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I. INTRODUCTION

The recent White House insurrection has brought home the fragility of our norms. We live in a world where norms can all too easily disintegrate, and realities are increasingly splintered with individually tailored social media, news sources, and search engines. International human rights can serve as a needed moral and legal compass, connecting us to global conversations and standards. They further provide the opportunity to contribute lessons and build on the experiences of others.

At the same time, to be meaningful, human rights standards must be interpreted by communities to address local needs. This article posits that international human rights standards provide a useful minimum core on which communities can build. While human rights are embedded in international treaties, which function as contracts between states, their primary beneficiaries are third parties—the states’ inhabitants. There is thus a particular need for local initiatives to implement rights.

Over the last two decades, cities throughout the world have espoused international human rights in various forms. This development has also caught on in the United States with close to a dozen self-designated human rights cities and a vibrant “Cities for CEDAW” movement, focused on protecting women’s rights. This article probes the growing phenomenon of cities as human rights actors and its particular relevance in the U.S.

---

3 Id. at 133–36.
4 DOUGLAS L. DONOHOO, INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS LAW 63 (2017).
context. It argues that cities provide a critical vehicle to negotiate the inherent tension between the universality of human rights and respect for cultural and regional diversity. Cities are further particularly important as human rights actors in the U.S. context, where federalism limits the reach of international treaties to address issues touching on social welfare, family relations, or criminal law. Additionally, cities can play a crucial role in realizing women’s equality, often bound up with cultural norms. However, engagement with cities as human rights actors at both the international and national levels is still in its infancy.

This article posits that human rights cities are a critical frontier, bringing a local orientation to our understanding of rights and enabling a human rights approach to governance. Cities can thus play an important role in the implementation and development of international human rights law. Part II provides a conceptual and historical overview, tracing the emergence of cities as human rights actors. This encompasses the influence of three different but converging concepts: the “human rights city,” “human rights in the city,” and the “right to the city.” Part III contends that human rights implementation at the city level facilitates a human rights approach to governance that prioritizes participation and equality. Closer to communities, human rights cities can democratize rights, address federalism concerns, and move beyond the citizen construct at the national level to embrace all inhabitants. A focus on human rights by cities further advances equality by addressing disparate impacts and jurisdictional barriers to women’s rights. Parts IV through VI then explore the roles of cities as human rights actors in the international sphere, in the United States, and among peers, highlighting gaps and providing recommendations for better engagement.

II. THE EMERGENCE OF CITIES AS HUMAN RIGHTS ACTORS

Over the last two decades, cities have emerged as human rights actors of increasing importance on both the international and domestic stages. While not all cities are necessarily proponents of human rights, an

---

increasing number of cities have articulated a commitment to international human rights standards, influencing their policies and practice. This section explores the conceptual underpinning of this emerging movement and situates developments in the United States within a global landscape. Since human rights city is a self-designation, there is no standardization as to what this means. This designation also reflects the influence of several concepts that intertwine—the “human rights city,” “human rights in the city,” and the “right to the city.” Additionally, a growing number of city initiatives focus on particular rights. In all these efforts, local advocates have played a central role.6

A. THE HUMAN RIGHTS CITY

The term, “human rights city,” emphasizes the building of a local human rights community. As documentation of this movement describes, “[a] Human Rights City is a community, all of whose members—from ordinary citizens and community activists to policy-makers and local officials—pursue a community-wide dialogue and launch actions to improve the life [sic] and security of women, men and children based on human rights norms and standards.”7 This concept comes from the People’s Movement for Human Rights Learning (“PDHRE”), an international NGO focused on human rights education and formerly known as the People’s Decade for Human Rights Education.8 PDHRE launched the “human rights city” movement in the wake of the 1993
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As the Gwangju Declaration captures, the human rights cities movement emphasizes a “socio-political process” and the development of a “local community,” guided by international human rights standards. Under PDHRE’s model, the first step in creating a human rights city is to establish a democratically functioning steering committee that represents various segments of the population—giving special attention to historically marginalized groups—as well as the city government and United Nations (“U.N.”) agencies. The steering committee then

---

11 Oomen, supra note 10, at 6.
12 Soohoo, supra note 10, at 271.
14 HRC August 2015 Report, supra note 9, ¶ 61.
17 Id.
18 Neubeck, supra note 13, at 240.
develops a plan of action to prioritize human rights requiring attention, conduct human rights education, and evaluate city sectors against human rights goals. PDHRE’s name itself reflects its focus on education and popular engagement, complementing the traditional emphasis on government enforcement.

