

ISSN 1806-6445

v. 11 • n. 20 • Jun./Dec. 2014

sur

20

COMMEMORATIVE ISSUE
HUMAN RIGHTS IN MOTION



CONECTAS
HUMAN RIGHTS

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)
Flavia 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 EDITORS

Maria Brant – Executive editor
 Thiago Amparo – Guest editor
 Luz González – Assistant executive editor

EXECUTIVE BOARD

Albertina de Oliveira Costa
 Ana Cernov
 Conrado Hubner Mendes
 Glenda Mezarobba
 Juana Kweitel
 Laura Waisbich
 Lucia Nader
 Luz González
 Manoela Miklos
 Maria Brant
 Thiago Amparo

REFERENCES

Luz González
 Thiago Amparo
 Tânia Rodrigues

LANGUAGE REVISION**SPANISH**

Carolina Fairstein
 Celina Lagrutta
 Erika Sanchez Saez
 Laia Fargas Fursa

PORTUGUESE

Erika Sanchez Saez
 Renato Barreto
 Marcela Vieira

ENGLISH

Murphy McMahon
 Oliver Hudson
 The Bernard and Audre Rapoport
 Center for Human Rights and Justice,
 University of Texas, Austin.
 Tina Amado

GRAPHIC DESIGN

Oz Design

LAYOUT

Alex Furini

COVER DESIGN

Mariana Brend

COVER PHOTO

Renato Stockler

CIRCULATION

Beatriz Kux

PRINTING

Yangraf Gráfica e Editora Ltda/Alphagraphics

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 Angelo/RS (Brazil)
José Reinaldo de Lima Lopes University of São Paulo (Brazil)
Juan Amaya Castro VU University Amsterdam/ University for Peace (Costa Rica)
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 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

Human Rights in Motion

CONTENTS

| | | |
|--|------------|---|
| LUCIA NADER, JUANA KWEITEL, & MARCOS FUCHS | 7 | Introduction |
| PROFILE OF PEDRO PAULO POPPOVIC | 11 | “We Did not Create Sur Journal Because We Had Certainties, But Because We Were Full of Doubts” |
| MALAK EL-CHICHINI POPPOVIC OSCAR VILHENA VIEIRA | 17 | Reflections On the International Human Rights Movement in the 21 st Century: Only the Answers Change |
| LANGUAGE | | |
| SARA BURKE | 27 | What an Era of Global Protests Says about the Effectiveness of Human Rights as a Language to Achieve Social Change |
| VINODH JAICHAND | 35 | After Human Rights Standard Setting, What’s Next? |
| DAVID PETRASEK | 45 | Global Trends and the Future of Human Rights Advocacy |
| SAMUEL MOYN | 57 | The Future of Human Rights |
| STEPHEN HOPGOOD | 67 | Challenges to the Global Human Rights Regime: Are Human Rights Still an Effective Language for Social Change? |
| EMÍLIO ÁLVAREZ ICAZA | 77 | Human Rights as an Effective Way to Produce Social Change |
| INTERVIEW WITH RAQUEL ROLNIK | 81 | UN Special Procedures System is “Designed to Be Ineffective” |
| INTERVIEW WITH PAULO SÉRGIO PINHEIRO | 91 | “Besides Human Rights, I Don’t See a Solution for Serving the Victims” |
| INTERVIEW WITH KUMI NAIDOO | 97 | “The Rule of Law Has Consolidated All the Injustices That Existed Before It” |
| THEMES | | |
| JANET LOVE | 105 | Are we Depoliticising Economic Power?: Wilful Business Irresponsibility and Bureaucratic Response by Human Rights Defenders |
| PHIL BLOOMER | 115 | Are Human Rights an Effective Tool for Social Change?: A Perspective on Human Rights and Business |
| GONZALO BERRÓN | 123 | Economic Power, Democracy and Human Rights. A New International Debate on Human Rights and Corporations |
| DIEGO LORENTE PÉREZ DE EULATE | 133 | Issues and Challenges Facing Networks and Organisations Working in Migration and Human Rights in Mesoamerica |
| GLORIA CAREAGA PÉREZ | 143 | The Protection of LGBTI Rights: An Uncertain Outlook |

ARVIND NARRAIN **151** Brazil, India, South Africa:
Transformative Constitutions and their Role in LGBT Struggles

SONIA CORRÊA **167** Emerging powers: Can it be that sexuality and human rights
is a 'lateral issue'?

CLARA SANDOVAL **181** Transitional Justice and Social Change

PERSPECTIVES

NICOLE FRITZ **193** Human Rights Litigation in Southern Africa:
Not Easily Able to Discount Prevailing Public Opinion

MANDIRA SHARMA **201** Making Laws Work:
Advocacy Forum's Experiences in Prevention of Torture in Nepal

MARIA LÚCIA DA SILVEIRA **213** Human Rights and Social Change in Angola

SALVADOR NKAMATE **219** The Struggle for the Recognition of Human Rights in Mozambique:
Advances and Setbacks

HARIS AZHAR **227** The Human Rights Struggle in Indonesia:
International Advances, Domestic Deadlocks

HAN DONGFANG **237** A vision of China's Democratic Future

ANA VALÉRIA ARAÚJO **247** Challenges to the Sustainability of the Human Rights
Agenda in Brazil

MAGGIE BEIRNE **257** Are we Throwing Out the Baby with the Bathwater?: The North-South
Dynamic from the Perspective of Human Rights Work in Northern Ireland

INTERVIEW WITH
MARÍA-I. FAGUAGA IGLESIAS **265** "The Particularities in Cuba Are Not Always Identified Nor
Understood By Human Rights Activists From Other Countries"

VOICES

FATEH AZZAM **273** Why Should We Have to "Represent" Anyone?

MARIO MELO **283** Voices from the Jungle on the Witness Stand of the
Inter-American Court of Human Rights

ADRIAN GURZA LAVALLE **293** NGOs, Human Rights and Representation

JUANA KWEITEL **305** Experimentation and Innovation in the Accountability
of Human Rights Organizations in Latin America

PEDRO ABRAMOVAY
AND HELOISA GRIGGS **323** Democratic Minorities in 21st Century Democracies

JAMES RON, DAVID CROW AND
SHANNON GOLDEN **335** Human Rights Familiarity and Socio-Economic Status:
A Four-Country Study

CHRIS GROVE **353** To Build a Global Movement to Make Human Rights
and Social Justice a Reality For All

INTERVIEW WITH MARY LAWLOR
AND ANDREW ANDERSON **365** "Role of International Organizations Should Be to Support
Local Defenders"

TOOLS

- | | | |
|---|------------|--|
| GASTÓN CHILLIER AND PÉTALLA BRANDÃO TIMO | 375 | The Global Human Rights Movement in the 21 st Century: Reflections from the Perspective of a National Human Rights NGO from the South |
| MARTIN KIRK | 385 | Systems, Brains and Quiet Places: Thoughts on the Future of Human Rights Campaigning |
| ROCHELLE JONES, SARAH ROSENHEK AND ANNA TURLEY | 399 | A 'Movement Support' Organization: The Experience of the Association For Women's Rights in Development (AWID) |
| ANA PAULA HERNÁNDEZ | 411 | Supporting Locally-Rooted Organizations: The Work of the Fund For Global Human Rights in Mexico |
| MIGUEL PULIDO JIMÉNEZ | 419 | Human Rights Activism In Times of Cognitive Saturation: Talking About Tools |
| MALLIKA DUTT AND NADIA RASUL | 427 | Raising Digital Consciousness: An Analysis of the Opportunities and Risks Facing Human Rights Activists in a Digital Age |
| SOPHEAP CHAK | 437 | New Information and Communication Technologies' Influence on Activism in Cambodia |
| SANDRA CARVALHO AND EDUARDO BAKER | 449 | Strategic Litigation Experiences in the Inter-American Human Rights System |
| INTERVIEW WITH FERNAND ALPHEN | 461 | "Get Off Your Pedestal" |
| INTERVIEW WITH MARY KALDOR | 469 | "NGO's are not the Same as Civil Society But Some NGOs Can Play the Role of Facilitators" |
| INTERVIEW WITH LOUIS BICKFORD | 475 | Convergence Towards the Global Middle: "Who Sets the Global Human Rights Agenda and How" |

