

States and the Provision of Human Rights Education

'Bimbo Ogunbanjo

Politics and International Relations, ISM - Adonai University, Cotonou, Republic of Benin.

Corresponding author: mbimboogunbanjo@yahoo.com

Abstract

Human rights education (HRE) aims to provide people the knowledge, skills, and values they need to recognize, assert, and defend their rights. This paper takes a unique and thought-provoking method to interpreting the responsibility to deliver human rights education. This paper argues that there is a link between the provision of human rights education and the creation of a culture of human rights by tracing the history of human rights education as part of the UN's mandate. It implies that states should embrace human rights education as a proactive strategy rather than a reactive response to a problem after it has occurred. Before moving on to a contemporary examination of the General Assembly's Decade for Human Rights Education and the ongoing World Programme for Human Rights Education, this paper conducts a scholarly analysis of the nature and scope of the human rights education mandate and a variety of UN instruments. While there has been a considerable worldwide push to promote human rights education, domestic implementation by states remains weak, according to this paper. Recognizing that there are several barriers and problems in the way of fully realizing human rights education, this paper offers the reader some practical solutions for overcoming these obstacles and raising the level of human rights education in schools.

Keywords: Human Rights, Human Rights Education, United Nations, States, International Law, Obligations.

Introduction

Human rights education (HRE) refers to education, training, dissemination, information, practices, and activities aimed at empowering learners to contribute to the building and defense of a universal culture of human rights in society, with a view to the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms, by equipping them with knowledge, skills, and understanding, and moulding their attitudes and behaviour.

Human Rights Education is crucial for a variety of reasons. Some of the most frequently cited arguments for the need of human rights education are listed below:

1. Human rights education is essential for the development and advancement of society;
2. Human rights education allows people to understand, assert, and defend their rights;
3. Human rights education encourages participation in decision-making and dispute resolution through peaceful means; and
4. Empathy, inclusion, and non-discrimination are promoted through human rights education.

Human rights education, abbreviated as "HRE", is an important instrument for human rights understanding and empowerment. Many teachers do not name their classes as "human rights education," but they do include elements of HRE in their lessons. Nondiscrimination, gender equality, anti-racism, and other educational frameworks contribute to a better understanding and respect for human rights. Students are taught about their rights, history, and responsibilities as global citizens.

Human rights education was primarily a concern of domestic legal and educational systems before 1948, as human rights were not deemed an appropriate subject for international law (Adefemi and Paul, 2018: 121). This changed with the formation of the United Nations (UN) and the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR)¹, and HRE was included in an international treaty for the first time.

This paper examines the historical context for HRE's inclusion in international human rights legislation, as well as what States must do to comply with international HRE responsibilities contained in treaties and other instruments. It finishes with some observations on levels of conformity with international HRE regulations and challenges to their implementation, before offering some advice on how States can improve their adherence to international HRE obligations.

Human Rights Education (HRE) in International Law

'Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be created,' says the Preamble to the UNESCO Constitution². Human rights education, or education about human rights, is based on this principle. Education about human rights is one of the best methods to ensure respect for human rights, and respect for human rights is one of the greatest ways to ensure a culture of peace where human rights are respected. As a result, human rights education is similar to preventative medicine in that it requires States to take proactive efforts to be 'healthy,' averting possible human rights catastrophes like those seen in Kosovo, Darfur, and Zimbabwe. Given that one of the UN's key goals is to maintain international peace and security³, it is no surprise that the UN has put a lot of work into supporting HRE. This section considers five initiatives of the UN to mandate and encourage greater HRE by States, namely:

- (i) UDHR;
- (ii) International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights;⁴
- (iii) Convention on the Rights of the Child;⁵
- (iv) UN Decade for Human Rights Education (1995–2004);⁶ and
- (v) World Programme for Human Rights Education (2005-ongoing).⁷

Other international treaties contain provisions relating to HRE⁸, but because the aforementioned are the most important HRE mandates, a comprehensive study of other instruments dealing to HRE is not included in this paper.

The first draft of the UDHR stated that everyone had the right to education, but did not specify what that education should consist of (Easterman, 1949: 484). Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were heavily involved in the UDHR's formulation, and it was an NGO representative who made the initial observation:

The Article on education provided a technical framework but contained nothing about the spirit governing education which was an essential element. Neglect of this principle in Germany had been the main cause of two catastrophic wars (see Fergusson, 2015: 115).