Most recently, in October 2021, the European Union Agency for Fundamental Human Rights developed detailed guidance, proposing “a framework for becoming, and functioning as, a human rights city in the European Union.” This guidance (“EU Framework for Reinforcing Rights Locally”) is aimed at mayors, city administrators, and civil society groups interested in reinforcing human rights locally. It includes “foundations” affirming the city’s commitment to human rights; “structures” or procedures integrating human rights into daily city life; and “tools” supporting ongoing human rights work by cities.

Human rights cities have also developed in the United States. Starting with Washington D.C. in 2008, U.S. human rights cities now include Carrboro and Chapel Hill, North Carolina; Richmond, California; Eugene, Oregon; Boston, Massachusetts; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Seattle, Washington; Jackson, Mississippi; Edina, Minnesota; and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; among others. The EU Framework includes a model for becoming a human rights city which is aimed at mayors, city administrators, and civil society groups interested in reinforcing human rights locally. The framework is aimed at creating a framework for becoming, and functioning as, a human rights city in the European Union.

19 Id.; Oomen, supra note 10, at 9; Marks et al., supra note 7, at 47–49.
21 Id.
22 Id.
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Minnesota, and Mountain View, California in 2016. In 2017, Dallas County, Texas designated itself a human rights county, and in 2019, Portage, Michigan affirmed the city’s human rights commitment to all its residents. Efforts are further underway to make Birmingham, Alabama a human rights city. With support from the U.S. National Human Rights Network, these U.S. cities are further coordinating and have formed the National Human Rights Cities Alliance to share experiences and “advance knowledge about effective models and practices for local implementation of human rights.” Additionally, in 2007, Berkeley, California became the first U.S. city to produce a report on local compliance with the human rights treaties the United States has ratified, and from 2009, it instituted regular reporting for the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (“ICCPR”), International Covenant on the Elimination of All


36 BRINGING HUMAN RIGHTS HOME, supra note 23, at 20 & n.153.

37 Id. at 20 & n.154; see also International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, ratified June 8, 1992, 999 U.N.T.S. 171 [hereinafter ICCPR].
Forms of Racial Discrimination ("ICERD"),\textsuperscript{38} and Convention against Torture ("CAT"),\textsuperscript{39} requiring all city departments to contribute data, share progress, and identify remaining gaps.\textsuperscript{40} Berkeley then sends these reports to both the U.S. State Department and the relevant international treaty body.\textsuperscript{41}

In the United States, adoption of an international human rights framework has important implications for both the content of rights and their enforcement. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights ("UDHR"),\textsuperscript{42} the foundational human rights document, includes civil and political rights enshrined in the U.S. Constitution, such as the rights to due process, freedom of expression and religion, and political participation.\textsuperscript{43} It further includes social and economic rights, such as rights to housing, health, and education.\textsuperscript{44}

Unlike the generally negative conception of rights in the United States,\textsuperscript{45} which focuses on freedom from government interference,\textsuperscript{46} the international human rights framework recognizes three levels of state obligations: (1) to respect, or the obligation not to violate a right itself; (2) to protect, or the obligation to ensure other parties do not violate a right; and (3) to fulfill, or the obligation to create the conditions necessary for exercising a right—perhaps the most challenging.\textsuperscript{47} Thus, ensuring

---


\textsuperscript{39} Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, \textit{ratified} October 21, 1994, 1465 U.N.T.S. 85 [hereinafter CAT].

\textsuperscript{40} BRINGING HUMAN RIGHTS HOME, \textit{supra} note 23, at 20.

\textsuperscript{41} \textit{id.} at 20, 21.

\textsuperscript{42} G.A. Res. 217 (III) A, Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Dec. 10, 1948) [hereinafter UDHR].

\textsuperscript{43} \textit{id.}

\textsuperscript{44} \textit{id.}


\textsuperscript{46} Tamar Ezer, \textit{A Positive Right to Protection for Children}, 7 YALE HUM. RTS. & DEV. L.J. 1, 4 (2004) ("Negative, or non-interference rights, prevent the state from violating individual autonomy, while positive, or integrative rights, impose a duty on the state to provide certain goods and services . . . . This differentiation also reflects two conceptions of liberty: negative liberty, or liberty from, and positive liberty, or liberty to.").

rights requires not only addressing violations, but also taking preventive action and a proactive role to create the conditions for the fulfillment of rights.

