



G15

Third Generation Human Rights

By Adam Ziemba

INTRODUCTION

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights

On 10 December 1948, the United Nations General Assembly voted to adopt one of the most significant documents encompassing the issue of human rights: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Thomas Scanlon, the Alford Professor of Natural Religion, Moral Philosophy, and Civil Polity at Harvard University Department of Philosophy, underscores that the concept of creating such an internationally-recognized document developed as a result of human concern over specific threats such as atrocities of the World War II. Scholars say that human rights emerged to protect human beings from genocide and abuse, thus becoming demands on political and social institutions. As a document combining moral as well as certain legal value, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights aims to create a new “world order” in which states would be able to interact and live peacefully, preserving and propagating values such as liberty, equality, and international cooperation and security.

After the tragedies and horrors of World War I and World War II, the international community hoped to build this “new world order” through the establishment, protection, propagation and consolidation of human rights. In 1948, the United Nations General Assembly passed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by a vote of 48 in favor and 8 abstentions. Adherents of this document indicate that the Declaration has become the most prominent Western political and legal concept. To stress the significance of human rights included in this document, the General Assembly proclaimed that:

“THIS UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of Member States themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction.”

The preamble of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights remarks that the document embraces virtues, values and views shared among all peoples and all nations in the world. As such, the General Assembly passed this document, which intends to define and unify norms and standards which should be established, respected, and protected by all countries.

Two Generations of Human Rights

Karel Vašák, the first Secretary-General at the International Institute of Human Rights in Strasbourg, was the first person to remark on a distinction between human rights included in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other binding and non-binding documents dealing with human rights. His suggestion of three genera-



tion human rights is based on the watchwords of the French Revolution: *Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité* (Liberty, Equality and Fraternity). From the very beginning of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the General Assembly, as Vašák observes, outlined two main types of human rights that should be of the special interest among international community. These rights embrace freedom and equality of all human beings. In fact, experts in the field of human rights issues label the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as the document incorporating the first and second generation human rights. The present document will briefly discuss those rights to facilitate understanding of the concept and situation of third generation human rights which, as one could expect, complies with the maxim of *fraternité*.

The first generation of human rights (known as civil and political rights) developed from the American and French revolutions, which underscored the value of liberty. The first generation of human rights strives to secure the citizen's freedom from the arbitrary actions of the state. Articles two to 21 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights are of special significance as they raise the issue of personal freedom. Such rights include the following:

- freedom from arbitrary arrest, detention, or exile,
- freedom from interference in privacy and correspondence,
- freedom from racial and other forms of discrimination,
- freedom from slavery or involuntary servitude,
- freedom from torture and from cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment,
- freedom of movement and residence,
- freedom of opinion and expression,
- freedom of peaceful assembly and association; and the right to participate in government, directly or through free elections,
- right to a fair and public trial,
- right to a nationality,
- right to asylum from persecution,
- right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion - this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance,
- right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country,
- right to life, liberty, and security of the person.

The second generation of human rights (known as economic, social and cultural rights) appeared at the turn of the 19th and 20th century as a result of the Russian Revolution. These rights initially aimed to fight economic inequalities for the material well-being of society. The value of economic, social and cultural rights for ensuring the legal status of the individual seems to be incontestable in the contemporary world. As is noted in the preamble of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, "the ideal of free human beings enjoying freedom from fear and want can only be achieved if conditions are created whereby everyone may enjoy his economic, social and cultural rights, as well as his civil and political rights." The Universal Declaration of Human Rights embraces such rights in articles 22 to 27. These rights include but are not limited to:

- right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of self and family,
- right to education,
- right to rest and leisure,

right to social security,
right to the protection of one's scientific, literary, and artistic production,
right to work and to protection against unemployment.

Many scholars and experts indicate that the second generation rights were established to mark the importance of equality among peoples of the world.

EXPLANATION OF THE PROBLEM

History of the Problem

The Third Generation of Human Rights

As described, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is ultimately focused on the first and second generation of human rights. In the document entitled "The Liberal Western Tradition of Human Rights," which is also recognized by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, René Cassin observes that the concept of human rights included in the Declaration is deeply rooted in the Western liberal tradition. László Ervin, a Hungarian philosopher of science, systems theorist, and integral theorist, noticed that Western liberal democracy is strongly opposed to any religious affiliations. The secular virtues and ideas, valued by this type of democracy, tended to serve as means to propagate a vision of universal human values embodied in an independent society where people do what best suits their wishes and temperament in order to achieve happiness. Yet, conservative and traditional analysts and experts have objected to such a liberal perspective of rights and considered them as an unreasonably individualistic and even egoistic sort of rights.

Recently, international organizations, such as the High Commissioner on National Minorities of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, Directorate-General for the Environment of the European Commission, Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, have paid special attention to the third generation of human rights - also known as collective and solidarity rights. The third generation of human rights encompasses a wide spectrum of liberties and privileges concerning economy, society and culture. First of all, they are known as collective rights since - as opposed to individualism, personal liberty and equality - they are focused on rights of groups of peoples. Gillian Triggs, PhD, a former Director of the British Institute of International and Comparative Law, stresses that not only certain rights are collective by default, but also that "certain individual rights cannot be exercised outside of the group context." She illustrates collective human rights in the following example: collective rights allow us to see a tree in the forest, the tree being any individual in the context of the group to which he or she belongs. In other words, third generation human rights focus on the entire group to have basic needs of the group met, including employment, health care, housing, and education. Individual rights for the members of that group remain unachievable promises until collective rights are met. Secondly, third generation human rights are sometimes called solidarity rights. Some human rights experts note that the developing states invented this concept of rights, since they give preference to the communities' economic and social rights over civil and political rights of individuals, such as equality or liberty. Rohimi Shapiee, the Associate Professor Doctor in Public International Law, International Economic Law, Land Law at the National University of Malaysia, claims that "solidarity rights are moral claims to a minimum condition of a decent life of persons as group members, which is based on collective welfare."