This view was endorsed by the UNESCO delegate, Pierre Lebar, who added that:

[In] Germany, under the Hitler regime, education had been admirably organized but had, nevertheless, produced disastrous results. It was absolutely necessary to make clear that education to which everyone was entitled should strengthen respect of the rights set forth in the Declaration and combat the spirit of intolerance (see Harvey and Adebimpe, 2017: 233).

As a result, the draft UDHR was amended to include Article 26(2) which provides that:

Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and

friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace (see Elvis, 2013: 122).

This wording is the first formal expression of HRE in international law, and it has served as the cornerstone for all subsequent declarations on the subject.

Because the UDHR is a statement rather than a treaty, it is not strictly binding on States, hence it was determined that its contents be integrated into legally binding treaties. As a result, Article 26(2) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was renamed Article 13 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (ICESCR). Three minor changes were made to the text, namely;

1. Making it mandatory for HRE to incorporate the development of a feeling of dignity;
2. The demand for individuals to have an education that enables them to properly participate in a free society; and
3. In addition to racial and religious categories, ethnic groups should be mentioned.

The mention of dignity in Article 13(1) of the ICESCR appears to be a realization that HRE must help people recognize their own intrinsic worth and the human rights that come with it (Beiter, 2006: 95). The addition of a necessity that education enable a person to engage effectively in a free society necessitates education that is both theoretical and practical, i.e., HRE should teach students how to meet their practical needs in life (Ahmed and Sa'id, 2016: 255).

Finally, the use of the word 'ethnic' underlines the fact that discrimination happens on grounds other than race and religion, necessitating the addition of ethnicity⁹. The discrepancies between Article 26(2) of the UDHR and Article 13(1) of the ICESCR amount to little more than a "fluffing out" of the HRE standard.

The Committee on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights (CESCR) is a body of specialists tasked with ensuring that States comply with and implement ICESCR¹⁰. One of the CESCR's functions is to publish General Comments which:

Provide authoritative interpretations of the general wording of the treaty text, thus assisting states parties to understand and fulfill their obligations under the treaties . . . they play an increasingly important role in promoting a shared understanding of treaty norms and developing agreement about the detail of their content. (Otto, 2012: 3).

As a result, General Comments provide assistance on how to interpret and apply treaty clauses. General Comment No. 13 is about Article 13 of the ICESCR, and while it focuses mostly on the right to education, it does go into some detail about the normative substance of that education. It specifies, in particular, that:

*States parties are required to ensure that curricula, for all levels of the educational system, are directed to the objectives identified in article 13(1). They are also obliged to establish and maintain a transparent and effective system which monitors whether or not education is, in fact, directed to the educational objectives set out in article 13(1)*¹¹.

As a result, States Parties to the ICESCR have a positive obligation to provide HRE, and States that allow schools to adopt a curriculum that violates Article 13(1) of the ICESCR are breaking this treaty norm. Article 2 of the ICESCR is important to the obligation of State Parties to offer HRE under Article 13(1) of the Convention. States are only bound to take steps to realize the rights set out in the ICESCR to the extent of their available resources and with the goal of gradually fulfilling their commitments, according to the treaty. As a result, State Parties are not obligated to furnish HRE in line with Article 13 right away, and non-compliance will be forgiven if it is due to budgetary constraints¹². This is in

stark contrast to State Parties' responsibilities under the comparable paragraph of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), which compels States Parties to "respect and ensure" the ICCPR's rights immediately, with no room for gradual fulfillment.

In two ways, General Comment No. 13 tackles the subject of gradual realization. First, while accepting that the responsibility to adopt Article 13(1) is progressive rather than immediate, State Parties must at the very least take steps to put this standard into effect. General Comment No. 3 goes into greater detail about what it means to "take steps," noting that "such steps should be purposeful, concrete, and focused as clearly as possible toward satisfying the commitments specified in the Covenant"¹³. As a result, while States are not compelled to attain HRE immediately in accordance with Article 13, they are required to take steps toward that aim.

The second method that General Comment No. 13 addresses a State Party's lack of resources to implement Article 13(1) is by emphasizing that all States, international organizations, and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) must play a role in ensuring that the right to HRE is realized everywhere. The committee emphasizes the importance of "civil society, UNESCO, the United Nations Development Programme, UNICEF, the International Labour Organization, the World Bank, regional development banks, and the International Monetary Fund" working together¹⁴. As a result, the CESCR acknowledges that many States lack the financial and technical resources to deliver HRE and relies on members of the international community to assist those States in implementing the HRE norm in Article 13(1).