While in many U.S. cities the human rights designation is mostly symbolic, some cities have taken concrete steps towards implementation. In 2011, the City Council of Eugene, Oregon unanimously voted to revise its Human Rights Ordinance so that its Human Rights Commission addresses the full range of rights in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.48 Portland, Oregon’s Human Rights Commission has likewise incorporated the UDHR into its bylaws,49 and the Los Angeles County Human Relations Commission and Berkeley’s Peace and Justice Commission draw on international human rights standards in their work.50 Additionally, Eugene has developed a human rights framework to internalize human rights standards in all city operations and departments, which calls on officials to proactively identify human rights issues and seek solutions, establish mechanisms for public participation and accountability, and educate all residents on human rights and avenues for redress.51 As Eugene is integrating human rights in governance, local groups have also adopted human rights framing, which includes positive obligations by government to fulfill social and economic rights.52 For instance, local advocates used the right to housing to push the city to address homelessness by making city property available for camping or building homes and providing support for emergency shelters.53

Moreover, some city governments have used human rights standards as an accountability frame. As Columbia Law School’s Human Rights Institute describes, cities draw on human rights “as benchmarks to understand the potential impact of their policies and decisions, to measure program effectiveness and to identify barriers to reaching intended beneficiaries.”54 Eugene, for instance, has developed a Triple Bottom Line Analysis Tool (“TBL”) grounded in the UDHR to assess the social

---

48 BRINGING HUMAN RIGHTS HOME, supra note 23, at 12; Human Rights in Eugene, supra note 25.
50 Id. at 2005.
51 Neubeck, supra note 13, at 242.
52 Id. at 254.
53 Id. at 251–52.
54 BRINGING HUMAN RIGHTS HOME, supra note 23, at 7.
equity, environmental, and economic implications of city decisions.\textsuperscript{55} The social equity dimension entails a human rights assessment, “[p]lacing priority upon protecting, respecting, and fulfilling the full range of universal human rights, including civil, political, social, economic, and cultural rights.”\textsuperscript{56} Additionally, both the environmental health and economic development dimensions reference human rights, recognizing the interrelationship among the three components.\textsuperscript{57} Community participation is also an important part of this process.\textsuperscript{58} Eugene has used TBL analysis to assess policies, leading to improved youth recreation and public amenities and increased investment in health, particularly for low-income families.\textsuperscript{59}

B. HUMAN RIGHTS IN THE CITY

In parallel with the human rights cities movement, cities have mobilized around the concept of “human rights in the city,” which focuses on the role of local government in protecting rights. This initiative emerged out of a meeting by several European cities in 1998 to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the UDHR.\textsuperscript{60} Seeking to affirm their commitment to advance human rights at the local level and highlight the critical role of cities in human rights protection, they drafted the European Charter for the Safeguarding of Human Rights in the City in 2000.\textsuperscript{61} They then entrusted follow up to United Cities and Local Governments (“UCLG”), the international organization of cities.\textsuperscript{62} With leadership from Barcelona and Nantes, the UCLG subsequently developed and adopted the Global-Charter Agenda for Human Rights in the City at its 2011 World Council.\textsuperscript{63} These documents focus on protection of rights by local government and set out a human rights approach to local

\textsuperscript{55} Neubeck, \textit{supra} note 13, at 244.
\textsuperscript{56} Id.
\textsuperscript{57} Id.
\textsuperscript{58} BRINGING HUMAN RIGHTS HOME, \textit{supra} note 23, at 23.
\textsuperscript{59} Id.; GENDER EQUITY THROUGH HUMAN RIGHTS, \textit{supra} note 47, at 16.
\textsuperscript{61} Id.
\textsuperscript{62} Id.
\textsuperscript{63} Id.
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policies. The Global-Charter Agenda for Human Rights in the City further includes suggested action plans and benchmarks for local government under each right. To become effective, it calls for a consultation process in each city to allow inhabitants to adapt it to local conditions and set up implementation bodies.

Complementing this city-driven movement, Europe’s intergovernmental organizations have clarified the responsibilities of cities in realizing rights. In a series of conventions and resolutions, the Council of Europe’s Congress of Local and Regional Authorities developed a body of law addressed at local authorities, including the European Urban Charter adopted in 1992. It also held a forum of exchange among them in 2015. Likewise, the European Union’s Committee of the Regions passed a Charter for Multilevel Governance in Europe in 2014, aimed at coordinated action with regional and local authorities.