Scholars believe that the third generation human rights are developed to serve as an update, expansion and reformulation of human rights to make them compatible

with the changing needs of human society. “This be can also perceived as part of the process of development of the modern conception of human rights which from western personal rights, it was expanded to include economic, social and cultural rights. To address the needs and problems of the [...] nations, a third generation of human rights is needed.” Although the Western democracy is based on individuality and individual freedom, it is important to note that not all cultures have to share values of the Western liberal democracies. As a matter of fact, developing countries and states which are focused on the society rather than on individuals seek to establish rights which could protect groups of people and thus contribute to the proper development of the nations. Member States of the Group of Fifteen (G-15) seem to emphasize that the third generation human rights are necessary to supplement rights included in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

G-15—*Group of Fifteen*

At their core, third generation human rights aim to protect both entire populations and specific groups. Collective rights tend to be focused on groups which are subdivided according to the following criteria: ethnicity, gender, sexuality, and class. In fact, William Felice, a professor of political science and head of the International Relations and Global Affairs discipline at Eckerd College, deems that “[a]n individual cannot just be defined by his or her ethnicity or gender or sexuality. Rather each identity revolves around a combination of all three.” In addition to this, these groups should have (1) common identity, (2) common history, and (3) common sources of suffering. Third generation human rights develop and enshrine progressively more and more groups and aspects of life, as they are yet to be defined. As of today, these rights include, but are not limited to:

collective rights,
right to peace,
the right to a healthy and sustainable environment,
right to humanitarian disaster relief,
right to political, economic, social, and cultural self-determination,
right to economic and social development; and the right to participate in and benefit from “the common heritage of mankind.”

Shapiee remarks that “[t]he third generation human rights are rights due to human beings as moral beings – who are endowed with a conscience, and entitled to live in conditions that allow them to strive for the good life.”

Scholars from different parts of the world discussed various formulations of third generation rights and peoples’ rights in the 1980s and 1990s. Felice notes that “[a]cademics documented how the existing world system did not display much hospitality toward defining and implementing a program of collective human rights.” These rights have never been included in one document that has been internationally recognized and promoted by the United Nations. However, although third generation human rights are not united in one document, a few of these rights have been recognized by some local legislative entities. This document will now turn to discuss three types of third generation human rights: rights of ethnic and minority groups, Women’s Rights, and rights to a healthy and sustainable environment. The following part serves as an example of third generation human rights issues that should ideally be addressed in a document introduced to be accepted by the G-15 community. The following examples of rights are examples of third generation human rights that seem to embrace the large part of the population. Those three rights, however, do not constitute entire definition and scope of third generation human rights. The following part should serve as an example of third generation human rights issues that should be addressed in one docu-

ment voted for and signed by the G-15 states.

Ethnic minority rights

It seems that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights does not address the needs of the states of which citizens pay particular attention to the socialized reality of life. In fact, many Third World scholars have criticized the Western formulation of human rights, which revolve around individuality and individual freedom, as they only reflect Western thought and perspective. Therefore, the Declaration may not be considered “as “universal” as is commonly asserted.” The failure to include third generation human rights in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights allowed states and people to infringe upon entire ethnic groups and ethnic minorities. Although some regional documents (see: Past International Actions) enshrine certain rights of ethnic groups and minorities, they are not of the same value as the documents ratified by the representatives of the quickly developing world.

The Rwandan Genocide

The Rwandan Genocide in 1994 entailed severe human rights violations of the national minority. Scholars estimate that 800,000 people were victims of the mass murder in Rwanda, a small East African nation. The conflict between the Hutu – the majority – and Tutsi – the minority – broke out on 6 April 1994 when Juvenal Habyarimana, the third President of the Republic of Rwanda, was assassinated. Although the identities of the assassins are still unclear, the Tutsi were accused of attempting a coup d'état. Such an accusation was followed by the genocide of the Tutsi minority. The first sign of widespread genocide was marked by the massacre of Tutsi children at a church in Gikondo. The Rwandan military and Hutu militia groups murdered all the Tutsis, regardless of age or sex. The military and militia typically inflicted pain on victims killing them with machetes, the weapon that became a symbol of this tragedy. In addition to this, several years after the genocide, the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda stated that war rape was an element of the genocide. The sexual violence in the country stands out in three ways: (1) the organized nature of the propaganda supported sexual violence against Tutsi woman, (2) the rapes were perpetrated in public, and (3) there was an extraordinarily high level of brutality against Tutsi women. Estimates indicate that between 250,000 and 500,000 Rwandese women and girls had been raped. Estimates of the death toll have range between 500,000 and 1,000,000, which means that seven out of ten Tutsi were killed.'

Third generation human rights would grant groups of people national and international protection. Any national minority would have had a number of resources and tools to preserve their freedom, identity and independence. The international community constituting international organizations, such as the UN, would be responsible to not only prevent abuses and discrimination against groups of people, but also support peace processes taking place in the member states.

Indigenous People in South America

Special attention should be given to the situation of collective rights of in-

indigenous people in Latin America. The United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues remarked that indigenous people in South America had been regularly prevented from access to medical care, education, and numerous other career opportunities. In the 1940s, many South American governments passed bills for a movement called “indigenismo.” The movement intended to propagate greater social and political role for the indigenous peoples of the Americas. At the beginning of the 21st century, Amnesty International noted that “basic rights of indigenous communities, including the right to land and to cultural identity – in the use of language, education and the administration of justice – are systematically violated in a variety of countries. At the same time, racism and discrimination entrenched in most societies make indigenous people more vulnerable to human rights violations including torture and ill-treatment, ‘disappearance’ and unlawful killings.” The members of the indigenous groups could decide to either cultivate their traditions and cultures, avoiding contacts with the civilization, or to be “Westernized,” which would result in the disappearance of their culture.

indigenismo—a movement for greater social and political roles for indigenous peoples

As noted before, rights of indigenous people are part of third generation human rights which are yet to be recognized by the international community. In 2007, the UN managed to establish the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples without the votes in favor of from Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States at the time of the voting. The Declaration embraces specific rights of a specific group of people. Article one and seven of the Declaration, for instance, state, “[a]rticle 1. Indigenous peoples have the right to the full enjoyment, as a collective or as individuals, of all human rights and fundamental freedoms as recognized in the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and international human rights law. [...] Article 7. [...] Indigenous peoples have the collective right to live in freedom, peace and security.” Rights and freedoms enshrined in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples should be not only included, but also expanded in the document signed and ratified by the G-15.