When read in connection with General Comment No. 13, Article 13(1) of the ICESCR establishes a clear mandate for HRE that the 159 State Parties must follow, albeit in a gradual rather than instantaneous way (Roland and Falola, 2018: 89). It converts Article 26(2) of the UDHR into a legally binding requirement and establishes a firm legal foundation on which subsequent HRE initiatives have been based.

The creation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CROC) was sparked by the International Year of the Child in 1979. (Detrick, 2002: 19). While the UDHR took only two years to draft, CROC took ten years to complete¹⁵. This reflects the fact that CROC was formed at the height of the Cold War, when East-West tensions were high, making consensus on the final language difficult.

CROC was preceded by two previous statements on children's rights, the 1924 Geneva Declaration on the Rights of the Child¹⁶ and the 1959 UN Declaration on the Rights of the Child¹⁷, but neither of these declarations addressed human rights education, unlike CROC. According to Article 29(1) of the CROC, State Parties agree that the child's education shall be geared to:

- (a) The greatest possible development of the child's personality, talents, and mental and physical ability;
- (b) The promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms, as well as the ideals stated in the United Nations Charter;
- (c) The development of respect for the kid's parents, his or her own cultural identity, language, and values, as well as national values of the country in which the child is living, the country from which he or she may have emigrated, and civilizations other than his or her own;
- (d) The training of children for responsible lives in a free society, based on mutual understanding, peace, tolerance, gender equality, and friendship among all peoples, ethnic, national, and religious groups, and indigenous peoples;
- (e) The development of respect for the natural environment.

The first thing to notice in Article 29(1) is how weak the language is in the beginning. States are not compelled to provide HRE or to ensure that children receive it; all that is required of them is that they

agree that education should cover the topics listed in paragraphs (a) – (e) (e). As a result, Article 29 does not appear to obligate states to provide HRE. Furthermore, just like Article 2 of the ICESCR, Article 4 of the CROC states that States Parties must only gradually implement Article 29 to the degree that their resources allow. Despite these flaws, Article 29(1) offers a valuable addition to the worldwide legal system governing HRE. For example, it builds on prior definitions of HRE by requiring HRE to incorporate environmental education. This is undoubtedly due to growing concern about environmental degradation (which was not a major worry when the UDHR and ICESCR were negotiated in the 1940s), as well as realization of the interdependence between human rights and the environment¹⁸.

The first General Comment of the Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC) focused on the meaning and interpretation of Article 29(1)¹⁹. This General Comment highlights that the paragraphs in Article 29(1) are connected and that they support, integrate and complement the other rules in CROC, and cannot be correctly interpreted in isolation from them (Adebambo, 2019: 129). As a result, this clause must be construed holistically, taking into account CROC's core values of nondiscrimination (Article 2), best interests of the child (Article 3), and right to participate (Article 12) (Adebambo, 2019: 130).

The HRE set out in Article 29(1) is aimed at sowing the seeds of harmonious relationships among all people and helping to prevent the eruption of violent conflicts and related human rights violations, according to General Comment No. 1 (Baxi, 2007: 146). Overall, General Comment No.1 highlights the importance of HRE against prejudice, racism, discrimination, and xenophobia²⁰ in order to foster peace and harmonious relationships among people of different cultures.

Because it binds the largest number of States, Article 29 of CROC is undoubtedly the most important international treaty provision dealing to HRE. This is because, with the exception of the United States and Somalia, all countries have accepted the Convention on the Rights of the Child. As a result, 193 states have agreed to be bound by the HRE clause²¹.

It is worth mentioning that there are just two countries that have expressed reservations about Article 29. Both of these concerns State Parties' interpretation and application of Article 29 (and a number of other CROC Articles) in conformity with their respective constitutions²². Three states first approved with reservations about Article 29, but Thailand later withdrew its reservation. As a result, it may be argued that HRE, as expressed in this treaty, has widespread international acceptance²³.