C. THE RIGHT TO THE CITY

The third and perhaps most radical concept underlying the city’s relation to human rights is the “right to the city,” which sets out a collective right of inhabitants to own, manage, and develop their city according to human rights principles. This concept has roots that go back to the late 1960s and the work of French sociologist and philosopher, Henri Lefebvre. He coined this term in Le Droit à la Ville, which criticizes capitalism’s impact on urban life, articulating an alternate vision of the city as a social unit. Specifically, Lefebvre noted that “collective

65 Global Charter-Agenda, supra note 64.
66 Id. art. 12; see also European Human Rights Charter, supra note 64, art. 18, ¶ 3.
70 Oomen, supra note 10, at 5.
71 Id.; Eva G. Chueca, Human Rights in the City and the Right to the City: Two Different Paradigms Confronting Urbanization, in GLOBAL URBAN JUSTICE: THE RISE OF HUMAN RIGHTS, supra note 10, at 103, 112.
space belong[s] to all who live in it.”  

Both the European Charter for the Safeguarding of Human Rights in the City and the Global-Charter Agenda for Human Rights in the City incorporate the right to the city, dedicating their first article to this right. The European Charter specifically affirms the city as “a collective space belonging to all who live in it.” The Global-Charter Agenda recognizes city inhabitants as “full-fledged actors of the life of the city” and “active citizens” with “the right to participate in the configuration and coordination of territory as a basic space.” The Council of Europe’s European Urban Charter also mentions the right to the city in the preamble, but only in the French version.

However, the right to the city remains a peripheral paradigm in Europe, playing a more central role in Latin America. Urban justice movements in Latin America rallied around this concept since the 1980s. Both Brazil and Columbia adopted elements of this concept. Brazil’s Constitution, enacted in 1988, acknowledges the “social function” of property, which Brazil’s City Statute translated into urban planning policies in 2001. Then, in 2006, Brazil established the Council of Cities to provide for citizen participation in urban policies. Likewise, the Colombian Constitution, enacted in 1991, acknowledges the “social dimension” of property, further developed in a 1997 law on land use planning. In 2008, Ecuador’s Constitution explicitly referenced the right to the city, recognizing inhabitants’ “right to fully enjoy the city and its

---

72 Oomen, supra note 10, at 6.
73 Id. at 5.
74 European Human Rights Charter, supra note 64, art. 1, ¶ 1; Global Charter-Agenda, supra note 64, art. 1, ¶ 1.
75 European Human Rights Charter, supra note 64, art. 1, ¶ 1.
76 Global-Charter Agenda, supra note 64, art. 1, ¶ 1.
77 Chueca, supra note 71, at 113.
78 Id. at 114. In 2005, protests in the settlements of Durban, South Africa also used the right to the city in their call for better living conditions for the urban poor. Id. at 118.
79 Constituição Federal [C.F.] [Constitution] Oct. 5, 1988, art. 5, ¶ 23 (Braz.) (“Property shall observe its social function.”).
80 Chueca, supra note 71, at 115.
81 Id.
82 Constitución Política de Colombia [C.P.] July 4, 1991, art. 58 (“Property has a social dimension that implies obligations.”).
83 Chueca, supra note 71, at 115.
public spaces” and noting, “[e]xercising the right to the city is based on the democratic management of the city, with respect to the social and environmental function of property.”

The 2001 World Social Forum in Brazil further stimulated a global endorsement of the right to the city and the drafting of the World Charter to the Right to the City (“World Charter”), finalized in 2005. U.N.-Habitat (“United Nations Human Settlements Programme”) espoused the right to the city as a framework with potential to address urban problems comprehensively. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (“UNESCO”) likewise endorsed this framework and participated in its development. The World Charter explains that the right to the city includes “all the civil, political, economic, social, cultural and environmental rights which are already regulated in the international human rights treaties.”

However, it also goes further and defines a “collective right” of inhabitants to “equitable usufruct [or enjoyment] of cities within the principles of sustainability, equity, and social justice.” It recognizes the city’s “primary purpose” as a “social function,” requiring “democratic management” and all inhabitants to benefit from its resources. The city is thus collectively owned and constructed.

