEVIKA PRASAD
Strengthening democratic policing and accountability in the Commonwealth Pacific

IGNACIO CANO
Public security policies in Brazil: attempts to modernize and democratize versus the war on crime

TOM FARER
Toward an effective international legal order: from co-existence to concert?

BOOK REVIEW

SUR 6, v. 4, n. 6, Jun. 2007

UPENDRA BAXI
The Rule of Law in India

OSCAR VILHENA VIEIRA
Inequality and the subversion of the Rule of Law

RODRIGO UPRIMNY YEPES
Judicialization of politics in Colombia: cases, merits and risks

LAURA C. PAUTASSI
Is there equality in inequality? Scope and limits of affirmative actions

GERT JONKER AND RIKA SWANZEN
Intermediary services for child witnesses testifying in South African criminal courts

PREVIOUS NUMBERS

Previous numbers are available at <www.surjournal.org>.

SERGIO BRANCO

Brazilian copyright law and how it restricts the efficiency of the human right to education

THOMAS W. POGGE

Eradicating systemic poverty: brief for a Global Resources Dividend

SUR 7, v. 4, n. 7, Dec. 2007

LUCIA NADER

The role of NGOs in the UN Human Rights Council

CECÍLIA MACDOWELL SANTOS

Transnational legal activism and the State: reflections on cases against Brazil in the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights

TRANSITIONAL JUSTICE

TARA URS

Imagining locally-motivated accountability for mass atrocities: voices from Cambodia

CECILY ROSE AND

FRANCIS M. SSEKANDI

The pursuit of transitional justice and African traditional values: a clash of civilizations – The case of Uganda

RAMONA VIJEYARASA

Facing Australia's history: truth and reconciliation for the stolen generations

ELIZABETH SALMÓN G.

The long road in the fight against poverty and its promising encounter with human rights

INTERVIEW WITH JUAN MÉNDEZ

By Glenda Mezarobba

SUR 8, v. 5, n. 8, Jun. 2008

MARTÍN ABREGÚ

Human rights for all: from the struggle against authoritarianism to the construction of an all-inclusive democracy – A view from the Southern Cone and Andean region

AMITA DHANDA

Constructing a new human rights lexicon: Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

LAURA DAVIS MATTAR

Legal recognition of sexual rights – a comparative analysis with reproductive rights

JAMES L. CAVALLARO AND

STEPHANIE ERIN BREWER

The virtue of following: the role of Inter-American litigation in campaigns for social justice

RIGHT TO HEALTH AND ACCESS TO MEDICAMENTS

PAUL HUNT AND RAJAT KHOSLA

The human right to medicines

THOMAS POGGE

Medicines for the world: boosting innovation without obstructing free access

JORGE CONTESSE AND DOMINGO LOVERA PARMO

Access to medical treatment for people living with HIV/AIDS: success without victory in Chile

GABRIELA COSTA CHAVES, MARCELA FOGAÇA VIEIRA AND RENATA REIS

Access to medicines and intellectual property in Brazil: reflections and strategies of civil society

SUR 9, v. 5, n. 9, Dec. 2008

BARBORA BUKOVSKÁ

Perpetrating good: unintended consequences of international human rights advocacy

JEREMY SARKIN

Prisons in Africa: an evaluation from a human rights perspective

REBECCA SAUNDERS

Lost in translation: expressions of human suffering, the language of human rights, and the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission

SIXTY YEARS OF THE UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

PAULO SÉRGIO PINHEIRO

Sixty years after the Universal Declaration: navigating the contradictions

FERNANDA DOZ COSTA

Poverty and human rights from rhetoric to legal obligations: a critical account of conceptual frameworks

EITAN FELNER

A new frontier in economic and social rights advocacy? Turning quantitative data into a tool for human rights accountability

KATHERINE SHORT

From Commission to Council: has the United Nations succeeded in creating a credible human rights body?