Beyond treaty provisions, there is a global drive for HRE. Although the notion of human rights education had been part of international human rights instruments for more than 40 years by the early 1990s, there was concern regarding the extent to which States were actually taking steps to guarantee that people were educated about human rights²⁴. To offset this perceived apathy, the United Nations General Assembly declared the Decade for Human Rights Education (1995-2004), urging all countries to step up their efforts in this area and to develop and implement national human rights education plans²⁵. The Decade had five distinct goals, namely to:

1. Evaluate the needs and develop effective methods for advancing human rights education at the international, regional, national, and local levels;
2. Build and strengthen programmes and capacities for human rights education at these levels;
3. Coordinate the development of effective human rights education materials;
4. Strengthen the role and capacity of the media in human rights education; and
5. Disseminate the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in as many languages as possible, as well as in other formats appropriate for different levels of literacy and disabled²⁶.

The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) published Guidelines that comprised a set of principles as well as a step-by-step method for producing national plans of action in HRE to assist States with the preparation and implementation of national plans of action²⁷. States were encouraged to form a national committee for HRE, which would be responsible for drafting the national plan of action for HRE, commissioning a baseline study for HRE, facilitating the implementation of the national action plan, conducting periodic evaluation and review, and finally preparing follow-up programs as needed, according to the Guidelines (Afris and Olajumoke, 2020: 140).

Despite the demand for States to promote HRE, there was evidence at the conclusion of the Decade that there was still a need for considerably more attention to be paid to human rights education. The High Commissioner's Report on the Decade's accomplishments and deficiencies cited the Decade's triumphs as placing human rights education on the agenda, raising awareness of HRE, and establishing a framework for international collaboration in this area (Bukarambe, 2018: 241). Failure to ensure the inclusion of economic, social, and cultural rights as part of HRE; a tendency for urban populations to benefit from HRE more than rural populations; a failure to effectively coordinate HRE at all levels; and a lack of adequate human, technical, and financial resources, according to the report (Bukarambe, 2018: 242). The report concluded with a recommendation that the United Nations General Assembly declare a second Decade for Human Rights Education, with the UN playing a stronger coordination role and receiving more widespread support from the whole UN system (Bukarambe and Pogson, 2019: 143). It also advocated for the creation of a voluntary fund for HRE and stated that a human rights education convention may be beneficial (Bukarambe and Pogson, 2019: 145). None of these ideas were ultimately implemented, with the General Assembly preferring to declare a continuing World Programme for Human Rights Education.

As previously noted, as the Decade for HRE drew to a close, there was a lot of debate regarding what should happen next. Finally, the United Nations General Assembly resolved to establish an ongoing World Programme for HRE²⁸. The World Programme's first phase, which ran from 2005 to 2009, concentrated on HRE in elementary and secondary schools. States were encouraged to fulfill four separate steps, namely:

- (i) examine the existing state of HRE in educational institutions;
- (ii) create a national implementation strategy and identify priorities;
- (iii) carry out and track HRE activities; and
- (iv) conduct a programme evaluation²⁹.

To accomplish these goals, the OHCHR suggests that each Ministry of Education appoint a suitable unit to coordinate with all relevant actors and serve as a national focal point for school-based HRE activities. States were asked to inform the OHCHR of the identification of their focal point and report on their efforts to implement the World Programme's first phase plan of action. So far, 50 countries have submitted reports, the most of which are from Europe and North America (though the United States is conspicuously absent)³⁰. This is a disappointing reaction to such a significant undertaking, as it represents roughly a quarter of the UN membership.

Furthermore, many of these States have not gone beyond establishing the focal point for their national implementation of the first phase, according to the studies³¹. There is evidence of a weak awareness of what HRE comprises among the States that have reported on more serious efforts. For example, Australia only refers to civics and citizenship education³², which is a small subset of HRE that excludes education about the whole range of human rights, including economic, social, and cultural rights (Gerber, 2019).

The international push for HRE, which began with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the 1940s, has gained significant traction in recent years. It is apparent that HRE has been, and continues to be, a focus of worldwide attention, and that there is a strong drive for expanded human rights education. However, the international enthusiasm for HRE does not appear to be mirrored in the domestic arena. For example, empirical research by some authors into the extent of HRE in secondary schools in Melbourne, Australia and Boston, USA revealed low levels of HRE (Gerber, 2018). (Gerber, 2018). Low amounts of HRE in schools have been discovered in similar research in other jurisdictions (Neacsu-Hendry et al., 2007; Dobozy, 2014; Enslin, 2016: 73-83). In the face of a determined international drive for HRE, the lack of broad HRE requires deeper investigation into the possible causes. The next part looks at some of the potential roadblocks to incorporating HRE into school curricula, as well as some potential solutions.