African-Americans in the USA

The population of African-Americans in the USA was a subject of racial discrimination which took various forms including the denial of voting rights, racial segregation, exploitation, and being targeted by violence until the 1950s. It is important to note, however, that the African-American community has been discriminated in one way or the other since then. In 1896, the United States Supreme Court in the document Plessy-Ferguson (163 U.S. 537 1896) upheld the constitutionality of state laws requiring racial segregation in private business by the vote of seven in favor and one against. At that time, the constitutional legal doctrine was based on the idea of “separate but equal.” Along these lines, at the end of the 19th century, there was a rapid and vehement development of discriminatory laws and related violence against African American citizens in the United States. African Americans fought wars for their country alongside their White American compatriots and other racial minorities. However, upon return to their country, they did not enjoy freedom and equality as understood today. Such living standards and situation led to the African-American Civil Rights Movement that aimed at changing discriminatory laws and stopping racist violence. This movement contributed to the establishment of Civil Rights Act of 1964 that banned discrimination based on “race, color, religion, or national origin” in schools, employment practices, public accommodations, and labor unions. The next step to improve the human rights situation in the USA was the Voting Rights Act of 1965 that allowed the participation of African-Americans in voter registration and elections. Only in 1989, did Douglas Wilder become the first African-American elected governor

in U.S. history. In 2000, 8,936 African-Americans were employed in the official positions (e.g. in the government), which showed a net increase of 7,467 since the 1970s.

In accordance with the international instruments and legal system, all people should be treated equally “without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.” As history shows, the racial segregation was common in the USA as was in other parts of the world, even though the rights of individuals were preserved. The group of African-Americans has been discriminated in various ways, which include but are not limited to biases in the place of employment, involvement in social life, and freedom of opportunity. Whereas the current internationally-recognized declarations protect individuals, they do not take into account the membership in the group. Therefore, an individual may be granted the same rights, but as a member of a group may be still subject to direct or indirect discrimination. Given their cultural, national and ethnic diversity, it seems that third generation human rights are of the special interest of the developing states.

Women’s Rights

Women’s rights have always been very important as they exist to protect more than 50% of the global population. History shows many attempts of organizations defending women’s rights to allow women to be considered legal equals to men. Yet, such rights are not specific to women, but rather are exercised by all people. Noreen Burrows, a Jean Monnet Professor of European Law at the University of Glasgow, presents the effect of such an approach:

A definition of rights which omits to take on board the needs and aspirations of half the human race cannot thereby lay claim to universality nor can it be seen to have an overriding moral authority. For most women, what it is to be human is to work long hours in agriculture or in the home, to receive little or no remuneration, and to be faced with political and legal processes which ignore their contribution to society and accord no recognition of their particular needs.

The defenders of women’s right argue that women should be defined in their own group (collective rights) with no reference to men. Felice suggests that “[a] new formulation of collective human rights should demonstrate a commitment to accept the dignity and worth of women (as women and not as men).” Such an approach would indeed grant sexual equality between men and women. Felice adds, “[i]f women’s rights are to be truly recognized, they must have their own identity and should not be equated with rights for men.”

It is important to include women’s rights in internationally recognized documents since, as history shows, women are subject to certain types of abuses not experienced by men. For instance, the 1995 Human Development Report includes the following worldwide violations against women’s rights: 70% of the 1.3 billion people in poverty are women this derives from their unequal situation in the labor market, their treatment under social welfare systems and their status and power in the family. A higher rate of unemployment among women than men is recorded in all regions of the world. The average female wage is only three-fourths of the male wage recorded in fifty-five countries which have comparable data. Women tend to occupy only 10% of parliamentary seats and only 6% of the cabinet positions. Women work longer hours than men in nearly every country – 53% more hours than men in developing countries

and 51% more in industrial countries. In addition to the aforementioned inequalities, a disproportionate amount of women as compared to men are victims of physical violence. Surveys estimate that one in every four women will experience domestic violence in her lifetime. Furthermore, the Bureau of Justice in the United States claims that around 1.3 million women are the victims of physical violence by their partners each year. Eighty-five percent of domestic violence victims are women. Although women are granted exactly the same rights as men under international laws, agreements and declarations (including the UNDHR), it is clear that women are not treated equally around the globe. The problem exists in not only developing countries, but also long-standing democratic states. The UN tired to outlaw discrimination against women through different declarations (see: Past International Actions), yet unequal treatment is still visible around the world. It seems that the rights of groups – third generation human rights – recognized by the G-15 might contribute to the positive change in the society. As a group and thus individuals, women would be able to enjoy the whole spectrum of freedoms, rights, and equality.

Rights to a Healthy and Sustainable Environment

The right to a healthy and sustainable environment embraces the past, present and future of humanity. The declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment of 1972 in Stockholm, Sweden, suggested that the protection of the environment is “essential [...] to the enjoyment of basic human rights – even the right to life itself,” and further claims, “[m]an has the fundamental right to [...] adequate conditions of life, in an environment of a quality that permits a life of dignity and well-being.” As set forth by the Stockholm Declaration of 1972, human beings should be responsible for the protection and improvement of the quality of the environment for present and future generations.

As of today, many states choose not to ratify declarations enshrining environmental laws, such as Stockholm Declaration 1972, as countries focus primarily on economic and social developments which eventually contribute to their wealth. The heads of developing states believe that environmental sustainability could impede their economic, social and political development. Such sustainability is hindered by numerous issues, which include climate change, environmental degradation, nuclear issues, pollution, resource depletion, toxins, and waste disposal. All of these problems affect human-beings negatively. Deforestation across the world influences not only indigenous people who become deprived of their lands to live, but also people in other regions of the world as they begin to feel the consequences of global warming. States choose to develop and expand their economies, which usually occurs at the expense of the environment. Many species in the fauna and flora of sea, land and air ecosystems are prone to extinction, as it was noted in many states. Such activities not only affect human beings *per se*, but also other aspects of human lives. For instance, economies may ironically slow down as the trade based on fishing has no resources to be sold and exchanged. Violations against the environment deprive people of the surroundings which could afford them an environment that allows them and their descendants to fully enjoy a life of dignity and well-being at different levels.

Recent Developments

Neither international community nor the G-15 has ever discussed the topic of the third generation human rights. Undoubtedly, the inclusion of these rights in the international, regional and local agendas would be the first step to accept and respect not only cultural differences between people, but also rights of different groups of peo-

ple, regardless of their ethnicity, gender, class, and other such factors. The approach known as prescriptive relativism seems to be especially significant in adopting the third generation human rights. Therefore, the adherents of prescriptive relativism are seen to be a key element in incorporating cultural differences between people into universal norms. In fact, proponents of the approach not only respect differences in practices, moral attitudes and beliefs between people, but also notice the importance of incorporating different beliefs into universal, standardized norms.