ANTHONY ROMERO

Interview with Anthony Romero, Executive Director of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU)

SUR 10, v. 6, n. 10, Jun. 2009

ANUJ BHUWANIA

“Very wicked children”: “Indian torture” and the Madras Torture Commission Report of 1855

DANIELA DE VITO, AISHA GILL AND DAMIEN SH-ORT

Rape characterised as genocide

CHRISTIAN COURTIS

Notes on the implementation by Latin American courts of the ILO Convention 169 on indigenous peoples

BENYAM D. MEZMUR

Intercountry adoption as a measure of last resort in Africa: Advancing the rights of a child rather than a right to a child

HUMAN RIGHTS OF PEOPLE ON THE MOVE: MIGRANTS AND REFUGEES

KATHARINE DERDERIAN AND LIESBETH SCHÖCKAERT

Responding to “mixed” migration flows: A humanitarian perspective

JUAN CARLOS MURILLO

The legitimate security interests of the State and international refugee protection

MANUELA TRINDADE VIANA

International cooperation and internal displacement in Colombia: Facing the challenges of the largest humanitarian crisis in South America

JOSEPH AMON AND KATHERINE TODRYS

Access to antiretroviral treatment for migrant populations in the Global South

PABLO CERIANI CERNADAS

European migration control in the African territory: The omission of the extraterritorial character of human rights obligations

SUR 11, v. 6, n. 11, Dec. 2009

VÍCTOR ABRAMOVICH

From Massive Violations to Structural Patterns: New Approaches and Classic Tensions in the Inter-American Human Rights System

VIVIANA BOHÓRQUEZ MONSALVE

AND JAVIER AGUIRRE ROMÁN
Tensions of Human Dignity: Conceptualization and Application to International Human Rights Law

DEBORA DINIZ, LÍVIA BARBOSA AND WEDERSON RUFINO DOS SANTOS

Disability, Human Rights and Justice

JULIETA LEMAITRE RIPOLL

Love in the Time of Cholera: LGBT Rights in Colombia

ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS

MALCOLM LANGFORD

Domestic Adjudication and Economic, Social and Cultural Rights: A Socio-Legal Review

PREVIOUS NUMBERS

Previous numbers are available at <www.surjournal.org>.

ANN BLYBERG

The Case of the Mislaid Allocation: Economic and Social Rights and Budget Work

ALDO CALIARI

Trade, Investment, Finance and Human Rights: Assessment and Strategy Paper

PATRICIA FEENEY

Business and Human Rights: The Struggle for Accountability in the UN and the Future Direction of the Advocacy Agenda

INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS COLLOQUIUM

Interview with Rindai Chipfunde-Vava, Director of the Zimbabwe Election Support Network (ZESN) Report on the IX International Human Rights Colloquium

SUR 12, v. 7, n. 12, Jun. 2010

SALIL SHETTY

Foreword

FERNANDO BASCH ET AL.

The Effectiveness of the Inter-American System of Human Rights Protection: A Quantitative Approach to its Functioning and Compliance With its Decisions

RICHARD BOURNE

The Commonwealth of Nations: Intergovernmental and Nongovernmental Strategies for the Protection of Human Rights in a Post-colonial Association

MILLENNIUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

Combating Exclusion: Why Human Rights Are Essential for the MDGs

VICTORIA TAULI-CORPUZ

Reflections on the Role of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues in relation to the Millennium Development Goals

ALICIA ELY YAMIN

Toward Transformative Accountability: Applying a Rights-based Approach to Fulfill Maternal Health Obligations

SARAH ZAIDI

Millennium Development Goal 6 and the Right to Health: Conflictual or Complementary?

MARCOS A. ORELLANA

Climate Change and the Millennium Development Goals: The Right to Development, International Cooperation and the Clean Development Mechanism

CORPORATE ACCOUNTABILITY

LINDIWE KNUTSON

Aliens, Apartheid and US Courts: Is the Right of Apartheid Victims to Claim Reparations from Multinational Corporations at last Recognized?

DAVID BILCHITZ

The Ruggie Framework: An Adequate Rubric for Corporate Human Rights Obligations?