Obstacles to the Realization of Human Rights Education

Politico-financial barriers are the most common impediments to compliance with international HRE laws (Coomans, 2017: 284). If governments do not make human rights education a priority, it will never become widely available. HRE is not only not a priority for many countries, but it is also seen as a potential threat and destabilizing impact by the government. As one author puts it:

An educated and emancipated citizenry (such as students) may trigger calls for democratic change, respect for human rights and accountability of those in power, and cause political unrest. Such developments may ultimately lead to a loss of power of the ruling group in a society (Coomans, 2017: 286).

As a result, governments may oppose HRE in order to keep their populace unaware of their human rights, because it is simpler to violate someone's human rights if they are unaware of their rights and how to claim and enforce them. Even governments that are not driven by a desire to keep their populace unaware about human rights may choose to put HRE on the back burner for a variety of reasons. Organizations like the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) judge the effectiveness of a country's education system based on characteristics like literacy and numeracy levels, rather than whether or not HRE is included in the regular curriculum³³. As a result, governments seeking to demonstrate that they have a high-quality education system are more likely to focus on parts that are measured by global standards rather than those that are not part of any examination of a State's education system, such as HRE.

HRE involves a financial commitment from a state, which may be an impediment to HRE. Training instructors on human rights, establishing tools for students and educators, and changing curricula to instill human rights all cost money to a government. However, it is also uncommon for states to have insufficient financial resources, preferring instead to spend their money on other priorities such as military spending (Watkins, 2015: 322). As a result, what appears to be a financial barrier to HRE may actually be a political barrier, with governments preferring to fund their armed forces over investing in human rights education. International financial authorities, such as the World Bank, the IMF, and international donors and relief agencies, could solve a shortage of government resources available for HRE by requiring the State to invest in HRE as a condition of giving cash or help (Coomans, 2017: 298). External pressure, it is proposed, could be utilized to sway governments' budgetary decisions in favour of HRE.

Political and financial constraints, as well as a lack of local human rights legislation, might be barriers to HRE. HRE is simpler to achieve, according to empirical study, if there is a culture of human rights

that stems from a domestic human rights instrument. Having a Bill of Rights that is rooted in the culture of a society is one means of fostering HRE (Afris, 2022: 260). (Afris, 2022: 260). This may be seen in South Africa, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom, where HRE expanded after domestic human rights agreements were enacted (Fergusson and Adamson, 2021: 334-338). The danger of depending on local mechanisms to enhance HRE is that the focus of education will likely be parochial rather than worldwide (Remilson, 2020), which educators must avoid. In this age of globalization, it is critical that HRE possess a global perspective.

Notwithstanding that a Bill of Rights may have the effect of narrowing the scope of HRE, it is nevertheless suggested, that a strong domestic Bill of Rights can be a more effective tool in the push for increased HRE, than international initiatives calling for increased HRE. A 'homegrown' request for HRE stated in a domestic human rights document can have a greater influence than a remote call for HRE from Geneva's 'foreign' ambassadors. As a result, it is recommended that, rather than fighting for further UN action in this area, promoting HRE in a country like Australia, which currently has a Bill of Rights, the best way to promote HRE is to push for a national Bill of Rights³⁴.

Although the focus of this paper has been on HRE in schools, international HRE mandates demand much more than human rights education for children. Many other aspects of society require HRE, and other scholars have written about it in a variety of fields, including the military, police, medical profession, and journalists (Hinkley, 2015: 298-300; DuBois, 2017: 311-315; Mann et al., 2017: 333-338; Parlow, 2020: 374-377). Clearly, for HRE to have the greatest impact, it must reach out to people from all walks of life.