This section of the document will discuss violations of rights of minorities, women, and environmental rights in three regions: Latin America (with the focus on Brazil, Colombia and Chile), the European Union, and Iran. The present document does not exhaust the subject, since there are many more regions and examples of third generation human rights that could be discussed. However, this part of the study guide serves to illustrate how certain regions in the world deal or fail to deal with the rights of peoples. This is purely exemplary and serves to present the situation through regional cases, and does not seek to focus on certain regions at the expense of others.

Case Study: Latin America – Brazil, Colombia and Chile

Latin American states have generally shown significant improvements in protection and recognition of some third generation human rights. These countries, however, selectively implemented mechanisms and tools overseeing rights of peoples. Some states have never committed to any declarations and agreements (see: Past International Actions), which would establish normative foundation for specific rights that could be classified as third generation human rights.

Firstly, special attention should be given to the long-standing issue of the rights of indigenous peoples in Latin America. Although some states such as Brazil or Chile have established constitutions that grant indigenous peoples rights and privileges to cultivate their traditions, customs, cultures and languages, the indigenous people in Latin America still suffer from threats and violence. The 1988 Brazilian Constitution allows indigenous people to “have their social organizations, customs, languages, creeds and traditions recognized, as well as their original rights to the lands they traditionally occupy, it being incumbent upon the Union to demarcate them, protect and ensure respect for all of their property.” Therefore, the constitution not only grants special protection, but also allows native people to live in the demarcated areas known as Indigenous Territories. These assurances seem to be especially significant in Brazil as the National Indigenous Foundation (FUNAI) estimates that there are nearly 360,000 indigenous people in 215 societies. The Colombian authorities also took legal steps such as the 1991 Colombian Constitution, and Colombian National Law 21 to affirm the protection of the rights of its native people. These documents protect the cultural and territorial rights of around 800,000 indigenous people in Colombia.

In spite of some legal protection, international human rights reports alert that indigenous persons face serious discriminations and other challenges in Latin America, including societal abuses, The Indigenous Missionary Council in Brazil, for example, notes that 53 indigenous people were killed in the single year of 2008. Of those killed, as many as 40 were members of the Guarani-Kaiowa tribe in Mato Grosso do Sul State. Some of these deaths were a result of a conflict between indigenous people and illegal wood-extracting companies. The situation is even more alarming in Colombia. Amnesty International notices that “indigenous peoples struggle to survive in Colombia.” The most common abuses in Colombia include “killings, enforced disappearances and kidnappings, threats, sexual abuse of women, recruitment of child soldiers, forced displacement and persecution of Indigenous leaders.” Within a few days in June

2004, the Autodefensas Unidas de Colombia massacred 40 indigenous men, women, and Children in the Huella community. The Fiscalía, the Office of the Attorney General of Colombia, and the Inter-American Court for Human Rights have all condemned involvement of the state in such atrocities.

Chile, on the other hand, established *Comisión Especial de Pueblos indígenas* (Special Commission of Indigenous People), whose reports gave the foundations for the intellectual framework of the “Indigenous Law” promulgated on 28 September 1993. Despite those efforts, it seems that indigenous people are still discriminated in the Chilean justice. As noted by Indigenous News – an organization defending indigenous peoples’ rights based in Chile, indigenous people in Chile have been long marginalized, exploited, and discriminated and excluded from the society.

UNEP—*United Nations Environment Programme*

Secondly, many Latin American governments committed to protect rights of women, yet, as noted by Humberto Márquez, Emilio Godoy and Franz Chávez, who are the journalist at IPS-Inter Press Service International Association, the “application and enforcement [of women’s rights] remain a distant goal.” The most commonly ratified and recognized documents among Latin American states include the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women and the 12 priorities established by the Platform for Action Adopted by the Fourth World Conference on Women. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development reports that “Latin American women suffer less total gender discrimination — in ownership rights, civil liberties, family codes and physical integrity — than other regions of the world except for the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development states.” At the same time, they add that the entire region remains stagnant at implementing new ways to enforce and protect collective rights of women.

According to the regional agencies of the United Nations, the violation of women’s dignity and freedom is rampant in the entire region of Latin America. From the economical perspective, for instance, women tend to earn much less than men; in Brazil and Mexico half of what their male colleagues earn; in countries such as Uruguay, Chile and Costa Rica the gap is slightly smaller – 30 to 40 percent. However, the most serious infringements of women’s rights include physical violence, as it is, in fact, in the most of the rest of the world. The Pan American Health Organization estimates that in 2006 one in three women in the region was a victim of sexual, physical, or psychological violence committed by their intimate partners. Latin American countries try to outlaw such violence through legal acts. The crime of murder of a woman has been singled out, and is now called femicide in Latin American states.

Last but not least, rights to healthy and sustainable development, followed by the protection of the environment, differ from country to country. As noted by the World Bank, “the key environmental issues in the Latin America and Caribbean Region include: (1) urban-industrial pollution, (2) mismanagement of natural resources in areas of existing and new settlement, and the consequent loss of terrestrial and marine biodiversity, and (3) the high vulnerability of urban and rural populations to natural disasters.” Although some countries managed to work out documents intending to preserve the environment, many of them failed to establish instruments and mechanisms monitoring the implementation of those documents. In fact, many violations against the environment occur in Latin American states.

The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) notes that the Brazilian Environmental Crimes Law (BECL) is “one of the most modern and comprehensive legal texts focusing on environmental crime.” The issues discussed in the BECL in-

clude but are not limited to broad culpability, assignment of penalties, crimes against fauna and flora, and pollution and other environmental crimes. Despite such a highly-developed mechanisms, Planeta Orgânico, a non-profit organization based in Brazil, remarks that the laws have not been adequately and strictly enforced. In the period from 2000 to 2005, Brazil had the highest deforestation rate in the world. Since 1970, nearly 232,000 square miles (600,000 square kilometers) of Amazon rainforest have been destroyed. As many other parts of Latin America, Chile is known for certain violations against environment, thus declining people's rights to life in the properly-cultivated environment. The most common issues include the widespread deforestation, excessive air and water pollution from industrial, vehicle emissions and raw sewage. The World Wildlife Fund (WWF) reports that between 1985 and 1995, Chile lost nearly 2 million hectares of native forest. It further notes that "Chile now has the world's largest expanse of radiata pine tree farms and some of the world's most endangered native forests." Colombia, on the other hand, enacted environmental protection legislation, as a result of which around 200 protected zones were created. Those areas include many forest areas and national parks. In spite of that, the state faces the issues of excessive deforestation and lumber exploitation in the jungles of Amazon. Deforestation has a profound ecological effect in that Columbia is extremely rich in biodiversity with 10% of the world's species.

