
American Convention Of Human Rights

*American Convention Of
Human Rights*

*Downloaded from
www remodelicious.com
by Palmer & Bronson*

UNDERSTANDING THE PILLAR OF HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE AMERICAS

The protection of fundamental freedoms and inherent dignity is a cornerstone of modern democratic societies. Across the globe, regional frameworks have emerged to codify and enforce these principles. In the Western Hemisphere,

the **American Convention of Human Rights** stands as the most significant legal instrument safeguarding civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights. Often hailed as the cornerstone of the inter-American human rights system, this treaty provides a robust mechanism for individuals and groups to seek justice when their rights are violated. Understanding the **American Convention of Human Rights** is essential not only for legal scholars but

for anyone interested in how human rights are protected and contested across North, Central, and South America.

The Historical Genesis of the Pact of San José

The journey toward a binding, regional human rights treaty in the Americas was a gradual process rooted in the mid-20th century. Following the atrocities of World War II, there was a global surge in human rights codification, leading to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. In the same year, the Organization

of American States (OAS) adopted the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man, which was a non-binding declaration of principles. For nearly two decades, advocates pushed for a more enforceable treaty.

This effort culminated in 1969 at the Inter-American Specialized Conference on Human Rights, held in San José, Costa Rica. It was here that the **American Convention of Human Rights** was formally adopted. The treaty did not enter into force immediately; it required ratification by eleven member states. This threshold was reached in 1978, marking the official commencement of the Convention's legal force. Because of its place of adoption, the treaty is widely known as the **Pact of San José**. This historic agreement created a dual

structure for oversight: the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights.

Key Rights and Freedoms Protected

The **American Convention of Human Rights** is a comprehensive document that enumerates a wide array of specific rights. It begins by affirming the obligation of states parties to respect and ensure the free and full exercise of these rights to all persons subject to their jurisdiction, without any form of

discrimination. This non-discrimination clause is foundational, covering race, color, sex, language, religion, political opinion, national origin, social status, and economic status.

Among the core civil and political rights enshrined in the Convention are:

- **Right to Juridical Personality:** Every person has the right to recognition as a person before the law.
- **Right to Life:** This right is protected from conception, with significant implications for debates on abortion and the death penalty. The Convention allows for the death penalty only in states that already had it and prohibits its extension or re-establishment.

- **Right to Humane Treatment:** Prohibition of torture, cruel, inhuman, or degrading punishment or treatment. All persons deprived of their liberty must be treated with respect for their inherent dignity.
- **Right to Personal Liberty:** Protection against arbitrary arrest or imprisonment, with strict limits on pre-trial detention and the right to habeas corpus.
- **Right to a Fair Trial:** Guarantees include the right to a hearing with due guarantees, the right to be presumed innocent, the right to a defense, and the right to appeal a judgment.
- **Freedom of Thought and Expression:** This right includes

the freedom to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers. The Convention explicitly prohibits prior censorship.

- **Freedom of Conscience and Religion:** Protection of the right to profess, change, and disseminate one's religion or beliefs.
- **Freedom of Assembly and Association:** Rights to peaceful assembly and to form associations for ideological, religious, political, economic, labor, social, cultural, or other purposes.
- **Right to a Name and Nationality:** Every person has the right to a name and to the nationality of the state in whose territory they were born if they do

not have the right to any other nationality.

- **Right to Property:** Protection from unlawful deprivation of property, subject to the public interest and just compensation.
- **Right to Judicial Protection:** The right to simple and prompt recourse to a court for protection against acts that violate fundamental rights.

Beyond these civil and political rights, the **American Convention of Human Rights** contains a significant chapter on economic, social, and cultural rights. Article 26 requires states to adopt measures to progressively achieve the full realization of these rights, including rights to education, health, social

security, and work. The progressive nature of this obligation has been a subject of extensive litigation and interpretation by the Inter-American Court.

The Supervisory Bodies: Commission and Court

The effectiveness of the **American Convention of Human Rights** hinges on its two principal monitoring bodies: the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and the Inter-American

Court of Human Rights. These institutions form the dual pillar of the inter-American system.

THE INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

The Commission, headquartered in Washington, D.C., is the first port of call for individuals alleging violations of their rights under the Convention. Its functions are multifaceted:

1. **Receiving and Processing**

Petitions: Any person, group of persons, or non-governmental organization legally recognized in an OAS member state can submit a petition alleging a violation of the Convention by a state party. The Commission evaluates

admissibility, investigates the facts, and attempts to facilitate a friendly settlement between the parties.

2. **Issuing Recommendations:** If a friendly settlement is not reached, the Commission prepares a report with its conclusions and recommendations. The state is given a period to comply with these recommendations.
3. **Referral to the Court:** If the state does not comply, the Commission may decide to refer the case to the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, provided the state has accepted the Court's jurisdiction.
4. **Country Reports and Thematic Studies:** The Commission

conducts on-site visits, publishes reports on the human rights situation in specific countries, and issues thematic reports on issues such as freedom of expression, indigenous rights, and the rights of migrants.

5. **Precautionary Measures:** The Commission can request that a state adopt urgent precautionary measures to prevent irreparable harm to persons in serious and urgent situations.