SUR 13, v. 7, n. 13, Dec. 2010

GLENDA MEZAROBBA

Between Reparations, Half Truths and Impunity: The Difficult Break with the Legacy of the Dictatorship in Brazil

GERARDO ARCE ARCE

Armed Forces, Truth Commission and Transitional Justice in Peru

REGIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS MECHANISMS

FELIPE GONZÁLEZ

Urgent Measures in the Inter-American Human Rights System

JUAN CARLOS GUTIÉRREZ AND SILVANO CANTÚ

The Restriction of Military Jurisdiction in International Human Rights Protection Systems

DEBRA LONG AND LUKAS MUNTINGH

The Special Rapporteur on Prisons and Conditions of Detention in Africa and the Committee for the Prevention of Torture in Africa: The Potential for Synergy or Inertia?

LUCYLINE NKATHA MURUNGI AND JACQUI GALLINETTI

The Role of Sub-Regional Courts in the African Human Rights System

MAGNUS KILLANDER

Interpreting Regional Human Rights Treaties

ANTONIO M. CISNEROS DE ALENCAR

Cooperation Between the Universal and Inter-American Human Rights Systems in the Framework of the Universal Periodic Review Mechanism

IN MEMORIAM

Kevin Boyle – Strong Link in the Chain
By Borislav Petranov

SUR 14, v. 8, n. 14, Jun. 2011

MAURICIO ALBARRACÍN CABALLERO

Social Movements and the Constitutional Court: Legal Recognition of the Rights of Same-Sex Couples in Colombia

DANIEL VÁZQUEZ AND DOMITILLE DELAPLACE

Public Policies from a Human Rights Perspective: A Developing Field

J. PAUL MARTIN

Human Rights Education in Communities Recovering from Major Social Crisis: Lessons for Haiti

THE RIGHTS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES

LUIS FERNANDO ASTORGA GATJENS

Analysis of Article 33 of the UN Convention: The Critical Importance of National Implementation and Monitoring

LETÍCIA DE CAMPOS VELHO MARTEL

Reasonable Accommodation: The New Concept from an Inclusive Constitutional Perspective

MARTA SCHAAF

Negotiating Sexuality in the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

TOBIAS PIETER VAN REENEN AND HELÉNE COMBRINCK

The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in Africa: Progress after 5 Years

STELLA C. REICHER

Human Diversity and Asymmetries: A Reinterpretation of the Social Contract under the Capabilities Approach

PETER LUCAS

The Open Door: Five Foundational Films That Seeded the Representation of Human Rights for Persons with Disabilities

LUIS GALLEGOS CHIRIBOGA

Interview with Luis Gallegos Chiriboga, President (2002-2005) of the Ad Hoc Committee that Drew Up the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

SUR 15, v. 8, n. 15, Dec. 2011

ZIBA MIR-HOSSEINI

Criminalising Sexuality: *Zina* Laws as Violence Against Women in Muslim Contexts

LEANDRO MARTINS ZANITELLI

Corporations and Human Rights: The Debate Between Voluntarists and Obligationists and the Undermining Effect of Sanctions

INTERVIEW WITH DENISE DORA
Former Ford Foundation's Human Rights Officer in Brazil (2000-2011)

PREVIOUS NUMBERS

Previous numbers are available at <www.surjournal.org>.

IMPLEMENTATION AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL OF THE DECISIONS OF THE REGIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS SYSTEMS

MARIA ISSAEVA, IRINA SERGEEVA AND MARIA SUCHKOVA

Enforcement of the Judgments of the European Court of Human Rights in Russia: Recent Developments and Current Challenges

CÁSSIA MARIA ROSATO AND LUDMILA CERQUEIRA CORREIA

The *Damião Ximenes Lopes* Case: Changes and Challenges Following the First Ruling Against Brazil in the Inter-American Court of Human Rights

DAMIÁN A. GONZÁLEZ-SALZBERG

The Implementation of Decisions from the Inter-American Court of Human Rights in Argentina: An Analysis of the Jurisprudential Swings of the Supreme Court

MARCIA NINA BERNARDES

Inter-American Human Rights System as a Transnational Public Sphere: Legal and Political Aspects of the Implementation of International Decisions

SPECIAL ISSUE: CONECTAS HUMAN RIGHTS - 10 YEARS

The Making of an International Organization from/in the South

SUR 16, v. 9, n. 16, Jun. 2012

PATRICIO GALELLA AND CARLOS ESPÓSITO

Extraordinary Renditions in the Fight Against Terrorism. Forced Disappearances?