Conclusion

This paper has shown that human rights have been a main element of the UN since its founding, and practically all States have agreed to provide HRE to varying degrees, depending on which treaties they have signed and whose projects they have committed to. Despite these efforts, there remains a large gap between the right to HRE as stipulated by international law and its actualization. As a next step in encouraging increased HRE, the UN Human Rights Council has recognized this and is considering the idea of developing a Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training³⁵. A HRE Declaration could provide more clarity and assurance about what is necessary and how it can be accomplished. A Declaration on HRE, on the other hand, is unlikely to achieve anything more than the strong body of international law on HRE that currently exists unless it is widely disseminated — outside the community of diplomats and international lawyers. This viewpoint differs from that of certain NGOs, who argue that a UN Declaration on HRE would:

- make a stronger commitment to human rights education and training;
- make human rights education a legal requirement;
- clarify definitions and practice;
- prioritize duty-bearers' and rights-holders' training;
- establish HRE benchmarks and indicators;
- provide states with incentives and encouragement to carry out their commitments; and
- provide a powerful tool for lobbying and advocacy by NGOs committed to HRE³⁶.

This author, on the other hand, believes that it is time for the international community to refocus its efforts. The UN should focus less on defining standards and more on monitoring and giving practical support to States in order to enable them meet their commitment to offer HRE. If UN committees such as the CRC and the CESCR make inspection of States' HRE activities a priority, it may help to build the political will that is required for States to implement HRE. Similarly, as part of the UN

Human Rights Council's Universal Periodic Review process, the UN Human Rights Council could monitor States' HRE initiatives. Simultaneously, practical and financial help is required to enable many countries to provide teacher training, build human rights curricula, and develop relevant resources for students. UNESCO and the international aid and development community have a role to play in this field, so that no State can claim that a lack of resources is the reason for its failure to deliver HRE in the future.

Many people believe that the current world is more perilous than ever before for human rights and fundamental freedoms. Human rights education at all levels, for everyone, is the answer to the world's issues, so that the world shifts from a planet of violence and hostile use of force to one characterized by a culture of human rights and peace in a rule of law society. States should realize that more humans educated in human rights, capable and willing to challenge governments to adhere to the human rights norms that are the birthright of all human beings and were painfully birthed in the crucible of the holocaust, are what the world needs now, not more soldiers trained to kill or destroy in order to prevent others from killing or destroying. States should realize that there can be no peace if there is no justice. We should all work together to promote and safeguard human rights by first learning about them in school, online, or in other places. We should also educate them to our children, who are the planet's future. States should also realize that there is no longer a need for war. We should work to promote justice and peace by increasing our understanding of and commitment to human rights.

Notes

1. Adopted and proclaimed by General Assembly Resolution 217 A (III) of 10 December 1948.
2. Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, adopted in London on 16 November 1945.
3. Preamble to the United Nations Charter signed at San Francisco on 26 June 1945, entered into force 24 October 1945.
4. Adopted by General Assembly Resolution 2200A (XXI) on 16 December 1966, entered into force 3 January 1976.
5. Convention on the Rights of the Child, adopted by General Assembly Resolution 44/25 on 20 November 1989, entered into force 2 September 1990.
6. Proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly in Resolution 49/184 on 23 December 1994.
7. Proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly in Resolution 59/113 on 10 December 2004.
8. See for example, Article 10 in Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, adopted by General Assembly Resolution 34/180 on 18 December 1979, entered into force 3 September 1981; Article 7 in Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, adopted by General Assembly Resolution 2106 (XX) on 21 December 1965, entered into force 4 January 1969; and Article 5 in UNESCO Convention Against Discrimination in Education, adopted by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization on 14 December 1960.
9. There is little detailed information available about what occurred during the drafting of Article 13 of ICESCR, in particular, who proposed these changes, and why. The leading texts on the drafting of ICESCR and Article 13 are silent when it comes to these changes.
10. Established by ECOSOC Resolution 1985/17 of 28 May 1985.
11. Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, E/C.12/1999/10, 8 December 1999.