THE INTER-AMERICAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

The Court, located in San José, Costa Rica, is the judicial organ of the inter-American system. Its authority is both contentious and advisory:

- **Contentious Jurisdiction:** The Court hears cases referred to it by the Commission or by states parties. Its judgments are binding and final, and cannot be appealed. The Court can order reparations, including monetary compensation, measures of rehabilitation, satisfaction, and guarantees of non-repetition. It can also order provisional measures to prevent irreparable damage.
- **Advisory Jurisdiction:** OAS member states and organs can request advisory opinions from the Court on the interpretation of the Convention or other treaties concerning the protection of human rights in the Americas. This advisory function has been

instrumental in developing the jurisprudence of the system.

- **Monitoring Compliance:** The Court monitors compliance with its judgments, requiring states to submit reports on the measures they have taken to implement the Court's orders.

The relationship between the Commission and the Court is sequential. The Commission acts as a filter and a facilitator, while the Court provides authoritative judicial resolution. This dual system ensures that cases are thoroughly examined and that states have an opportunity to resolve matters domestically before facing international adjudication.

Signatories, Reservations, and State Compliance

As of today, twenty-five OAS member states have ratified or acceded to the **American Convention of Human Rights**. Notable signatories include Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico, Peru, and Venezuela. However, some significant nations have not ratified the treaty. The United States signed the Convention in 1977 but has never ratified it. Canada and several

English-speaking Caribbean states, such as Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, and Barbados, are also not parties, although some have ratified other inter-American human rights instruments.

The issue of state compliance remains the most significant challenge for the system. While the jurisprudence of the Court is highly respected, several states have been slow or reluctant to fully implement its judgments. Cases involving indigenous land rights, freedom of expression in the face of defamation laws, and the rights of detainees have seen protracted non-compliance. In extreme cases, states like Venezuela and Trinidad and Tobago have denounced the Convention altogether, withdrawing from the treaty and the Court's jurisdiction. This

highlights the tension between state sovereignty and international human rights obligations.

The Convention in Contemporary Context

The **American Convention of Human Rights** continues to be a living instrument, adapted through the evolving interpretation of the Court. Several contemporary issues illustrate its ongoing relevance:

Gender Equality and Reproductive Rights: The Court has issued landmark rulings on the rights of women, including

cases on gender-based violence and access to reproductive healthcare. The landmark case of *Artavia Murillo v. Costa Rica* addressed in vitro fertilization, with the Court ruling that the right to private life and family includes the right to reproductive autonomy.

LGBTI+ Rights: The Court's advisory opinion on gender identity and same-sex marriage (OC-24/17) was a watershed moment. It affirmed that the Convention protects the right to change one's name and gender on identity documents and that states must recognize same-sex unions under the right to family. This opinion has influenced domestic legal reforms across the region.

Indigenous and Tribal Peoples: The Court has developed a robust body of jurisprudence on the collective rights of

indigenous and tribal communities, particularly concerning communal property and prior consultation. Cases involving the Saramaka people in Suriname and the Kichwa Indigenous People of Sarayaku in Ecuador have set important precedents for the protection of ancestral lands and resources.

Freedom of Expression and Digital Rights: The Convention's strong protection of freedom of expression is being tested in the digital age. Issues such as internet censorship, criminal defamation, and the protection of journalists are central to the Commission and Court's work. The system has consistently held that the right to seek and receive information applies to all forms of communication, including online media.

Environmental Rights and the Climate Crisis:

In a recent advisory opinion (OC-23/17), the Court recognized the right to a healthy environment as a fundamental right, linking environmental degradation to violations of the rights to life and personal integrity. This opinion has implications for state obligations to address climate change and environmental harm.

Migrants and Refugees: The current migration crisis in the Americas has brought the Convention's provisions on freedom of movement, due process, and humane treatment to the forefront. The Court and Commission have been active in challenging immigration detention practices and advocating for the protection of asylum seekers and refugees.

Challenges and Criticisms of the System

Despite its achievements, the inter-American human rights system faces significant challenges. The principle of subsidiarity, which holds that the international system should only intervene after domestic remedies have been exhausted, is sometimes criticized for creating lengthy delays in justice. The system also grapples with limited resources, leading to a backlog of petitions and cases. Furthermore, the lack of universal ratification means that some of the hemisphere's most powerful

states are not bound by the Convention's most stringent obligations. The political will of states to comply with rulings is variable, and some states have actively sought to limit the Court's authority. The process of selecting Commissioners and judges is also subject to political influences, which can impact the independence and credibility of the institutions.

Conclusion: A Living Legacy for the Americas

The **American Convention of Human Rights** remains an indispensable framework for the protection of human dignity in the Western Hemisphere. From its inception in 1969 as the Pact of San José, it has evolved into a dynamic legal system that has empowered individuals and communities to hold states accountable. While the system is not without its flaws—facing hurdles of state compliance, limited resources, and political backlash—its contributions to justice, democracy, and the rule of law are undeniable. The Convention continues to shape the legal landscape of the Americas, providing a beacon of hope for the protection of fundamental freedoms. As