MULTIPOLARITY

- | | | |
|--|------------|--|
| LUCIA NADER | 483 | Solid Organisations in a Liquid World |
| KENNETH ROTH | 491 | Why We Welcome Human Rights Partnerships |
| CÉSAR RODRÍGUEZ-GARAVITO | 499 | The Future of Human Rights: From Gatekeeping to Symbiosis |
| DHANANJAYAN SRISKANDARAJAH AND MANDEEP TIWANA | 511 | Towards a Multipolar Civil Society |
| INTERVIEW WITH EMILIE M. HAFNER-BURTON | 519 | "Avoiding Using Power Would Be Devastating for Human Rights" |
| INTERVIEW WITH MARK MALLOCH-BROWN | 525 | "We Are Very Much A Multi-Polar World Now, But Not One Comprised Solely Of Nation States" |
| INTERVIEW WITH SALIL SHETTY | 531 | "Human Rights Organisations Should Have a Closer Pulse to the Ground" Or How We Missed the Bus |
| INTERVIEW WITH LOUISE ARBOUR | 539 | "North-South solidarity is key" |

INTRODUCTION



HUMAN RIGHTS IN MOTION: A MAP TO A MOVEMENT'S FUTURE

Lucia Nader (Executive Director, Conectas)
Juana Kweitel (Program Director, Conectas)
Marcos Fuchs (Associate Director, Conectas)

Sur Journal was created ten years ago as a vehicle to deepen and strengthen bonds between academics and activists from the Global South concerned with human rights, in order to magnify their voices and their participation before international organizations and academia. Our main motivation was the fact that, particularly in the Southern hemisphere, academics were working alone and there was very little exchange between researchers from different countries. The journal's aim has been to provide individuals and organizations working to defend human rights with research, analyses and case studies that combine academic rigor and practical interest. In many ways, these lofty ambitions have been met with success: in the past decade, we have published articles from dozens of countries on issues as diverse as health and access to treatment, transitional justice, regional mechanisms and information and human rights, to name a few. Published in three languages and available online and in print for free, our project also remains unique in terms of geographical reach, critical perspective and its Southern 'accent'. In honour of the founding editor of this journal, **Pedro Paulo Poppovic**, the 20th issue opens with a biography (by João Paulo Charleaux) of this sociologist who has been one of the main contributors to this publication's success.

This past decade has also been, in many ways, a successful one for the human rights movement as a whole. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights has recently turned 60, new international treaties have been adopted and the old but good global and regional monitoring systems are in full operation, despite criticisms regarding their effectiveness and attempts by States to curb their authority. From a strategic perspective, we continue to use, with more or less success, advocacy, litigation and naming-and-shaming as our main tools for change. In addition, we continue to nurture partnerships between what we categorize as local, national and international organizations within our movement.

Nevertheless, the **political and geographic coordinates** under which the global human

rights movement has operated have undergone profound changes. Over the past decade, we have witnessed hundreds of thousands of people take to the streets to protest against social and political injustices. We have also seen emerging powers from the South play an increasingly influential role in the definition of the global human rights agenda. Additionally, the past ten years have seen the rapid growth of social networks as a tool of mobilization and as a privileged forum for sharing political information between users. In other words, the journal is publishing its 20th issue against a backdrop that is very different from that of ten years ago. The protests that recently filled the streets of many countries around the globe, for example, were not organized by traditional social movements nor by unions or human rights NGOs, and people's grievances, more often than not, were expressed in terms of social justice and not as rights. Does this mean that human rights are no longer seen as an effective language for producing social change? Or that human rights organizations have lost some of their ability to represent wronged citizens? Emerging powers themselves, despite their newly-acquired international influence, have hardly been able – or willing – to assume stances departing greatly from those of “traditional” powers. How and where can human rights organizations advocate for change? Are Southern-based NGOs in a privileged position to do this? Are NGOs from emerging powers also gaining influence in international forums?

It was precisely to reflect upon these and other pressing issues that, for this 20th issue, SUR's editors decided to enlist the help of over 50 leading human rights activists and academics from 18 countries, from Ecuador to Nepal, from China to the US. We asked them to ponder on what we saw as some of the most urgent and relevant questions facing the global human rights movement today: 1. Who do we represent? 2. How do we combine urgent issues with long-term impacts? 3. Are human rights still an effective language for producing social change? 4. How have new information and communication technologies influenced activism? 5. What are the challenges of working internationally from the South?

The result, which you now hold in your hands, is a **roadmap for the global human rights movement** in the 21st century – it offers a vantage point from which it is possible to observe where the movement stands today and where it is heading. The first stop is a reflection on these issues by the founding directors of Conectas Human Rights, **Oscar Vilhena Vieira** and **Malak El-Chichini Poppovic**. The roadmap then goes on to include **interviews** and **articles**, both providing in-depth analyses of human rights issues, as well as **notes from the field**, more personalized accounts of experiences working with human rights, which we have organized into **six categories**, although most of them could arguably be allocated to more than one category:

Language. In this section, we have included articles that ponder the question of whether human rights – as a utopia, as norms and as institutions – are still effective for producing social change. Here, the contributions range from analyses on human rights as a language for change (**Stephen Hoggood** and **Paulo Sérgio Pinheiro**), empirical research on the use of the language of human rights for articulating grievances in recent mass protests (**Sara Burke**), to reflections on the standard-setting role and effectiveness of international human rights institutions (**Raquel Rolnik**, **Vinodh Jaichand** and **Emílio**

Álvarez Icaza). It also includes studies on the movement's global trends (**David Petrusek**), challenges to the movement's emphasis on protecting the rule of law (**Kumi Naidoo**), and strategic proposals to better ensure a compromise between utopianism and realism in relation to human rights (**Samuel Moyn**).

Themes. Here we have included contributions that address specific human rights topics from an original and critical standpoint. Four themes were analysed: economic power and corporate accountability for human rights violations (**Phil Bloomer, Janet Love and Gonzalo Berrón**); sexual politics and LGBTI rights (**Sonia Corrêa, Gloria Careaga Pérez and Arvind Narrain**); migration (**Diego Lorente Pérez de Eulate**); and, finally, transitional justice (**Clara Sandoval**).

Perspectives. This section encompasses country-specific accounts, mostly field notes from human rights activists on the ground. Those contributions come from places as diverse as Angola (**Maria Lúcia da Silveira**), Brazil (**Ana Valéria Araújo**), Cuba (**María-Ileana Faguaga Iglesias**), Indonesia (**Haris Azhar**), Mozambique (**Salvador Nkamate**) and Nepal (**Mandira Sharma**). But they all share a critical perspective on human rights, including for instance a sceptical perspective on the relation between litigation and public opinion in Southern Africa (**Nicole Fritz**), a provocative view of the democratic future of China and its relation to labour rights (**Han Dongfang**), and a thoughtful analysis of the North-South duality from Northern Ireland (**Maggie Beirne**).

Voices. Here the articles go to the core of the question of whom the global human rights movement represents. **Adrian Gurza Lavalle** and **Juana Kweitel** take note of the pluralisation of representation and innovative forms of accountability adopted by human rights NGOs. Others study the pressure for more representation or a louder voice in international human rights mechanisms (such as in the Inter-American system, as reported by **Mario Melo**) and in representative institutions such as national legislatures (as analysed by **Pedro Abramovay and Heloisa Griggs**). Finally, **Chris Grove**, as well as **James Ron, David Crow and Shannon Golden** emphasize, in their contributions, the need for a link between human rights NGOs and grassroots groups, including economically disadvantaged populations. As a counter-argument, **Fateh Azzam** questions the need of human rights activists to represent anyone, taking issue with the critique of NGOs as being overly dependent on donors. Finally, **Mary Lawlor and Andrew Anderson** provide an account of a Northern organization's efforts to attend to the needs of local human rights defenders as they, and only they, define them.