In 2010, Mexico City became the first municipality to adopt a full Charter for the Right to the City. This comprehensive instrument sets out the background to its adoption, guiding principles, the various components of the right to the city, state responsibilities, and the

85 Chueca, supra note 71, at 116.
86 Ana M. Sánchez Rodríguez, The Right to the City in Mexico City: The Charter, in GLOBAL URBAN JUSTICE: THE RISE OF HUMAN RIGHTS CITIES, supra note 10, at 220, 229; see also Anna Kajumulo Tibaijuka, Preface to MARKS ET AL., HUMAN RIGHTS CITIES: CIVIC ENGAGEMENT FOR SOCIETAL DEVELOPMENT, supra note 7, at 7 (referencing “UN-HABITAT’s strategy for sustainable urban development, which lays emphasis on the need for inclusionary urban governance”).
87 HRC August 2015 Report, supra note 9, ¶ 47.
88 Int’l All. Inhabitants, World Charter for the Right to the City, art. 1, ¶ 2 [hereinafter World Charter for the Right to the City]; see also id. art. 7, ¶ 47.
89 World Charter for the Right to the City, supra 88, art. 1, ¶ 2.
90 Id. art. 2, ¶ 2.
91 Id. art. 2, ¶ 1.
92 Id. art. 2, ¶¶ 1, 2.
93 Mexico City Charter for the Right to the City, July 2010 [hereinafter Mexico City Charter]; Chueca, supra note 71, at 118.
commitments of different stakeholders. Although the Charter is not enforceable in court, it is recognized by the local government and social movements have incorporated it in their advocacy. Development of the Charter entailed an extensive participatory process, including public events, over thirty consultations, workshops, radio programs, and even a children’s painting contest on “the city we want.”

The Mexico City Charter for the Right to the City (“Mexico City Charter”) draws on the World Charter, similarly highlighting the interdependence of the right to the city with “all the civil, political, economic, social, cultural and environmental rights regulated in the international human rights treaties,” and defining a “collective right” to “equitable usufruct of cities within the principles of sustainability, democracy, equity, and social justice.” As “[s]trategic foundations” to the right to the city, it identifies “[f]ull exercise of human rights in the city”—referencing the human rights in the city movement, the “[s]ocial function of the city,” “[d]emocratic management of the city,” “[s]ustainable and responsible management” of resources, “[d]emocratic and equitable enjoyment of the city,” and “[d]emocratic production of the city and in the city.”

D. CITY ADOPTION OF PARTICULAR HUMAN RIGHTS

Finally, the last two decades have seen the growth of city initiatives centered on particular rights. In the United States, the most developed is the city movement on implementing the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (“CEDAW”) through city ordinances and resolutions. San Francisco led the way with its CEDAW Ordinance in 1998 and helped launch the Cities for CEDAW

---

94 Mexico City Charter, supra note 93.
95 Rodríguez, supra note 86, at 233.
96 Mexico City Charter, supra note 93, at 3.
97 Id. art. 1; see also id. art. 1, ¶ 1.4 (“While the Right to the City is not explicitly mentioned in the current human rights instruments, these instruments are considered the legal framework of reference and support of the Right to the City.”); id. art. 3 (emphasizing “the integrality and interdependence of human rights”); id. at 32 (calling on the judiciary to “[a]pply the international human rights instruments ratified by Mexico”).
98 Id. art. 1.
99 Id. art. 2.
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Campaign in 2014.\textsuperscript{102} There are currently nine U.S. cities and counties with binding CEDAW ordinances, and over thirty others have passed resolutions in support of CEDAW, signaling their commitment to women’s human rights.\textsuperscript{103}

Cities with CEDAW ordinances have used them as a basis for gender assessments of city programs and policies, including budgets, service delivery, and employment practices.\textsuperscript{104} Under San Francisco’s CEDAW Ordinance, city departments participate in gender assessments, examining budgets, service delivery, and employment practices to identify barriers to women’s equality and shape better policies.\textsuperscript{105} San Francisco has also developed a gender analysis tool to assist city departments in these assessments\textsuperscript{106} and a set of principles to guide self-assessments by private companies.\textsuperscript{107}

In 2000, San Francisco amended its CEDAW Ordinance to incorporate the principles of ICERD and include the “unique experiences of women of color” in its analysis.\textsuperscript{108} Starting in 2003, when faced with