BECL—Brazilian Environmental Crimes Law

As noted in the Stockholm Declaration, the environment is "essential [...] to the enjoyment of basic human rights – even the right to life itself." As a result of the environmental situation in many Latin American states, not only is the wildlife endangered, but also people become deprived of their native natural heritage, and the resources to live in dignity. Third generation human rights which also include the healthy and sustainable development of the country contribute to people's welfare.

Case Study: The European Union

The European Union (EU) member states recognize some third generation human rights included in the documents already ratified by the EU nations. The most significant region-wide document is the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, which enshrines into European Union law some political, social and economic rights for European Union citizens and residents. The preamble of the document declares that "the Union is founded on the indivisible, universal values of human dignity, freedom, equality and solidarity." Although the Charter does not specify third generation rights directly, the document mentions some collective rights, especially in Chapters III, IV and V – Equality, Solidarity and Citizen's Rights, respectively. As emphasized by the European Union Delegation in the USA, the EU pushes for the protection of a wide variety of human rights, including civil, political, economic, social, and cultural ones. However, international non-governmental organizations advocating human rights, such as Human Rights Watch, report that the European Union member states commit minor violations against dignity, freedom, and solidarity of peoples. Moreover, Human Rights Watch notices that "EU institutions frequently showed a lack of will to hold member states to account for breaches of European standards on human rights."

Ethnic and minority groups are sometimes a target of violence in the EU states since the protection of the national minorities has not yet become a widely approved legally binding norm. Amnesty International noted the EU's ineffectiveness and insufficient efforts to halt discrimination against Roma people. Nicolas Beger, Director of Amnesty International's European Institutions Office said, "Despite the EU's public commitment to improving the climate for Roma people and halting dis-

crimination, we've yet to see effective measures for change. The EU is failing to hold member state to account." He added, "[w]e can't understand this gap void, when discrimination against Roma people, including intolerant invective from senior politicians and hate crime, are rampant throughout Europe. We won't solve this problem by avoiding it." The NGO reported many abuses of Roma rights to housing, education, water and health care. Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch direct attention to the disrespect of some EU states for migrants. Spanish police, for example, use racial and ethnic profiling in identity checks. Such activities, as stressed by the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, not only convene the human right to non-discrimination, but also segregate people on the basis of arbitrary factors. Furthermore, the NGOs note some other violations of human rights. The UN Human Rights Council under the Universal Periodic Review in March and the UN special rapporteur on racism in July drew attention to continuing issue of racism, xenophobia and discrimination in Germany.

Although the European Union cares about rights of its peoples, women cannot fully exercise their rights at times. As individuals, women are granted all rights to equality, freedom, and many more included in the ratified and signed declarations. However, women still experience certain inequalities, when compared to men. These inequalities include the following:

- The employment rate of women remains lower than men's, even though women represent a majority of students and university graduates,
- Women earn on average 17.8% less than men,
- Women are very under-represented in economic and political decision-making positions,
- Majority of people in poverty is women, and
- Women are the main victims of gender-based violence and women and girls are more vulnerable to trafficking of human beings.'

The EU has established instruments and mechanisms which intend to protect the environment in all member states. The Directorate-General for the Environment declares that "[i]n the past 30 years the EU has adopted a substantial and diverse range of environmental measures aimed at improving the quality of the environment for European citizens and providing them with a high quality of life." However, it seems that the EU legislation does not take into account possible future dangers. France and Great Britain, two out of fourteen EU member states using nuclear energy, store nuclear waste in a way that may pose a threat to human life in the future. Greenpeace remarks that "[e]ach year, Europe's giant nuclear reprocessing facilities at Sellafield in the UK and La Hague in France, discharge hundreds of millions of liters of radioactive waste into the sea." Mike Townsley, the International Media Officer at Greenpeace, says, "although dumping radioactive wastes at sea from ships [has been] banned [since 1993], paradoxically the discharge of radioactive wastes into the sea via pipelines from land is not." Such storage of nuclear waste may pose serious threats to human life in the future. As the concept of third generation human rights suggests, groups of people (or even all people in general) should be granted rights, instruments and mechanisms which would protect them as a whole.

Case Study: Iran

Some Middle Eastern as well as African states still need to deal with serious violations of the basic human rights, not to mention the third generation human rights. However, the situation of rights of peoples varies from country to country. Some countries in the Middle East have been recorded by international non-governmental organi-

zations as states that have relatively good progressive human rights developments. Others, on the other hand, are renowned for their repressive and discriminating regimes that have no consideration to human rights.

As a country which pays particular attention to tradition, Iran defines human rights through the formulas provided by the administration and high state officials. The national government has been criticized for the constitution and law, which allow state actions such as the torture, rape, and killing of political prisoners, and the beatings and killings of dissidents and other civilians. Amnesty International notes that the state “continues to document serious human rights violations including detention of human rights defenders and other prisoners of conscience, unfair trials, torture and mistreatment in detention, deaths in custody and the application of the death penalty.” Furthermore, the organization claims that “Iran has one of the highest number of recorded executions of any country in the world.” People from different groups may be subject to such punishments from political activities to apostates to women to journalists.

Historically, Iran has been ethnically diverse, which contributed to the amicable interethnic relations. The Constitution of Iran guarantees freedom of cultural expression and linguistic diversity. Article 19 of the Constitution declares, “[a]ll people of Iran, whatever the ethnic group or tribe to which they belong enjoy equal rights; color, race, language, and the like, do not bestow any privilege.” In many regions, programs on local radio and television stations are in local language or dialect. In spite of those efforts, Human Rights Watch reports that some ethnic minorities may suffer from the state violations. However, the organization admits that little is known on this issue. Another problem is the lack of institutions and mechanisms monitoring enforcing equality between men and women in the Iranian society. Articles 20 and 21 of the Iranian Constitution tackle the issue of equality before law and women’s rights. The Constitution states, “Article 20. All citizens of the country, both men and women, equally enjoy the protection of the law and enjoy all human, political, economic, social, and culture rights, in conformity with Islamic criteria. Article 21. The government must ensure the rights of women in all respects, in conformity with Islamic criteria, and accomplish the following goals: (1) create a favorable environment for the growth of woman’s personality and the restoration of her rights, both the material and intellectual, (2) the protection of mothers, [...] (3) establishing competent courts to protect and preserve the family, and (4) the provision of special insurance for widows, aged women, and women without support.” As a matter of fact, all women are required by law to have a male guardian who could permit the work outside the home or travel abroad. Oftentimes, they are subject to accusations of fornication. The so-called “victimless” testimonies provided by men are sufficient to sentence women to death by fornication.