Tools. In this section, the editors included contributions that focus on the instruments used by the global human rights movement to do its work. This includes a debate on the role of technology in promoting change (**Mallika Dutt and Nadia Rasul**, as well as **Sopheap Chak and Miguel Pulido Jiménez**) and perspectives on the challenges of human rights campaigning, analysed provocatively by **Martin Kirk** and **Fernand Alphen** in their respective contributions. Other articles point to the need of organizations to be more grounded in local contexts, as noted by **Ana Paula Hernández** in relation to Mexico, by **Louis Bickford** in what he sees as a convergence towards the global middle, and finally by **Rochelle Jones, Sarah Rosenhek and Anna Turley** in their movement-support model. In addition, it is noted by **Mary Kaldor** that NGOs are not the same as civil society,

properly understood. Furthermore, litigation and international work are cast in a critical light by **Sandra Carvalho and Eduardo Baker** in relation to the dilemma between long and short term strategies in the Inter-American system. Finally, **Gastón Chillier and Pétalla Brandão Timo** analyse South-South cooperation from the viewpoint of a national human rights NGO in Argentina.

Multipolarity. Here, the articles challenge our ways of thinking about power in the multipolar world we currently live in, with contributions from the heads of some of the world's largest international human rights organizations based in the North (**Kenneth Roth** and **Salil Shetty**) and in the South (**Lucia Nader, César Rodríguez-Garavito, Dhananjayan Sriskandarajah** and **Mandeep Tiwana**). This section also debates what multipolarity means in relation to States (**Emilie M. Hafner-Burton**), international organizations and civil society (**Louise Arbour**) and businesses (**Mark Malloch-Brown**).

Conectas hopes this issue will foster debate on the future of the global human rights movement in the 21st century, enabling it to reinvent itself as necessary to offer better protection of human rights on the ground.

Finally, we would like to emphasize that this issue of Sur Journal was made possible by the support of the Ford Foundation, Open Society Foundations, the Oak Foundation, the Sigrid Rausing Trust, the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA). Additionally, Conectas Human Rights is especially grateful for the collaboration of the authors and the hard work of the Journal's editorial team. We are also extremely thankful for the work of Maria Brant and Manoela Miklos for conceiving this Issue and for conducting most of the interviews, and for Thiago Amparo for joining the editorial team and making this Issue possible. We are also tremendously thankful for Luz González's tireless work with editing the contributions received, and for Ana Cernov for coordinating the overall editorial process.



sur

Human Rights in Motion

Voices

FATEH AZZAM

Why Should We Have to "Represent" Anyone?

MARIO MELO

Voices from the Jungle on the Witness Stand of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights

ADRIAN GURZA LAVALLE

NGOs, Human Rights and Representation

JUANA KWEITEL

Experimentation and Innovation in the Accountability of Human Rights Organizations in Latin America

PEDRO ABRAMOVAY AND HELOISA GRIGGS

Democratic Minorities in 21st Century Democracies

JAMES RON, DAVID CROW AND SHANNON GOLDEN

Human Rights Familiarity and Socio-Economic Status:
A Four-Country Study

CHRIS GROVE

To Build a Global Movement to Make Human Rights and Social Justice a Reality for All

INTERVIEW WITH MARY LAWLOR AND ANDREW ANDERSON

"Role of International Organizations Should Be to Support Local Defenders"



JUANA KWEITEL

Juana Kweitel has been program director at Conectas Human Rights since April 2011. She has a Masters in International Human Rights Law from the University of Essex, United Kingdom and in Political Science from the University of Sao Paulo on the topic: "Accountability of Latin American Human Rights Organizations". She holds a postgraduate degree in Human Rights and Democratic Transition from the University of Chile and graduated in law from the University of Buenos Aires (UBA). She has worked in Argentina as institutional coordinator of the Center for Legal and Social Studies (CELS) and as coordinator of the same organization's Economic, Social and Cultural Rights Program.

Email: juana.kweitel@conectas.org

ABSTRACT

This article proposes to examine how human rights organizations from Latin America, working on the national level, are addressing the demand for accountability. The field research was conducted through interviews with five human rights organizations from Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico and Peru. The academic research on the accountability of civil society organizations has been concentrated on the normative grounds of the need for more accountability, while very few studies analyze the matter from the perspective of the actual actors involved. In this article, based on this diagnosis, the author works with a specific group of national human rights organizations, with a view to analyzing what five organizations have done on the subject. The result of the research demonstrates that, unlike what is claimed in the literature, human rights organizations from Latin America are sufficiently concerned about the topic that they have adopted a complex idea of their accountability to civil society. Moreover, these organizations have developed incipient and innovative practices in this field, paying special attention to the particular type of work they do. The article concludes by asserting that further theoretical debate is needed on the question of the legitimacy of these organizations, in light of the fact that they have, indeed, adopted practices of representation.

Original in Portuguese. Translated by Barney Whiteoak.

Received in August 2014.

KEYWORDS

Accountability – Latin America – Legitimacy – NGOs – Civil society



This paper is published under the *creativecommons* license.

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

ARTICLE

EXPERIMENTATION AND INNOVATION IN THE ACCOUNTABILITY OF HUMAN RIGHTS ORGANIZATIONS IN LATIN AMERICA

Juana Kweitel

This article¹ aims to examine how human rights organizations from Latin America working on the national level are addressing the demand for accountability. This aim is a response to the call made by Gurza Lavalle and Castello, who highlight “the usefulness of documenting the different answerability models of civil organizations and of examining them in search of any internal control and sanction mechanisms that encourage them” (GURZA LAVALLE; CASTELLO, 2008, p. 71).

The discussion on the accountability of non-governmental organizations is part of the broader debate on the accountability of institutions in general. In the field of political science, the idea of accountability was revived in Latin America following the work of Guillermo O’Donnell – an author who addressed the topic in several articles, inserting into the regional debate the old idea of checks and balances of American constitutionalism (O’DONNELL, 1998; 2002).²

The concept of accountability is a complex one and different authors have given it distinct meanings. Andreas Schedler attempted to recreate the concept based on its use by different actors. As such, he claims:

[...] the notion of political accountability carries two basic connotations: answerability, the obligation of public officials to inform about and to explain what they are doing; and enforcement, the capacity of accounting agencies to impose sanctions on power holders who have violated their public duties.

(SCHEDLER, 1999, p. 14).

Alnoor Ebrahim (2010) also emphasizes that most discussions on the concept pose three central questions: **accountability to whom, accountability for what and accountability how.**

Notes to this text start on page 321.

It is important to mention that, for many authors, the concept of accountability has been stretched so much that it now lacks precision. As Newell and Bellour claim, “accountability has become a malleable and often nebulous concept, with connotations that change with the context and agenda” (NEWELL; BELLOUR, 2002, p. 2). It is what Ebrahim and Weisband call the “accountability panacea” (EBRAHIM; WEISBAND, 2007).

As we shall see in this article, the academic research on the accountability of civil society organizations has been concentrated on the normative grounds of the need for more accountability, while very few studies analyze the matter from the perspective of the actual actors involved. Moreover, the literature does not differentiate much between the various types of organizations (for example, between national and international organizations and between organizations that provide services and organizations that engage in advocacy).

As a result of this diagnosis, this article focuses on a specific group of organizations: **national human rights organizations**.³ The research concentrated on the vision of accountability by five national human rights organizations. In this vein, it sought to tackle some of the dominant ideas in the literature on the topic based on the perception and the practices of the organizations themselves.

The field research was conducted through interviews with five human rights organizations from Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico and Peru.⁴ These organizations engage primarily in advocacy activities for a wide range of beneficiaries.