12. For further discussion on the meaning and application of Article 2 of ICESCR see General Comment No. 3 *The Nature of States Parties' Obligations*, 14 December 1990, E/1991/23.
13. Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, E/1991/23, 14 December 1990, paragraph 2.
14. General Comment No. 13, paragraph 60.
15. The drafting of CROC spanned a decade from 1979 to 1989.
16. Geneva Declaration of the Rights of the Child of 1924, adopted 26 September 1924, League of Nations O.J. Spec. Supp. 21, at 43.
17. General Assembly Resolution 1386(XIV) of 20 November 1959.
18. See for example Aaron Sachs and Jane A. Peterson, "Eco-Justice: Linking Human Rights and the Environment," (1995) Worldwatch Paper 127, Washington D.C., 1995), and Greg Maggio and Owen Lynch, "Human Rights, Environment, and Economic Development: Existing and Emerging Standards in International Law and Global Society," (1997) accessed at www.cedha.org.ar/docs/ENG38.doc on 23 July 2021.
19. Committee on the Rights of the Child, 'General Comment 1: The Aims of Education', CRC/GC/2001/1, 17 April 2001.
20. See for example General Comment No. 1, op. cit. (note 28), paragraph 11.
21. As at 29 October 2008. See <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/ratification/11.htm>.
22. Indonesia and Turkey ratified CROC with specific reservations concerning Article 29.
23. See <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/ratification/11.htm> (accessed 21 August 2021).
24. See for example Report of the Secretary-General on Human Rights Education, A/49/261-E/1994/110 and Add.1.
25. General Assembly Resolution A/RES/49/184, 6 March 1995, paragraphs 5 and 6.
26. Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the implementation of the Plan of Action for the United Nations Decade for Human Rights Education (1995-2004), A/51/506/Add.1, 12 December 1996, paragraph 5.
27. A/52/469/Add.1 and Add.1/Corr.1, 20 October 1997.
28. Resolution 59/113 of 10 December 2004.
29. General Assembly Resolution A/59/525/Rev.1, 2 March 2005, paragraph 26.
30. Eleven States are from Africa; 12 from Asia Pacific; 20 from Europe and North America; three from Latin America; and four from Middle East and North America. Accessed at <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/education/training/Summary-national-initiatives2005-2009.htm> on 29 October 2021.
31. Accessed at: www.ohchr.org/english/issues/education/training/national-focal.htm on 22 March 2021.
32. <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/education/training/Summary-national-initiatives2005-2009.htm> (accessed 29 October 2021).
33. See OECD Programme for International Student Assessment at www.pisa.oecd.org/pages/0,3417,en_32252351_32235731_1_1_1_1_1,00.html (accessed 29 October 2021).
34. Two jurisdictions within Australia do have local human rights legislation, namely Victoria with the Charter of Human Rights and Responsibilities Act 2006 (Vic) and the Australian Capital Territory with the Human Rights Act 2004 (ACT).
35. UN Human Rights Council Resolution 6/10, 28 September 2007. A Drafting Group of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee met with NGOs in Geneva on Friday, 7 August 2008. The

drafting committee will next meet in January 2009 during the next session of the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee.

36. Human Rights Education Associates at: www.hrea.org/lists2/display.php?language_id=1&id=9562 (accessed 31 October 2021).

References

- Adebambo, David. "Education Professionals and the Construction of Human Rights Education". *Comparative Education Review* 51, no. 1 (2019): 48–70.
- Adefemi, Mike and Paul, Bassiouni, 'International Recognition of Victims' Rights' (2018) *Human Rights Law Review*. 21(2), 221 – 27.
- Afris, Akira. *Global Community: The Role of International Organizations in the Making of the Contemporary World*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2022.
- Afris, Elizabeth Heger, and Olajumoke, Thompson. "National Politics and Resort to the European Commission on Human Rights." *Law & Society Review* 35, no. 2 (2020): 321–44.
- Ahmed, Tawhida, and Sa'id, Butler. "The European Union and Human Rights: An International Law Perspective," *European Journal of International Law* 27, no.4 (2016): 771–801.
- Ayodele, Hurwitz and David, Roy. "Lawyering for Justice and the Inevitability of International Human Rights Clinics." *The Yale Journal of International Law* 48 (2021): 505–550.
- Baxi, Upendra. "Human Rights Education: The Promise of the Third Millennium?" In *Human Rights Education for the Twenty-First Century*, edited by George J. Andreopoulos and Richard Pierre Claude, 142–54. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.
- Beiter, Klaus Dieter. *The Protection of the Right to Education by International Law: Including a Systematic Analysis of Article 13 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights*. Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2006.
- Bukarambe, Allan. "Protecting the Rights of all Human Rights Defenders." *The Review (International Commission of Jurists)* Vol. 55 (December 2018): 39–57.
- Bukarambe, Allan and Pogonson, Kooijmans. "The Nongovernmental Organizations and the Monitoring Activities of the United Nations in the Field of Human Right." In *The Role of Non-Governmental Organizations in the Protection of Human Rights, Symposium International Commission of Jurists* (2019): 15–22.
- Coomans, Fons. "Content and Scope of the Right to Education as a Human Right and Obstacles to its Realization." In *Human Rights in Education, Science and Culture: Legal Developments and Challenges*, edited by Yvonne Donders and Vladimir Volodin, 183–230. Paris: UNESCO Publishing, and UK: Ashgate Publishing, 2017.
- Craven, Matthew. *The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights: A Perspective on its Development*. USA: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Detrick, Sharon. *The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child: A Guide to the Travaux Préparatoires*. Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2002.
- Dobozy, Eva. "Education in and for Democracy and Human Rights: Moving from utopian Ideas to Grounded Practice." PhD thesis, Murdoch University, 2014. Accessed at <http://www.lib.murdoch.edu.au/adt/pubfiles/adt-MU20050310.92906/01Front.pdf>
- DuBois, Marc. *Human Rights Education for the Police*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017.
- Easterman, Alex. A British journalist representing the World Jewish Congress. *United Nations Yearbook on Human Rights for 1947*, Lake Success, 1949.
- Elvis, Hayner, *Unspeakable Truths: Confronting Human Rights, State Terror and Atrocity*. New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Enslin, Penny. "Citizenship Education in Post-Apartheid South Africa." *Cambridge Journal of Education* 33, no. 1 (2016): 73–83.
- Fergusson, de Greiff (ed.), *The Handbook of Human Rights*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