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[102] \textit{Bringing Human Rights Home,} \textit{supra} note 23, at 22.
\item[105] San Francisco’s CEDAW Ordinance calls for a gender analysis in “selected City departments, programs, policies, and private entities to the extent permitted by law.” S.F., \textit{Cal.}, Admin. Code, § 33A.4(b) (1998). This analysis shall include “an evaluation of gender equity in the entity’s operations, including its budget allocations, delivery of direct and indirect services and employment practices” leading to development of an “Action Plan that contains specific recommendations on how it will correct any identified deficiencies and integrate human rights principles and the local principles of CEDAW into its operations.” \textit{Id.}
\item[106] Menon, \textit{supra} note 104, at 3–10. The gender analysis consists of five steps: (1) envisioning a program with full equality and freedom from all forms of discrimination, (2) collecting disaggregated data and identifying trends and gaps, (3) identifying effective practices and areas for improvement, (4) evaluating and prioritizing options and creating an action plan, and (5) monitoring implementation of the action plan. \textit{Id.} at 3–4.
\item[107] \textit{Bringing Human Rights Home,} \textit{supra} note 23, at 22.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
severe budget cuts, San Francisco adopted gender-responsive budgeting and assessed the impact of budgeting decisions on employment and public services, disaggregated by identities such as gender and race.\textsuperscript{109} In Los Angeles, Mayor Eric Garcetti, building on the city’s CEDAW Ordinance of 2003, issued an Executive Directive on Gender Equity in City Operations in 2014.\textsuperscript{110} This directive requires city departments to collect and analyze data on gender in recruitment, employment, work contracts, and services and to develop gender equity plans to address gaps.\textsuperscript{111} These plans then inform budgeting requests and expenditures by city departments, and the city leadership’s progress is evaluated under these plans.\textsuperscript{112}

The CEDAW Ordinance in San Francisco has had impact in small but practical ways significant in the daily lives of women affected. A number of changes relate to employment practices, including new policies for paid parental leave, telecommuting, and flex time; expansion of sexual harassment training; and increased job training to support women’s entry into nontraditional positions.\textsuperscript{113} In implementing these policies, the Department of Environment reported that women now comprise over fifty percent of personnel, including technical staff.\textsuperscript{114} Additionally, the city updated its system for allocating street artist licenses to no longer require in-person lottery attendance, which had disadvantaged those with childcare responsibility.\textsuperscript{115} Gender assessments also resulted in small changes to the city’s configuration by adding sidewalk cuts for strollers and placing more streetlights closer together for safety.\textsuperscript{116} The gender


\textsuperscript{109} MENON, supra note 104, at 8.

\textsuperscript{110} Los Angeles, Cal., Executive Directive No. 11 (Aug. 26, 2015) [hereinafter Los Angeles Executive Directive No. 11] (“Gender Equity must permeate every level of City operations—as leaders, employers, and service providers.”). In October 2021, Los Angeles County passed its own ordinance to “locally implement the principles of CEDAW in order to promote gender equity and address discrimination against women and girls in Los Angeles County,” building on the work at city level. Los Angeles County, Cal., Ordinance 2021-0063 (Nov. 30, 2021).

\textsuperscript{111} GENDER EQUITY THROUGH HUMAN RIGHTS, supra note 47, at 5.

\textsuperscript{112} Id. at 10.


\textsuperscript{114} BRINGING HUMAN RIGHTS HOME, supra note 23, at 22.

\textsuperscript{115} MENON, supra note 104, at 1, 6.

\textsuperscript{116} The Promise and Limits of Local Human Rights, supra note 113, at 619; Thinking Globally, Acting Locally, supra note 108, at 270; MENON, supra note 104, at 5.
assessments further led to increased services. For instance, the Juvenile Probation Department started providing sexual assault and family planning services.\textsuperscript{117} The city also created a special “Girls Unit” in Juvenile Hall to provide girls with gender-specific trauma services.\textsuperscript{118} Moreover, according to city staff, “the very process of conducting a CEDAW gender analysis created a new awareness of gender-related issues.”\textsuperscript{119}

Thus, while human rights cities differ greatly, they all reference international human rights standards and aspire for these standards to guide the city’s operations, including the conduct of both local government and city inhabitants.\textsuperscript{120} They further draw on the different concepts of the “human rights city,” which emphasizes process and building a local human rights community; “human rights in the city,” which focuses on the responsibility of local government to realize human rights; and the “right to a city,” which articulates a collective right by inhabitants to develop a human rights-oriented city. While self-designation of a human rights city often takes the form of resolutions or proclamations that lack the force of law, this can set up a basis for institutionalization, resources, and accountability and facilitate advocacy.\textsuperscript{121}