It is important to point out that many of the national human rights organizations work in opposition to the State; some of them were founded during periods of authoritarian rule, which is reflected in their resistance to disclose certain information that, in their view, could be used unfavorably or detrimentally against the victims. This article demonstrates, however, that this resistance is gradually being overcome.

This article is structured into three main sections. The first section, below, makes an overall analysis of the subject of the accountability of civil society organizations, including the particularities of the organizations that engage in advocacy and work with a broad public. The second section is restricted to the field of research, with a view to describing the factors that specifically define human rights organizations, the practices adopted by these organizations and their visions of accountability. The article finally reflects on the conclusions of this study, pointing out that human rights organizations from Latin America have adopted some innovative accountability practices.

1 Accountability of civil society organizations

This section describes the growing debate over accountability in the literature on civil society organizations and examines two issues: the difficulty of evaluating advocacy activities and the challenges of working with a broad public. In the next section, based on research with national human rights organizations from Latin America, this literature will be evaluated in light of the practices already existing in these organizations.

1.1 “The mantra of greater NGO accountability”⁵

The discussion on accountability has grown exponentially in the academic literature on social organizations and also in the mainstream media. A number of theoretical articles on the topic have started by citing a piece in the magazine *The Economist* from September 2000 that succinctly summarizes the discussion. The British publication stated that, “They may claim to be acting in the interests of the people – but then so do the objects of their criticism, governments and the despised international institutions. In the West, governments and their agencies are, in the end, accountable to voters. **Who holds the activists accountable?** (ANGRY..., 2000).⁶

Using other words, the International Council on Human Rights Policy (ICHRP) claims in the first version of its report on accountability: “[some] people feel that NGOs are out of control, have acquired an ability to influence public opinion and the public agenda but have no corresponding **duty to take responsibility for the effects of their advocacy or the conduct of policy**” (INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY, 2003, p. 3).⁷

These questions ultimately pose a threat to the legitimacy of a type of organization that, unlike representative governments, are not subject to periodic elections by popular vote. The criticisms are leveled against organizations that do not generally represent either the interests of a specific group (like peasant organizations, for example) or the interests of their members (like unions).

Dagnino clearly articulates these criticisms:

[...] the political autonomization of NGOs creates a peculiar situation in which these organizations are responsible to the international agencies that finance them and to the State, which contracts them as service providers, but not to civil society, whose representatives they claim to be, nor to the social sectors whose interests they bear, nor to any other organ of a truly public character. For as well-intentioned as they might be, their activities express, fundamentally, the desires of their directors.

(DAGNINO, 2004, p. 101).

According to Jordan and Van Tuijl, criticisms like these have started to gain visibility since 2001, after the time, at the end of the 20th century, when NGOs used to be viewed – somewhat naively – as “inherently good”, as agents of development and as indispensable for democratization (JORDAN; VAN TUIJL, 2006, p. 3). Institutions such as the World Bank, during the 1990s, played a key role in the expansion of the work of civil society organizations. Against the backdrop of the end of the Cold War, many donors considered NGOs to be more reliable recipients of financial support than governments. Accordingly, as their role expanded, the criticisms over their legitimacy also grew.

These criticisms were leveled in particular at the actions of a particular kind of organization, one that worked primarily on a transnational level for development. They were organizations whose head offices are located in countries in the North (where they raise funds) but that develop their work in the South (in programs that support development) or for the South (through international advocacy actions).

One of the main reasons for demanding more accountability from civil society organizations stems from the fact that many of them use precisely this “lack of accountability” as a weapon to criticize States. The challenge for the organizations, says Edwards, is to demonstrate that they themselves can apply the same principles of accountability that they demand of others (EDWARDS, 2000).⁸

Many authors claim that civil society organizations do not discuss this subject in any depth. Jordan and Van Tujil claim that “a discourse on accountability has been lacking among NGOs, perhaps out of a defensive reflex towards immediate political threats and addressing immediate needs, but also because seriously engaging accountability is expensive for almost any type of organization” (JORDAN; VAN TUJIL, 2006, p. 5). The specialized literature also asserts that, of all civil society organizations, it is the human rights organizations that are most behind the curve in this area (INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY, 2009, p. 24).

However, there have been some recent examples of self-regulation, one of which is the adoption of the Accountability Charter, in June 2006, by 11 international organizations.⁹ The Charter represents an innovative effort to establish common rules. It deals with issues such as transparency, clarity of governance rules and combating corruption. It also includes the requirement for member organizations to submit an annual report to the Charter Secretariat and, since 2010, these reports have also been reviewed by an Independent Panel.¹⁰

As the literature on accountability grows, some authors have started to draw attention to the need to inquire **whether more accountability is always best**. Ebrahim raises the question of “whether there is a danger of too much accountability” (EBRAHIM, 2003b). This danger is associated both with the possibility of donors abusing their powers to manipulate the organizations, and with the risk that excessive control could limit their creativity, diversity and experimentation.

In recent years, the literature has focused on practical solutions to promote greater control of organizations by their beneficiaries.¹¹ This literature is partly based on concepts developed in the private sector for the management of companies. Accordingly, the idea of the stakeholder approach, which gives visibility to various different groups and individuals that may be affected by the actions of a company, has been gradually incorporated into the debate on non-profit organizations.¹²

Therefore, according to this stakeholder approach, and within the discussion on non-governmental organizations, the following concepts have been created that are now part of the debate on accountability and that are necessary to further the discussion proposed here:

- **Internal accountability:** refers to the accountability of the organization to its mission and its staff;
- **External accountability,**¹³ which can be divided into:
- **Upward accountability:** generally refers to the relationship with donors,

foundations and governments. It aims to demonstrate that money is used for the purposes for which it was donated;

- **Downward accountability:** refers to the relationship with customers and with the groups for which the organization provides services (beneficiaries);
- **Horizontal accountability:** refers to the relationship with other organizations in the same field.

Several voices have drawn attention to the excessive amount of proposed tools that prioritize short-term aspects instead of paying attention to long-term variations related to complex issues of social and political change (EBRAHIM, 2003a). They emphasize that what is lacking is a systemic vision in which it is possible to see, within a given thematic niche, the part played by each organization in jointly effecting the desired social change (EBRAHIM, 2014).

1.2 Accountability and the problem of assessing advocacy activities

Many proposals guided by the stakeholder approach recommend participatory processes in which the organizations at least explain their ideas and strategies to the beneficiary groups (BENDELL, 2006, p. 23).

However, accountability, when interpreted in this way, is particularly problematic in the case of organizations that engage in advocacy. There are at least four factors for this: 1) the success of an advocacy action depends on cooperation (and not on the individual action of one organization); 2) the impact of this action is not linear (there is no clear causality between result and advocacy); 3) since advocacy is eminently conflictual, it is unlikely that the results will be attributed to the work of one organization; and 4) the timeframes for assessing the impact need to be considerable.

In other words, first, the “performance assessment” is particularly complex in the case of advocacy organizations, since it is questionable to attribute specific results directly to the individual action of certain organizations. An effective advocacy action requires cooperation between several organizations, which is why, generally, the impact cannot be attributed only to the action of one actor.¹⁴

Second, political and institutional changes occur non-linearly, in response to multiple factors and, often, unexpectedly.¹⁵ An organization that is effective in its advocacy, for example, will know how to take advantage of political opportunities even when this means straying from its original plans (which makes it difficult to assess the performance comparing planning versus results).

Additionally, in third place, advocacy often involves influencing a decision-making process that is hostile to external interventions. In these cases, generally, the public official who was targeted by the advocacy action will not acknowledge that the change resulted from the organization’s work.¹⁶

Finally, the time frames for assessing the results of the advocacy action need to be long, which makes it difficult to maintain a permanent information channel with the potential beneficiaries. For example, there may be long periods in which no result is obtained despite the ongoing action of the organization.