The UN remarks that little is known on the issue of environmental protection in Iran. The country profile published during the Johannesburg Summit 2002 indicates “no information available” in most cases. However, it seems that the “Iranian National Committee on Sustainable Development is the key national sustainable development coordination mechanisms.” The Iranian Government is working to improve the air quality, which is one of the most important environmental issues in Iran. Especially in urban areas, vehicle emissions, refinery operations, and industrial effluents contribute to the poor air quality. It seems that some groups of people in Iran may be deprived of tools, resources, mechanisms and instruments, which would provide them with life in the healthy environment.

Past International Actions

The debate over a wide variety of the third generation human rights is inherently international and regional issue, here discussed within the frames of rights of ethnic and racial minorities, women, and rights to the healthy and sustainable environment in different parts of the world. The initial negligence and exclusion of the third generation rights as important aspect of human rights was noticed by the non-governmental organizations. Since the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 - the first and most important document listing human rights based on personal dignity and freedom, the worldwide society has taken some steps to gather and include solidarity rights in the declarations, conventions, charters and other documents ratified by the states.

First of all, the involvement of international community in the issue of the third generation human rights has been stimulated by the situation of peoples in different corners of the world. After long years of oppression and injustice against minority groups, the United States of America largely banned racial discrimination in the middle of the 20th century. In December 1960, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution known as the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICEFRD) condemning “distinction, exclusion, restriction or preference based on race, colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin which has the purpose or effect of nullifying or impairing the recognition, enjoyment or exercise, on an equal footing, of human rights and fundamental freedoms in the political, economic, social, cultural or any other field of public life.” Through this ICEFRD, all states were called to “take all necessary measures to prevent all manifestations and practices of racial, religious hatred.” In addition to this, ICEFRD was the first document to criminalize membership in the racist organizations. As of 2011, the convention has 85 signatories and 174 State parties. The implementation of ICEFRD in the states around the globe is monitored by the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, which, as of July 2011, consists of the following states: Algeria, Brazil, Burkina Faso, China, Colombia, France, Guatemala, India, Ireland, Niger, Pakistan, Romania, Russian Federation, Tanzania, Togo, Turkey, UK, and the USA.

I C E F R D —
International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination

Most importantly, three other documents, namely the Universal Declaration of the Rights of Peoples, the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights, and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, “provide the most complete elaboration of collective human rights to date.” Signed in 1979, The African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights is the only existing human rights treaty that “deals specifically with peoples’ rights in general.” As of 15 June 2009, all 53 African countries had ratified the charter. South Sudan, which has been an independent country since 9 July 2011, was encouraged by Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch to sign and respect the African Charter. Moreover, the Charter establishes the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights to “to promote human and peoples’ rights and ensure their protection in Africa.” Some of the rights of peoples included in the Charter concern: existence, self-determination, political status, economic, social, and cultural development, disposal of wealth and natural resources, and the elimination of foreign economic exploitation.

The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), another important document embracing third generation human rights, constitutes one of the most important documents affirming a number of collective rights of women in political, economic, social, cultural, and civil fields. As of May 2009, 186 states have ratified or signed the treaty. The United States remains the only country which has signed but has not ratified the treaty. CEDAW establishes the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, one of the eight United Nations-related human rights treaty bodies, which consists of 23 experts on women’s

issues. As of January 2011, the members are: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bangladesh, Brazil, China, Croatia, Cuba, Egypt, Finland, France, India, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Mauritius, Paraguay, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Timor Leste, and Turkey.

The global community also noticed the problem of the violations against human beings through the lens of the environment. Few years after the adoption of the International Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination, some third generation human rights were included in 1972 Stockholm Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment and 1992 Rio Declaration on Environment and Development. The human rights organization noticed the importance of the environment. As the Stockholm Declaration proclaims, “[t]he protection and improvement of the human environment is a major issue which affects the well-being of peoples and economic development throughout the world” In fact, the two documents were a link between the contemporaneous and future generations of human rights relating to the environment. They intend to ensure that “[m]an has the fundamental right to [...] adequate conditions of life, in an environment of a quality that permits a life of dignity and well-being.” It is especially important today, when developing countries try to develop, and make investments on a grand scale. The Stockholm and Rio Declarations indicate that “[t]he right to development must be fulfilled so as to equitably meet developmental and environmental needs of present and future generations.”

As stated in the Stockholm and Rio Declarations, the environment is a factor that can impact the right to a dignified life in a significant manner. Given the fact that the condition of the environment is deteriorating, as the International Fund for Agricultural Development notes, many leading economies have implemented policies regarding sustainable development. However, developing countries still face the problem of balancing effective development and a well-preserved environment. In many cases, domestic as well as foreign companies destroy biodiversity, fauna and flora of the state in order to expedite the process of economic development. Such an issue was noticed by the international community which decided to implement new mechanisms designed to evaluate the condition of the global environment. Earthwatch was a program implemented by the United Nations Environment Programme at the Stockholm United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in 1972. The program consists of the Global Environment Monitoring System (GEMS), the International Environmental Information System (Infoterra) and the International Register of Potentially Toxic Chemicals (IRPTC) - UNEP Chemicals.

Possible Solution

One of the most fundamental issues is that there is currently no standard or norm defining what constitutes the third generation human rights, thus it is difficult to emphasize their importance to people, and influence on the state development. The definition of the third generation human rights, however, should consider different cultural, religious and traditional settings, as it is in the member states of the G-15. Otherwise, states may decide not to both ratify and respect such rights as their definition infringe upon their cultures.

It is crucial to emphasize that the third generation human rights are inseparable from individual rights. As such, the third generation rights not only supplement, but also become an inherent part of individual rights which in some cases cannot be exercised when taken out of the context of the group. Therefore, it is important to de-

fine the third generation human rights, and stress their importance when referred to first and second generation human rights. Such defined rights would provide extensive backgrounds for further steps to protect entire groups and thus individuals.