E. A HUMAN RIGHTS APPROACH TO GOVERNANCE

Human rights will never be a reality unless they are meaningful at the local level. Eleanor Roosevelt famously captured this: “Where, after all, do universal human rights begin? In small places, close to home . . . . Such are the places where every man, woman, and child seeks equal justice, equal opportunity, equal dignity without discrimination. Unless these rights have meaning there, they have little meaning anywhere.”\textsuperscript{122}

Cities are on the frontlines of rights’ enforcement. At the bottom of the governmental hierarchy, cities are where laws intersect with people, and where people experience rights and violations. As Michele Grigolo

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item\textsuperscript{117} Thinking Globally, Acting Locally, supra note 108, at 270.
  \item\textsuperscript{118} MENON, supra note 104, at 5.
  \item\textsuperscript{119} Id.
  \item\textsuperscript{120} Neubeck, supra note 13, at 238; see also BRINGING HUMAN RIGHTS HOME, supra note 23, at 11 (“A human rights city is a community where elected officials and residents commit to using human rights norms and strategies to improve the city.”).
  \item\textsuperscript{121} Neubeck, supra note 13, at 240.
  \item\textsuperscript{122} Eleanor Roosevelt, Chairperson, Comm’n on Hum. Rts., Speech Before the U.N. on the 10th Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Mar. 27, 1958).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
explains, “[T]he city is embedded in a vertical and hierarchical system of legal relations . . . while at the same time being the space where the laws of these levels . . . converge to regulate particular issues and groups.”

The locality is where laws and policies impact people’s daily lives and where rights are violated and protected. Closest to the people, cities also serve as the point of contact with services. Thus, local authorities play an important role translating rights into practice and implementing laws and policies, such as by commonplace administrative decisions. Moreover, these actions help define rights in the context of concrete issues.

Accordingly, cities help to develop a human rights approach to governance that prioritizes participation and equality, advancing the human rights project. At the global level, U.N. agencies have defined a human rights-based approach to guide development efforts, drawn from the UDHR and human rights treaties. This approach, which aims to

---


125 Leilani Farha, *Adequate Housing*, supra note 9, at 268 (noting that cities “bear the primary responsibility to deliver government services”). As the Human Rights Council’s report remarked, “[I]t is difficult to imagine a situation of human rights being realized where there are no local authorities to provide the necessary services. Local authorities are thus responsible for a wide range of human rights issues in their day-to-day work.” *HRC August 2015 Report*, supra note 9, ¶ 26.

126 As the Human Rights Council’s report acknowledged, “Local authorities are actually those who are to translate national human rights strategies and policies into practical application.” *HRC August 2015 Report*, supra note 9, ¶ 21; see also BRINGING HUMAN RIGHTS HOME, supra note 23, at 5 (“[L]ocal implementation gives meaning to human rights.”).


128 Michel Grigolo describes a “micro-level of construction” and reconstruction of human rights where city employees “re-work and redefine human rights in the context of their daily activities,” engaging with human rights “discursively in the framing and solution of a concrete situation.” Grigolo, supra note 123, at 289–90; see also Soohoo, supra note 10, at 257 (“International human rights treaties are often abstract documents written in diplomatic, carefully negotiated and aspirational language. Situating human rights implementation at the local level where governmental policies are implemented provides a welcome concreteness.”).
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strengthen the capacities of rights-holders to claim their rights and duty bearers to meet their obligations.\textsuperscript{131} Identifies participation and non-discrimination as cornerstone principles.\textsuperscript{132} Cities are well-situated to apply a human rights-based approach to governance, including programs, budgets, and the delivery of services. As Cynthia Soohoo describes, cities are the “natural place” to integrate human rights into policymaking\textsuperscript{133} and “infuse human rights into their day-to-day work of governance and service provision.”\textsuperscript{134}

Thus, integrating human rights at a local level can facilitate participation and equality. Human rights cities bring a focus on participation, encompassing all inhabitants and democratizing rights. In the context of the United States, human rights cities further respond to federalism concerns in having rights imposed by the federal government. Moreover, a human rights framework advances equality through a proactive orientation, addressing disparate impacts and jurisdictional barriers to women’s rights.

III. PARTICIPATION

Human rights cities bring an emphasis on participation, which the various human rights city concepts underscore. Close to communities, cities provide multiple opportunities for participation. The human rights framework further encourages mobilization. Additionally, human rights cities have an expansive definition of participation, encompassing all inhabitants and bypassing the citizenship construct at the national level. Localizing human rights, cities can also address federalism concerns in the U.S. context. However, for participation to be meaningful, it is necessary to invest in education and make space for different voices.