1.3 Accountability and the problem of organizations that work with a broad public

Human rights organizations generally operate for the “public interest” (JAICHAND, 2004).¹⁷ As such, they try to change public policies using a range of strategies that includes litigation, lobbying, public opinion campaigns and the creation of alliances.¹⁸ In these cases, which form most of the actions of these organizations, there is no beneficiary public that can easily be consulted to apply the stakeholder approach model.

When looking from the perspective of the alleged beneficiaries, there are three types of roles played by human rights organizations – each raising a number of challenges when it comes to questioning their accountability:

- **Express mandate – Control through an ability to “opt out”:**¹⁹ in the case of organizations that engage in litigation (for which there is an express mandate of representation), the “customers” can choose to withdraw the case from the organizations. They can, therefore, exercise some control given their ability to “opt out”. In this case, since there is an express mandate, the problem of implicitly assuming representation (often called assumed or virtual representation) – which is the principal challenge when acting on behalf of a broad public – does not arise;
- **Legal mandate:** in other cases, the legitimacy (or representation) is based on the law (for example, in some types of consumer organizations). The question of accountability in these cases is also more specific and less problematic than when acting on behalf of a broad public (without authorization);
- **No express mandate:** it is this third type of role, involving cases in which there is no express authorization or consent, that is of interest to this article. It consists of cases of collective litigation (for example, on behalf of the prison population) or public action in support of a broad-ranging law. Situations such as these, that benefit a broad public or that have no authorization, pose the most interesting challenges to the analysis of the accountability of these organizations.

The next section addresses the relationship that these organizations with no express mandate, considered by the literature as “new actors of representation”, have with the beneficiaries on behalf of whom they speak and exercise this representation (GURZA LAVALLE; CASTELLO, 2008, p. 67), and the ability of the beneficiaries to impose some type of sanction on their “representatives”.

2 Accountability of human rights organizations specifically

2.1 Human rights organizations: values, agenda, governance and resources

The International Council for Human Rights Policy (ICHRP) has made one of the most consistent efforts to define human rights organizations and the values they defend. As such, it highlighted as **core values** of these organizations:

“loyalty to the universality of human rights and commitment to impartiality, independence and true and accurate communication of information” (2003, p. 38). It also stated that these organizations express their commitment to non-violent methods of action.

The organizations, meanwhile, consider that their mission is to “strengthen the democratic system”, “contribute to the democratic transition” or “promote and defend human rights”. They generally claim that they are promoting the implementation of human rights as they are recognized internationally in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Many human rights organizations from Latin America emerged in authoritarian contexts or during the period of transition to democracy. Concerning the activities they engage in, there has been an important shift in recent years that has led to the **expansion of their agendas** (ABREGÚ, 2008, p. 7).

If, during its early years, the human rights movement consisted primarily of organizations of victims and relatives and of organizations of lawyers who supported the demands of these groups, these days it is formed by **professional organizations that rarely identify with a specific cause**. They are not associations that defend the interests of their members, but that instead defend the “public interest” or “human rights” in general.

In many cases, the organizations are **governed by a Board of Trustees**, which chooses an executive director responsible for overseeing the daily activities of the organization, which are developed by a professional, remunerated team (that does not generally participate in the governance of the organization).²⁰

In most countries in our region, national human rights organizations raise **funds** from international foundations or international cooperation institutes. Generally speaking, it is to these actors that the organizations submit their detailed activities reports, often in English.

2.2 The practices and opinions of the organizations on four key topics

This section will present the results of the research conducted with five human rights organizations from Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico and Peru.

2.2.1 Accountability of NGOs in general

There is a consensus among the surveyed NGOs that the concept of accountability applies to civil society organizations, although their vision is somewhat nuanced. Some believe that, while it is recommendable for civil society to incorporate accountability practices, it is not an obligation like it is for the State.

All the interviewees affirmed that the idea of accountability applies to civil society organizations. However, they were less precise when referring to the “accountability of civil society” than when describing the “accountability of the State”. Concerning the State, the interviewees could provide more details on the aspects of accountability, and they included within the concept the

question of transparency, the explicit justification of the reasons for its decisions, the presentation of results, the fulfillment of campaign promises, access to information, accountability between the different branches of government and dialogue with civil society. When it came to civil society organizations, however, even though none of the interviewees limited their view of accountability to the question of transparency or financial accountability, they did not provide more details of the obligations imposed by accountability (nor did they mention the component of answerability/sanction).

During the interviews, it was also mentioned that civil society organizations ought to be accountable to their mission. Although the idea of accountability to the mission is interesting, since it resolves the problem of the difficulty of creating accountability mechanisms in the case of organizations that work with a broad public, it is also problematic, since it does not satisfy one of the central aspects of the idea of accountability: the question, *accountability to whom*. On this point, if there is no “principal” agent, i.e. someone to demand accountability to the mission, then neither can there be sanctions in the event of non-compliance. To claim that an organization should practice “accountability to the mission” without also clearly identifying who is responsible for assessing the accountability is contradictory to the very idea of accountability, for which sanctions for non-compliance are a central element.

The vision of the organizations gathered during the interviews refutes the literature that claims that human rights organizations are unconcerned about the subject of accountability (JORDAN; VAN TUJIL, 2006; ICHRP, 2009). The responses demonstrate that there is a growing interest in the issue. They also reveal that the organizations have a complex grasp of accountability that is not limited to the question of transparency and an acknowledgement that accountability also applies to civil society organizations. As we shall see in the pages ahead, the organizations are also exploring new mechanisms, albeit slowly, to improve their accountability.

2.2.2 Accountability of human rights organizations that engage in advocacy

On the question of whether human rights organizations differ from other civil society organizations, some conflicting arguments appeared in the responses. Some interviewees affirmed that the nature of human rights organizations requires more transparency while others justified less transparency.

The justification for “less transparency” was given mainly by organizations that permanently denounce human rights violations and therefore have a particularly tense relationship with the State, namely in Rio de Janeiro, Mexico and Peru. In these cases, the possibility of putting their staff or the victims at risk was used to justify less transparency, particularly in relation to the information that could be released on the Internet.

The demand for “more transparency” was also associated with various different arguments. The risk of paternalism was mentioned, emphasizing that in

the case of human rights organizations – which do not have an express mandate (to act as representatives) – the demand for accountability is even greater. Similarly, they also mentioned that “the ethical component of working with human rights” requires more accountability.

Analyzing the issue from this angle clearly demonstrates the difficulty of applying generic criteria of accountability without analyzing the specifics. In the case of national human rights organizations, it is essential to analyze the context before formulating generic demands for greater accountability. As already mentioned, it is not possible to apply the same requirements for organizations that work in democratic environments to those that work in authoritarian contexts.

When discussing accountability, the organizations expressed concern over the matter of impact assessment. Several interviewees stressed the difficulty of finding instruments to measure the effectiveness of the work of their organizations. This is one of the aspects in which greater and more in-depth theoretical research would help the organizations.

2.2.3 Practices adopted to improve accountability

As can be seen from the transcripts below,²¹ the research with the interviewed organizations shows that they have either already taken concrete steps or are discussing what steps to take to improve their accountability. Most of them have discussed the need to increase the amount of information available on the Internet. On this point they identified the need to publish financial information as well as additional information, such as priority actions, annual reports and the decisions of their internal decision-making bodies.

Publicity of information – Website

The organization has made an effort to publicize the information on its priorities (which topics), strategies and how the decisions are made. [...] We have also increased our use of press statements and electronic tools, and the website has the institutional history.

Improvement in reporting on activities

We used to have activities reports for each project and each person did what they thought was best, and it was rather informal. We wanted to establish a uniform system, so someone from one area can see what someone else from another area does. It is in the experimental stage. It generates opportunities for collaboration and more uniform reports.