BRIDGET CONLEY-ZILKIC

A Challenge to Those Working in the Field of Genocide Prevention and Response

MARTA RODRIGUEZ DE ASSIS MACHADO, JOSÉ RODRIGO RODRIGUEZ, FLAVIO MARQUES PROL, GABRIELA JUSTINO DA SILVA, MARINA ZANATA GANZAROLLI AND RENATA DO VALE ELIAS

Law Enforcement at Issue: Constitutionality of *María da Penha* Law in Brazilian Courts

SIMON M. WELDEHAIMANOT

The ACHPR in the Case of *Southern Camerouns*

ANDRÉ LUIZ SICILIANO

The Role of the Universalization of Human Rights and Migration in the Formation of a New Global Governance

CITIZEN SECURITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS

GINO COSTA

Citizen Security and Transnational Organized Crime in the Americas: Current Situation and Challenges in the Inter-American Arena

MANUEL TUFRÓ

Civic Participation, Democratic Security and Conflict Between Political Cultures. First Notes on an Experiment in the City of Buenos Aires

CELS

The Current Agenda of Security and Human Rights in Argentina. An Analysis by the Center for Legal and Social Studies (CELS)

PEDRO ABRAMOVAY

Drug policy and *The March of Folly*

Views on the Special Police Units for Neighborhood Pacification (UPPs) in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

Rafael Dias — Global Justice Researcher

José Marcelo Zacchi — Research Associate, Institute for Studies on Labor and Society — IETS

SUR 17, v. 9, n. 17, Jun. 2013

DEVELOPMENT AND HUMAN RIGHTS

CÉSAR RODRÍGUEZ GARAVITO, JUANA KWEITEL AND LAURA TRAJBER WAISBICH

Development and Human Rights: Some Ideas on How to Restart the Debate

IRENE BIGLINO, CHRISTOPHE GOLAY AND IVONA TRUSCAN
The Contribution of the UN Special Procedures to the Human Rights and Development Dialogue

LUIS CARLOS BUOB CONCHA

The Right to Water: Understanding its Economic, Social and Cultural Components as Development Factors for Indigenous Communities

ANDREA SCHETTINI

Toward a New Paradigm of Human Rights Protection for Indigenous Peoples: A Critical Analysis of the Parameters Established by the Inter-American Court of Human Rights

SERGES ALAIN DJOYOU KAMGA AND SIYAMBONGA HELEBA

Can Economic Growth Translate into Access to Rights? Challenges Faced by Institutions in South Africa in Ensuring that Growth Leads to Better Living Standards

INTERVIEW WITH SHELDON LEADER

Transnational Corporations and Human Rights

ALINE ALBUQUERQUE AND DABNEY EVANS

Right to Health in Brazil: A Study of the Treaty-Reporting System

LINDA DARKWA AND PHILIP ATTUQUAYEFIO

Killing to Protect? Land Guards, State Subordination and Human Rights in Ghana

CRISTINA RĂDOI

The Ineffective Response of International Organisations Concerning the Militarization of Women's Lives

CARLA DANTAS

Right of Petition by Individuals within the Global Human Rights Protection System

The work of the Carlos Chagas Foundation revolves around the principle of citizenship. Its specialities and lines of research are geared towards human and social development.

Research production at the FCC, which addresses the issues of policy evaluation, gender and race, consists of in-depth studies on the various levels of education.

In the Foundation's three publications – *Cadernos de Pesquisa* (Research Journals), *Estudos em Avaliação Educacional* (Educational Evaluation Studies) and *Textos FCC* (FCC Texts) – this academic production features alongside the work of researchers from other institutions, providing a diversified view of the issues in the field.



Fundação Carlos Chagas

A REFERENCE IN EDUCATION WWW.FCC.ORG.BR