It may turn out that it would be beneficial to establish some legally-binding documents which embrace rights of peoples. Such documents should reaffirm all previously signed and ratified resolutions, declarations, conventions and covenants, and should emphasize the significance of protection of groups based on peoples' status, gender, ethnicity, etc. Based on the provided examples, it appears that the oppression of certain groups may be a result of state activities and imprecise legislation. In case of constant violations, one radical solution would be to impose economic, social or even cultural embargos on the countries which repeatedly violate collective and thus individual rights. When such violations are performed by local population, the international community should demand that the state resolves the problem effectively. The violations of local people may indeed derive from not only ignorance of other people, but also lack of empathy and understanding. Therefore, the G-15 should support efforts to propagate the understanding among people, facilitating the cultivation of culture and tradition. It might be necessary to establish certain structures, mechanisms and tools to protect those groups.

Word—definition goes here.

Interest Group Perspectives

Algeria, Indonesia, Iran, Kenya, Malaysia, Nigeria, Senegal:

The group of African and Asian states would not be willing to sign and ratify the bill embracing all third generation human rights. In fact, due to the nature of the societies, these states could signed and/or ratify such a bill with certain reservations. Since most of the countries are considered to be developing, these states would prefer to invest in their economical growth. Therefore, the primacy is given to the investments on a wide scale rather than “unnecessary” constraints such as environmental protections or rights of different groups of people.

Australia:

The representatives of this country would support international efforts to integrate most third generation human rights in one document.

Canada:

The representatives of this country would support international efforts to integrate most third generation human rights in one document.

India, Indonesia, Sri Lanka:

The representatives of these countries would support international efforts to integrate most third generation human rights in one document.

Latin America:

Latin American governments neither support nor are opposed to rights of their indigenous peoples. They recognize the significance of the issue, but the topic is very sensitive. Only Bolivia, Nicaragua and South Africa drafted Resolution A/HRC/6/L.26 on human rights and indigenous peoples. These countries demonstrated a strong interest in protecting indigenous rights. Most of the Latin American states would be willing to create instruments protecting women's rights, despite the cultural concept of machismo. In addition, some national governments may support international aspirations

to preserve natural environment.

South Africa:

The representatives of this country would support international efforts to integrate most third generation human rights in one document.

Word—definition goes here.

The Arab League:

Most of the states may appear to be willing to accept and consequently respect collective rights, yet in fact they will fail to abide to such documents. Due to the nature of the governments, many important documents may include many reservations, even if signed and/or ratified. Since most of the countries in the region are considered to be developing, these countries would prefer to invest in economies rather than be constrained by the environmental laws. Therefore, the primacy is given to the welfare of the present generations.

The European Union (EU):

The EU declares that “[h]uman rights, democracy and the rule of law are the core values of the European Union.” Therefore, the member states of the European Union are always ready to develop mechanisms and strategies which aim to protect human beings. Moreover, one of the self-defined tasks of the European Union is to democratize third countries while integrating human rights in their systems. The representatives of the EU believe that the most effective way of achieving this is a constructive and positive partnership with state governments and heads, multilateral dialogue, support and encouragement.

United States of America:

The representatives of the USA would support international efforts to develop and protect most third generation human rights. However, based on its voting record, the USA would not be willing to discuss rights of indigenous peoples as it voted against the Declaration of Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Although the USA may support international efforts to establish environmental rights, the representatives would not be willing to sign and ratify such a document.

Relevant Partners

Amnesty International (AI):

AI is a worldwide network that works for international recognition of human rights for all, by investigating and documenting human rights abuses and campaigns for justice. Amnesty International has 3 million members, supporters and activists in more than 150 countries and works closely within the U.N. bodies. The Statute of Amnesty International declares, “Amnesty International’s vision is of a world in which every person enjoys all of the human rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights standards. In pursuit of this vision, Amnesty International’s mission is to undertake research and action focused on preventing and ending grave abuses of the rights to physical and mental integrity, freedom of conscience and expression, and freedom from discrimination, within the context of its work to promote all human rights.” AI principally campaigns for: (1) women’s, children’s, minorities’ and indigenous rights, (2) ending torture, (3) the abolition of

death penalty, (4) rights of refugees, (5) rights of prisoners of conscience, and (6) protection of human dignity.

Earthwatch:

Earthwatch is an international non-profit organization that has gathered more than 81,000 volunteers to support its 3,000 field research projects carried out in 118 countries. Earthwatch underscores that environment conservation decisions should derive from data from fieldwork. The main goal of the organization is to conserve the diversity and integrity of life on earth to accommodate the needs of current and future generations. This global organization aims to change the public perception of science and its significance in environmental sustainability.

Word—definition goes here.

Human Rights Watch (HRW):

HRW is an international organization that opposes violations of what it considers basic human rights by bringing international attention to instances or regions where human rights are violated. Based in New York with many offices around the globe, Human Rights Watch has worked to prevent discrimination, protect human rights, and do justice for a wide variety of offenses since its establishment in 1978. The HRW reports include but are not limited to issues of social and gender discrimination, discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation, and violence against children.

International Women’s Rights Action Watch, Asia Pacific (IWRAP Asia Pacific):

IWRAP Asia Pacific has worked to promote, monitor, and facilitate the implementation of the CEDAW for nearly 20 years. The organization envisions the realization of the human rights of women through: “(1) the effective implementation of human rights standards, as seen through the lens of CEDAW and other international human rights mechanisms, at all levels of society, (2) the inclusion of women in standard-setting processes at the national and international levels, and in the formulation of policies and laws, (3) the development of new knowledge and methodologies, and (4) the mobilization of women to bring about good governance and sustainable change.”

The Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW):

As one of the eight UN-related human rights treaty bodies, CEDAW is made up of 23 experts in women’s rights of “high moral standing and competence in the field covered by the Convention.” As of January 2011, those experts came from the following countries: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bangladesh, Brazil, China, Croatia, Cuba, Egypt, Finland, France, India, Israel, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Mauritius, Paraguay, Romania, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Timor Leste, and Turkey. The Committee holds its meetings twice a year to review reports on compliance with the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, which signatory states are required to submit every four years.

The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD):

CERD is a body of human rights experts established in the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICEFRD). Eighteen experts in the fields of law, social justice, sociology and many more, who are elected for four-year terms, with half the members elected every two years, are required to monitor the implementation of the ICEFRD. As of July 2011, those experts came from the following countries: Algeria, Brazil, Burkina Faso, China, Colombia, France, Guatemala, India, Ireland, Niger, Pakistan, Romania, Russian Federation, Tanzania, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States of America.

Word—definition goes here.

Questions a Bill Should Address

Should the concept of the third generation human rights be included in the internationally recognized documents such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights?

How should the Group of Fifteen respond to the argument that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is a document enshrining the Western concept of human rights, which is based on individuality and personal freedom, instead of dignity and freedom of entire community?