Expansion of the council of partners

The organization has made an effort to expand the council of partners, to count on a broad base of partners, not for the resources, but for the diversity, the partners propose other partners. A broad and pluralistic base of partners serves as a mouthpiece to be

accountable [...]. Among the partners, there are members of other organizations, of parties, of unions. We view the council as a place of accountability and suggestions.

Explanation/Consultation with external actors

Whenever we are going to make a controversial decision, we call on the beneficiaries and other organizations to explain. For example, a mining company asked us to audit a social fund and we decided not to accept. We considered it to be too polemic. When we embark on a controversial topic, we hold meetings to listen.

In the case of a study on social policies, meetings were held with groups of different actors, beneficiaries and academics to discuss the work before it was published.

Opinion poll

To improve its accountability, the organization conducts an opinion poll. [...] The poll is seen as a matter of legitimacy, to create political substance for the NGO. In the past 3 polls (in which only women were interviewed), the approval rating for abortion when the mother's life is at risk and due to rape has risen to 80%. The organization has been working on the topic (in memorandums to Congress, op-eds, etc.). Today, the topic is being debated by presidential candidates. [...] We view the opinion poll as a form of building a "mandate".

The research illustrates that these organizations are concerned about the topic of accountability and that they are developing incipient and innovative practices. The research also demonstrates that there are nuances and that a more in-depth analysis of these practices is necessary in order to understand more clearly the position of human rights organizations in relation to civil society organizations in general on the subject of accountability.

2.2.4 Ways of building legitimacy: discussion on representativeness

The question of the legitimacy and representativeness of the organizations is closely linked to the debate on accountability. Some institutions consider that defending international human rights standards gives legitimacy to human rights organizations. This, however, does not resolve the problem of whom they should be accountable to – as one interviewee affirms:

We represent a perspective, internationally recognized and mandatory standards. The vote is not the only form of legitimacy.

For others, the organizations can assume the representation of unorganized groups that cannot give an express mandate. In these cases, the obligation to be accountable is even greater. This interpretation is similar (but not identical) to the argument of Gurza Lavalle and Isunza (2010), who believe that authorization can come from accountability over time. According to one of the interviewees:

There is no need for an express mandate. The concept of representation can be built; you are within your right to do it, to protect a group or society in general. There are groups that are not organized as actors and cannot give a mandate, but the organization can assume the responsibility and engage based on the interests of this group. If you find yourself in this situation, you need to be concerned about making the information as public as possible. There is an obligation to give publicity so your achievements reach the group for which you are engaging. There should be, as a political and normative strategy, the obligation to make sure the information reaches them. The most marginalized groups in society cannot air their grievances; they are so debilitated that they do not present their demands. These groups are not going to grant you a mandate, since they cannot even defend their own rights on their own. The risk is that a relationship of paternalism is established. I am responsible for avoiding this; when you are the representative agent, there is an immediate obligation to be accountable to this sector. Otherwise, what is it all for?

This response is one of the few that recognizes the existence of representation (called “assumed representation”) and the need for accountability, without resolving, however, the matter of answerability. How could these represented groups control the representative and hold him or her accountable in the event that they are dissatisfied with their representation?

One possible solution, given the lack of an express mandate, is to increase the obligation to be accountable to society in general, regardless of the interest:

If four organizations are not representative, then there has to be some kind of link with the social base. [...] We are well aware that we are not like any ordinary citizen; an ordinary person could not act like we do; we have a lot more power than an ordinary citizen, which is why society has the right to know who is doing this (like the way you ask the State and political parties).

Some of the interviewees call into question the idea that the only way to create representativeness is through the vote. There are, therefore, two arguments that work in different spheres. On the one hand, some organizations use the knowledge argument: something like “I have the legitimacy to act because I know the topic”. In this case, therefore, legitimacy does not stem from proximity or intermediation, but from a technical knowledge of international human rights standards, or what Avritzer calls “affinity” (AVRITZER, 2007). Other organizations appear to be suggesting the possibility of building authorization through accountability over time (GURZA LAVALLE; ISUNZA, 2010). These organizations refer to the obligation to provide information both to the sectors on behalf of which they are acting (in the case of vulnerable groups) and to society in general (in the case of broader agendas).

Both in the literature and in the reality of the organizations, these two arguments on building legitimacy are recent. From a theoretical viewpoint, they represent a necessary deepening of the theory of representation, geared towards observing and analyzing democratic innovations. From a practical viewpoint, they

demonstrate that the organizations are concerned with the question of legitimacy and accountability and that they are developing new arguments similar to those raised in the specialized literature.

3 Conclusion

This article sought to examine how national human rights organizations from Latin America are addressing the demand for greater accountability based on the perspective of the actors themselves.

The result of the research demonstrates that human rights organizations from the region are increasingly concerned about the topic. It also reveals, at least on the conceptual level, that the organizations are currently prioritizing matters of justification (giving reasons for their actions) and monitoring (being transparent and providing information) over matters of stricter control (that include answerability/sanction).

However, it demonstrates that the organizations are adopting new practices that we might call “experimental”, aimed at resolving the question of accountability with special attention to the particular type of work they perform. On this point, they mentioned the following concrete steps: the inclusion of information on the website; an improvement in reporting on activities; the expansion of the council of partners; consultation with external actors; and, also, the taking of opinion polls. These practices, it is worth repeating, demonstrate that there is a concern about the topic, albeit incipient, within these organizations.

The result also demonstrates that, in the vision of the organizations, it is important to be accountable to the beneficiaries – and, on this point, the organizations are in agreement with the literature. At the same time, however, it reveals that, at least in the case of the organizations surveyed in this research, there are no concrete criticisms from the beneficiaries concerning their activities.

Regarding the theoretical debate, further reflection is still necessary. In the case of Gurza Lavalle and Isunza, for example, it is necessary to answer how what they call “accountability over time” – which would be transformed into “authorization for representation” – would work.

This article also illustrates the difficulty that the organizations encounter in their accountability and in evaluating the effectiveness of their advocacy for a broad public. In this regard, it is worth pointing out, as noted by Charnovitz (2006), that this difficulty does not mean that the organizations operate in a context without any forms of control. In the specific case of national human rights organizations, accountability mechanisms exist that are different from those applied by other types of organizations. Therefore, it is important to draw attention to the risk of applying standards that ignore the differences between political contexts to organizations working on the national level, in particular concerning the risks of working with human rights in repressive or highly polarized regimes.

In the case of national organizations, therefore, a growing importance is being attributed to evaluation by peers, or what Stark *et al.* (2006, p. 328) call embeddedness: the creation of forms of collaboration with peer organizations ends

up creating a form of horizontal accountability in a field of action or community of practice. In other words, the organizations need to maintain their good reputation, which implies taking into consideration accountability to their peers (GRANT; KEOHANE, 2006).

However, the difficulty of specifically identifying the broad public or the vulnerable beneficiaries, who do not have the capacity to organize or represent themselves, does not mean that the organizations should not find ways of notifying them clearly about their work. When an organization works for the benefit of a group that has not given it an express mandate, it should be careful to publish the greatest amount of information possible, thereby avoiding the risk of paternalism. As Edwards (2010) recently pointed out:

If the “public interest” is too vague and amorphous a concept to be useful in any operational sense, then at least one can ensure that activities that are claimed to be charitable in nature are openly disclosed and accessible for public questioning. The opportunities to know what an organization does and to ask questions as a result are surely the bedrock of accountability.

On this point, the practices of the organizations are incipient, and it is still not entirely clear how the information should be presented for it to be a real tool of accountability (for example, whether it is necessary to tailor the information for different publics).

Finally, this article shows that the organizations are accountable, in the most demanding sense of the concept (answerability/sanction), only to the State and to their donors (who can withdraw their support as punishment for their dissatisfaction with the results). This fact increases the responsibility of the donors to maintain an ongoing dialogue with the field in which they intervene, to ensure that the activities they fund effectively respond to real needs and contribute to a systemic change.