- Fergusson, Halliday and Adamson, Fred. "The Romance of Non-State Actors and Human Rights." in *Non-State Actors in World Politics*, ed. Daphne Josselin and William Wallace. New York: Palgrave Macmillian Publishers, 2021.
- Gerber, Paula *From Convention to Classroom: The Long Road to Human Rights Education* (2018) VDM Publishers, Germany.
- Gerber, Paula. "Human Rights Education: A Slogan in Search of a Definition?" In *Research Handbook on International Human Rights Law*, edited by Sarah Joseph and Adam McBeth. UK: Edward Elgar Publishers, 2019.
- Harvey, A. Meyer-Rieckh and Adebimpe, Greiff (eds.), *Justice, United Nations and Human Rights*. Social Science Research Council, 2017.
- Hinkley, D. Michael. *Military Training for Human Rights and Democratization*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2015.
- Keet, Andre, and Nazir Carrim. "Infusing Human Rights into the Curriculum: The Case of the South African Revised National Curriculum Statement." *Perspectives in Education* 23, no. 2 (2005): 99–110.
- Mann, Jonathan, Zita Lazzarini, Lawrence Gostin, and Sofia Gruskin, *Teaching Human Rights to Public Health Practitioners*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2017.
- Neacsu-Hendry, Ligia Ivan Turek, Jana Kwiecinska, Kozara Kati, and Theodore S. Orlin. *Implementing Human Rights Education in Three Transitional Democracies: Romani, Slovakia and Albania*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.
- Otto, Dianne. "Gender Comment": Why Does the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights Need a General Comment on Women?" *Canadian Journal of Women and the Law* 24 (2012): 1–52.
- Quigley, Charles N. and Center for Civic Education. *Preliminary Report on High School Students' Knowledge and Understanding Of The History And Principles Of The United States Constitution And Bill Of Rights*. Calabasas, California: Center for Civic Education, 1987.
- Parlow, Anita. "Beyond the "Official Story": What Journalists need to Know." In *Human Rights Education for the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Kelly George J. and Frank Jibunoh, 374–386. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2020.
- Pitts, David. "Human Rights Education in Diverse, Developing Nations: A Case in Point –South Africa." *Issues of Democracy* 7, no. 1 (2002): 14–18.
- Remilson, Carrillo. "Bringing International Law Home: The Innovative Role of Human Rights Clinics in the Transnational Legal Process." *Columbia Human Rights Law Review* 38 (2020): 527–587.
- Roland, Adjami and Falola Mirna E. "African Courts, International Law, and Comparative Case Law: Chimera or Emerging Human Rights Jurisprudence?" *Michigan Journal of International Law* 24 (2018): 103–167, 103–108.
- Tibbitts, Felissa. *Case Studies in Human Rights Education: Examples from Central and Eastern Europe*. Human Rights Education Associates & Council of Europe, 1997. Accessed at www.hrea.org/pubs/HRE_Case_studies/index.html
- Watkins, Karl. *Education Now: Break the Cycle of Poverty*, The Oxfam Education Report, Oxford, UK (2000).