What should be the standard and components of an international definition of the third generation human rights, which do not contradict (a) one another, (b) cultures and traditions of states ratifying this document? Should such a document be indeed truly universal and acceptable for the developing world?

What is the difference between rights of individuals and rights of group of individuals? What should the recognition of the third generation human rights aim to do?

What jurisdiction does the Group of Fifteen have over issues of the third generation human rights?

To what extent should the Group of Fifteen as a whole, oversee third generation human rights? Is it necessary to propagate and spread knowledge and sensitivity on the third generation rights among people?

What can international organizations such as NGOs, non-profit and many more do in order to change the perception of the society on the significance of not only the third generation human rights, but also the first and second generation human rights?

What institutions should propagate knowledge about significance and value of the third-generation human rights?

What other actions should the Group of Fifteen, non-governmental and non-profit organizations undertake to protect groups of peoples whose rights are violated just because they identify themselves with these particular groups?

What structures, mechanisms and control mechanisms should be implemented in and by the well-developed and developing countries?

Would it be reasonable to design structures and mechanisms which would verify the implementation of the third generation human rights? What jurisdiction should such organizations have to oversee such an implementation?

Summary

As already mentioned, the division of human rights was proposed by scholars in the 80s of the 20th century, yet neither has the United Nations nor any other regional body recognized the categorization of human rights. Therefore, to understand and investigate the issue of the third generation of human rights and their violations, it is important to have a reference point such as this study guide which explains the concept of the third generation human rights. After reading this document, it is indeed easier to not only do further research on the violations of rights of groups of peoples, but also ponder over the broader definition and meaning of the third generation human rights. The third generation human rights are especially significant for the G-15 states. This type of rights may grant the balanced development of the states, which could bring meaningful benefits for citizens.

With knowledge on this category of rights, it might be helpful to look through the conventions, declarations and other legally binding and non-binding documents signed and/or ratified in international, regional and domestic arenas. The Universal Declaration of the Rights of Peoples constitutes a fundament of the third generation human rights. The richest sources for information on recent legislation concerning solidarity rights, however, is through the documents of the functional commissions (i.e. United Nations Human Rights Council, the United Nations Environment Programme, Commission on Sustainable Development, UN Commission on the Status of Women) and some specialized agencies (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, World Health Organization, United Nations Children's Fund, United Nations Development Programme). The document database of the United Nations might be especially useful and helpful in investigating various cases of legislations and violations of rights of peoples. It is important to pay special attention to reports of non-governmental organizations such as Amnesty International or Human Rights Watch, which document and publish instances of human rights violations.

Bibliography:

"100th International Women's Day - 100 Inequalities remain | European Institute for Gender Equality." EIGE's Home | European Institute for Gender Equality. 01 June 2011 <<http://www.eige.europa.eu/100-international-womens-day-100-inequalities-remain>>.

"African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights | African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights." *African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights . Commission Africaine des Droits de l'Homme et des Peuples*. 02 June 2011 <http://www.achpr.org/english/_info/charter_en.html>.

Brouwer, Anne-Marie De. *Supranational Criminal Prosecution of Sexual Violence: the ICC and the Practice of the ICTY and the ICTR*. (Antwerpen: Intersentia, 2005).

Brown, Peter G., and Douglas MacLean, eds. *Human Rights and US Foreign Policy: Principles and Applications*. (Lexington, MA: Heath, 1979). 83-92

Burrows, Noreen. *International Law and Human Rights: The Case of Women's Rights*. Ed. Tom Campbell. (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1986).

Cassin, René. "The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization - Round-Table Meeting on Human Rights." UNESCO. Web. 22 May 2011

"CHARTER OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS OF THE EUROPEAN UNION." The European Union. 1 June 2011 <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/charter/pdf/text_en.pdf>.

"Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment." *The UNEP*. Web. 25 May 2011. <<http://www.unep.org/Documents.Multilingual/Default.asp?documentid=97&articleid=1503>>.

Déjeant-Pons, Maguelonne, Sara Fioravanti, and Marc Pallemmaerts. *Human rights and the environment: compendium of instruments and other international texts on individual and collective rights relating to the environment in the international and European framework*. (Strasbourg: Council of Europe Pub., 2002).

Gewirth, Alan. *Human Rights: Essays on Justification and Applications*. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982).

"Indigenous Peoples struggle to survive in Colombia | Amnesty International." Amnesty International | Working to Protect Human Rights. 31 May 2011 <<http://www.amnesty.org/en/news-and-updates/report/indigenous-peoples-struggle-survive-colombia-2010-02-23>>.

"International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights." *OHCHR Homepage*. Web. 23 May 2011. <<http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/pdf/cescr.pdf>>.

Kanger, Helle. *Human Rights in the U.N. Declaration*. (Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 1984). 27-28.

Laszlo, Ervin. *The Inner Limits of Mankind: Heretical Reflections on Today's Values, Culture, and Politics*. (Oxford [Eng.]: Pergamon, 1978).

Milne, A. J. M. *Human Rights and Human Diversity: an Essay in the Philosophy of Human Rights*. (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1986).

"Our Philosophy, Vision and Mission." International Women's Rights Action Watch Asia Pacific. 04 June 2011 <<http://www.iwraw-ap.org/organisation/philosophy.htm>>.

Rohimi, Hj Shapiee. *Third Generation Human Rights: Rights of the Third World : Conception and Policy Considerations*. (Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa Dan Pustaka, Kementerian Pendidikan, Malaysia, 1994).

The Organization (HRW Report - Leave None to Tell the Story: Genocide in Rwanda, March 1999)." *Home | Human Rights Watch*. Web. 24 May 2011. <<http://www.hrw.org/legacy/reports/1999/rwanda/Geno4-7-03.htm>>.

Triggs, Gillian. "The Rights of 'Peoples' and Individual Rights: Conflict or Harmony?" *The Rights of Peoples*. Ed. James Crawford. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1988).

United Nations Human Rights Council. Promotion and Protection of all Human Rights Civil, Political, Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Including the Right to Development. (Geneva: Sixth Session Press Release, 26 September 2007).

"Universal Declaration of Human Rights 60th Anniversary | Amnesty International." *Amnesty International | Working to Protect Human Rights*. Web. 22 May 2011. <<http://www.amnesty.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights-anniversary/landmark>>.

"WHO | Violence against Women." *WHO*. Web. 25 May 2011. <<http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs239/en/>>.

Yearbook of the United Nations 1948-1949, 535.

,