REFERENCES

Bibliography and Other Sources

- ABREGÚ, Martín. 2008. Direitos humanos para todos: da luta contra o autoritarismo à construção de uma democracia inclusiva—um olhar a partir da Região Andina e do Cone Sul. *SUR*, v. 5, n. 8, pp. 6-41. Available at: <http://www.surjournal.org/conteudos/pdf/8/abregu.pdf>. Last accessed in: 6 Aug. 2014.
- ANGRY and effective. 2000. *The Economist*, Washington DC, 21 Sept. Available at: <http://www.economist.com/node/374657>. Last accessed on: 6 Aug. 2014.
- AVRITZER, Leonardo. 2007. Sociedade Civil, Instituições Participativas e Representação: Da Autorização à Legitimidade da Ação. *DADOS – Revista de Ciências Sociais*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 50, n. 3, pp. 443-464.

- BENDELL, Jem. 2006. **Debating NGO Accountability**. NGLS Development Dossier. United Nations.
- CHARNOVITZ, Steve. 2006. Accountability of Non-Governmental Organizations in Global Governance. In: JORDAN, L.; VAN TUJIL, P. **NGO Accountability: Politics, Principles and Innovations**. Earthscan, pp. 21-43.
- COATES, Barry; DAVID, Rosalind. 2002. Learning for Change: The Art of Assessing the Impact of Advocacy Work. **Development in Practice**, v. 12, n. 3-4, pp. 530-541.
- CHAPMAN, Jennifer; WAMEYO, Amboka. 2001. **Monitoring and Evaluating Advocacy: A Scoping Study**, London: Action Aid.
- DAGNINO, Evelina. 2002. **Sociedade Civil e Espaços Públicos no Brasil**. São Paulo: Paz e Terra.
- _____. 2004. Sociedade civil, participação e cidadania: de que estamos falando? In: MATO, D. (coord.). **Políticas de ciudadanía y sociedad civil en tiempos de globalización**. Caracas: FACES, pp. 95-110.
- EBRAHIM, Alnoor. 2003a. Accountability in Practice: Mechanisms for NGOs. **World Development**, v. 31, n. 5, pp. 813-829.
- _____. 2003b. Making Sense of Accountability: Conceptual Perspectives for Northern and Southern Nonprofits. **Non profit Management & Leadership**, v. 14, n. 2, pp. 191-212.
- _____. 2010. **The Many Faces of Nonprofit Accountability**. Working Paper 10-069, Harvard Business School. Available at <<http://www.hbs.edu/research/facpubs/workingpapers/papers0910.html#wp10-069>>. Last accessed on: 6 Aug. 2014.
- EBRAHIM, Alnoor; RANGAN, V. Kasturi. 2014. What Impact? A Framework for Measuring the Scale and Scope of Social Performance. **California Management Review**, v. 56, n. 3, spring, pp. 118-141.
- EBRAHIM, Alnoor; WEISBAND, Edward. 2007. **Global Accountabilities: Participation, Pluralism and Public Ethics**. Cambridge.
- EDWARDS, Michael. 2000. **NGO Rights and Responsibilities. A New Deal for Global Governance**. The Foreign Policy Center.
- _____. 2010. **Aplomo latente, transigencia evidente: responsabilidad de las organizaciones no gubernamentales y los derechos humanos**, aporte ao Forum Human Rights Principles and NGO Accountability, ICHRP. Available at: <<http://www.ichrp.org/en/forum>>. Last accessed on: 6 Aug. 2014.
- GORVIN, Ian. 2009. Producing the Evidence that Human Rights Advocacy Works: First Steps towards Systematized Evaluation at Human Rights Watch. **Journal of Human Rights Practice**, v.I, n.3., pp. 477-487.
- GRANT, Ruth; KEOHANE, Robert. 2005. Accountability and Abuses of Power in World Politics. **American Political Science Review**, v. 99, n. 1, pp. 29-43.
- GURZA LAVALLE, Adrian; ARAUJO, Cicero. 2008. O debate sobre a representação

- política no Brasil: Nota introdutória, *Caderno CRH*, Salvador v. 21, n. 52, Abr., pp. 9-12.
- GURZA LAVALLE, Adrian; CASTELLO, Graziela. 2008. Sociedade Civil, Representação e a Dupla Face da *Accountability*: cidade do México e São Paulo. *Caderno CRH*, v. 21, n. 52, pp. 67-86.
- GURZA LAVALLE, Adrian; HOUTZAGER, Peter; CASTELLO, Graziela. 2006. Democracia, Pluralização da Representação e Sociedade Civil. *Lua Nova*, São Paulo, 67, pp. 49-103.
- GURZA LAVALLE, Adrian; ISUNZA VERA, Ernesto. 2010. Precisiones conceptuales para el debate contemporáneo sobre la innovación democrática, participación, controles sociales y representación. In: GURZA LAVALLE, Adrian; ISUNZA VERA, Ernesto (Coord.). *La innovación democrática en América Latina. Tramas y Nudos de la Representación, la Participación y el Control Social*, Centro de Investigaciones y Estudios Superiores en Antropología Social.
- HIRSCHMAN, Albert. 1970. *Exit, voice, and loyalty: responses to decline in firms organizations, and states*. Harvard University Press.
- INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON HUMAN RIGHTS POLICY. 2003. *Deserving Trust. Issues of Accountability for Human Rights NGOs, Draft for Consultation*. Available at: <http://www.africanchildinfo.net/index2.php?option=com_sobi2&sobi2Task=dd_download&fid=121&format=html&Itemid=>>. Last accessed on: 6 Aug. 2014.
- _____. 2009. *Deserving Trust. Issues of Accountability for Human Rights NGOs, Draft for Consultation*. Available at: <http://www.ichrp.org/files/drafts/7/119_draft.pdf>. Last accessed on: 6 Aug. 2014.
- JAICHAND, Vinodh. 2004. Estratégias de litígio de interesse público para o avanço dos direitos humanos em sistemas domésticos de direito. *SUR*, v. 1, n.1, pp. 135-149. Available at: <http://www.surjournal.org/index1.php>. Last accessed on: 6 Aug. 2014.
- JORDAN, Lisa. 2007. A rights-based approach to accountability. In: EBRAHIM, A. WEISBAND, E. *Global Accountabilities: Participation, Pluralism and Public Ethics*. Cambridge, pp. 151-167.
- JORDAN, Lisa; VAN TUJIL, Peter. 2006. *NGO Accountability: Politics, Principles and Innovations*. Earthscan.
- KEYSTONE. [no date]. *Learning with Constituents*. Available at: http://www.keystoneaccountability.org/sites/default/files/3%20Learning%20with%20constituents_0.pdf. Last accessed on: 6 Aug. 2014.
- KWEITEL, Juana. 2010. *Accountability de organizações de direitos humanos da América Latina: uma aproximação a partir da opinião dos atores*. Dissertação de Mestrado – Faculdade de Filosofia, Letras e Ciências Humanas, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, 29 de março. Available at: <<http://www.teses.usp.br/teses/disponiveis/8/8131/tde-07102010-154216/pt-br.php>>. Last accessed on: 6 Aug. 2014.
- LANDMAN, Tood; ABRAHAM, Meghna. 2004. *Evaluation of Nine Non-*

- Governmental Human Rights Organizations.** IOB Working Document, Febr. Available at: <<http://www.minorityrights.org/download.php?id=493>>. Last accessed on: August 9, 2014.
- NEWELL, Peter; BELLOUR, Shaula. 2002. **Mapping Accountability: Origins, Contexts and Implications for Development.** IDS Working Paper 168. Sussex: Institute of Development Studies. Available at: <<http://www.ids.ac.uk/files/Wp168.pdf>>. Last accessed on: August 9, 2014.
- O'DONNELL, Guillermo. 1998. *Accountability horizontal e novas poliarquias.* **Lua Nova**, n. 44, pp. 27-54.
- _____. 2002. Horizontal accountability: The legal institutionalization of mistrust. In: MAINNWARING S. e WELNA, C. **Accountability, Democratic Governance, and Political Institutions in Latin America**, OUP.
- O'DWYER, Brendan; UNERMAN, Jeffrey. 2008. The paradox of greater NGO accountability: A case study of Amnesty Ireland. **Accounting, Organizations and Society**, v. 33, n. 7-8, pp. 801-24.
- PERUZZOTTI, Enrique. 2006. Civil Society, Representation and Accountability: Restating Current Debates on the Representativeness and Accountability of Civil Associations. JORDAN, L.; VAN TUJIL, P. **NGO Accountability: Politics, Principles and Innovations.** Earthscan, pp. 43-61.
- SCHEDLER, Andreas. 1999. Conceptualizing Accountability. In: SCHEDLER, A; DIAMONG, L; PLATTNER, M. **The Self-Restraining State. Power and Accountability in New Democracies**, Lynne Rinner, pp. 13-28.
- SCHMITZ, Hans Peter; BRUNO, Tosca. 2007. **Attitudes towards Accountability: Transnational NGOs and the Challenge of Legitimacy**, Paper presented at the 2007 ARNOVA conference "The Global Pursuit of Social Justice: Challenges to Nonprofits & Civil Society", Atlanta, Georgia, November 15-17.
- SLIM, Hugo. 2002. **By what authority? The legitimacy and accountability of non-governmental organizations.** International Council on Human Rights Policy. Available at: <http://www.ichrp.org/files/papers/65/118_Legitimacy_Accountability_Nongovernmental_Organisations_Slim_Hugo_2002.pdf>. Last accessed on: 6 Aug. 2014.
- STARK, David; VEDRES, Balasz; BRUSZT, Laszlo. 2006. Rooted transnational publics: Integrating foreign ties and civil activism. **Theory and Society**, v. 35, pp. 323-349.

NOTES

1. This article is a highly abridged and updated version of the conclusions of the Masters dissertation in Political Science defended by the author at the Faculty of Philosophy, Arts and Human Sciences of the University of São Paulo (FFLCH–USP), Brazil, in September 2010.
2. In the Anglo-Saxon sphere, however, the most recent literature on the topic cites the article by Goetz and Jenkins (2002) as one of the decisive works for putting the topic back on the debate agenda.
3. Between the time the research was conducted and the present day, the categories for classifying organizations have become less clear. These days, it is less common to talk about national/international, human rights/development, litigation/advocacy. The distinction, however, is still relevant here as we shall see over the course of the article, as national organizations usually have mechanisms of accountability to their local peers and quite strong roots in the society where they work primarily.
4. In each of the five organizations, four people were interviewed. The interviews were conducted by telephone, using a semi-structured questionnaire.
5. Expression used by Steven Charnovitz (2006, p. 40).
6. Emphasis added. Also cited by Slim (2002).
7. The ICHRP, a Geneva-based think tank focusing on human rights policy that existed between 1996 and 2012, published in 2003 the report, "Deserving Trust. Issues of Accountability for Human Rights NGOs, Draft for Consultation". This report broadly discusses the issues of accountability of human rights organizations. The first version was released for consultation in 2003, but due to criticisms and a lack of consensus on the content of the document, the final version was never published. The ICHRP abandoned its plans to publish a study of the topic and created, in February 2010, an online discussion forum. In the quotation, the emphasis is added.
8. Also cited by Schmitz and Bruno (2007).
9. ActionAid International, Amnesty International, CIVICUS World Alliance for Citizen Participation, Consumers International, Greenpeace International, Oxfam International, International Save the Children Alliance, Survival International, International Federation Terre des Hommes, Transparency International and World YWCA (at the time of the submission of this article to SUR Journal, the Charter had 17 member organizations).
10. See the Accountability Charter Review Process, available at <http://www.ingoaccountabilitycharter.org/home/review-process/>. Amnesty International and Article 19 are the only two human rights organizations to have signed the Charter.
11. See, for example, Keystone (no date) and Action Aid (2006).
12. Ebrahim (2003a, p. 814) emphasizes "much of the early work in this field is credited to Edward Freeman's (1984) writing on a 'stakeholder approach' to strategic management among private sector firms, in which stakeholders are defined to include not only stockholders but also other individuals and groups who can affect, or are affected by, a particular business". See also Ebrahim and Weisband (2007).
13. In the literature, approaches that focus on upward accountability are often called "hierarchical accountability" and approaches that prioritize downward and horizontal accountability are called "holistic accountability". See, for example, O'Dwyer and Unerman (2008).
14. See Coates and David (2002). See, also, Chapman and Wameyo (2001) cited by the ICHRP (2003).
15. On the difficulties of Human Rights Watch to prove the impact of its advocacy work, see Gorvin (2009).
16. Analyzing the issue in the light of the advocacy practiced by the U.S. organization Human Rights Watch, Gorvin comments, with some irony, that: "It is rare indeed that an abusive government will come out and tell us: 'we saw the error of our ways, thanks to you, and we have changed'" (GORVIN, 2009, p. 480).
17. See Jaichand (2004).
18. See Abregú (2008).
19. See Hirschman (1970).
20. A whole other study would be necessary to analyze the transformation of these and other organizations into their current format (a non-remunerated Board of Trustees, a remunerated staff and volunteers), which appears to be strongly inspired by the practices of organizations in the United States.
21. **Editor's Note:** The quotations from this point on, unless otherwise specified, refer to the interviews that the author conducted with five human rights organizations as part of her research. See footnote 4 above.

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 SCHOCKAERT

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 Misplaced 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

GLENDIA 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)

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 Maria da Penha Law in Brazilian Courts

SIMON M. WELDEHAIMANOT

The ACHPR in the Case of *Southern Cameroons*

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, Dec. 2012

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 SCETTINI

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

SUR 18, v. 10, n. 18, Jun. 2013

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

PREVIOUS NUMBERS

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

SUR 19, v. 10, n. 19, Dec. 2013

FOREIGN POLICY AND HUMAN RIGHTS

DAVID PETRASEK

New Powers, New Approaches?
Human Rights Diplomacy in the 21st
Century

ADRIANA ERTHAL ABDENUR AND
DANILO MARCONDES DE SOUZA
NETO

Brazil's Development Cooperation
with Africa: What Role for Democracy
and Human Rights

CARLOS CERDA DUEÑAS

Incorporating International Human
Rights Standards in the Wake of
the 2011 Reform of the Mexican
Constitution: Progress and Limitations

ELISA MARA COIMBRA

Inter-American System of Human
Rights: Challenges to Compliance with
the Court's Decisions in Brazil

CONOR FOLEY

The Evolving Legitimacy of
Humanitarian Interventions

DEISY VENTURA

Public Health and Brazilian Foreign
Policy

CAMILA LISSA ASANO

Foreign Policy and Human Rights in
Emerging Countries: Insights Based on
the Work of an Organization from the
Global South

INTERVIEW WITH MAJA

DARUWALA (CHRI) AND SUSAN
WILDING (CIVICUS)

Emerging Democracies' Foreign Policy:
What Place for Human Rights? A Look
at India and South Africa

DAVID KINLEY

Finding Freedom in China: Human
Rights in the Political Economy

LAURA BETANCUR RESTREPO

The Promotion and Protection
of Human Rights through Legal
Clinics and their Relationships with
Social Movements: Achievements
and Challenges in the Case of
Conscientious Objection to Compulsory
Military Service in Colombia

ALEXANDRA LOPES DA COSTA

Modern-Day Inquisition: A Report
on Criminal Persecution, Exposure
of Intimacy and Violation of Rights
in Brazil

ANA CRISTINA GONZÁLEZ VÉLEZ
AND VIVIANA BOHÓRQUEZ
MONSALVE

Case Study on Colombia: Judicial
Standards on Abortion to Advance
the Agenda of the Cairo Programme
of Action