\textsuperscript{132} The Approach to Human Rights, supra note 130; UNDG-HRWG, supra note 131; see also Bringing Human Rights Home, supra note 23, at 2 (noting that the “human rights approach emphasizes transparency, accountability and participation in government decision-making”). The Mexico City Charter for the Right to the City identifies as guiding principles “non-discrimination, equality, participation, transparency and accountability.” Mexico City Charter, supra note 93, art. 1.6.

\textsuperscript{133} Soohoo, supra note 10, at 268.

\textsuperscript{134} Id. at 258.
A. PARTICIPATION IN HUMAN RIGHTS CITIES

Participation is a critical component of the human rights-based approach, which cities can help develop. As the U.N. Development Group sets out, “Participation is both a means and a goal.” Some have even characterized “active public participation in identifying and solving problems locally” as “a hallmark of human rights.” Participation is also closely linked to empowerment of local citizens, and “[p]eople are recognized as key actors in their own development, rather than passive recipients of commodities and services.” Participation is both a stand-alone right, recognized in the UDHR, ICCPR, and CEDAW, as well as a cross-cutting concept applicable to all rights. For instance, in its General Comment on the right to the highest attainable standard of health, the U.N. Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (“CESCR”) clarified: “Promoting health must involve effective community action in setting priorities, making decisions, planning, implementing and evaluating strategies to achieve better health. Effective provision of health services can only be assured if people’s participation is secured by States.”

Participation figures prominently in the “human rights city,” “human rights in the city,” and “right to the city” concepts. The Gwangju Declaration sets out “civic participation” as an important building block in human rights cities, calling for “a bottom-up approach involving genuine and meaningful participation by all inhabitants.” Scholars of PDHRE go so far as to define human rights cities as “a strategy of urban development through civic engagement.” Similarly, the Global-Charter
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135 UNDG-HRWG, supra note 131.
136 GENDER EQUITY THROUGH HUMAN RIGHTS, supra note 47, at 4.
137 UNDG-HRWG, supra note 131.
138 UDHR, supra note 42, art. 21 (“Everyone has the right and the opportunity to take part in the government of his country.”).
139 ICCPR, supra note 37, art. 25 (“Every citizen shall have the right and the opportunity . . . to take part in the conduct of public affairs, directly or through freely chosen representatives.”).
140 CEDAW, supra note 100, art. 7(b) (recognizing women’s right “[t]o participate in the formulation of government policy and the implementation thereof and to hold public office and perform all public functions at all levels of government.”).
142 Gwangju Declaration, supra note 16, ¶¶ 6–8.
143 MARKS ET AL., supra note 7, at 50; see also EU Framework, supra note 20, at 12 (“A human rights city promotes the meaningful participation of all. It does this by engaging with civil society, in particular grassroots organisations, as well as business, faith and religious
Agenda for Human Rights in the City has a section devoted to “participatory democracy,” providing for inhabitants’ participation in decision-making processes and the formulation and implementation of policy.\textsuperscript{144} To be effective, the section specifically requires consultation and local adaptation.\textsuperscript{145} Participation and consultative government are at the core of the right to the city concept. Under the World Charter for the Right to the City, “[a]ll persons have the right to participate through direct and representative forms in the elaboration, definition, implementation, and fiscal distribution and management of public policies and municipal budgets.”\textsuperscript{146} The Mexico City Charter goes even further, aiming at “citizen participation in all spaces and at the highest possible levels”\textsuperscript{147} and the city’s “democratic and inclusive management.”\textsuperscript{148} The right to the city movement contains a radical aspiration of recreating the city through active engagement and definition of rights by city inhabitants.\textsuperscript{149}

Local government is closer to communities and well-placed to provide opportunities for participation. In cities, participation can be exercised “on a daily and proximate basis,”\textsuperscript{150} and policies can respond to “local needs and priorities.”\textsuperscript{151} According to the Human Rights Council’s report, “[l]ocal government aims at bringing government to the grass roots and enabling citizens to participate effectively in the making of decisions affecting their daily lives.”\textsuperscript{152} Cities that embrace a human rights framework generally create an explicit role for public participation in needs assessments and policy development. For instance, following Salt

\begin{flushright}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{144} Global Charter-Agenda, \textit{supra} note 64, art. 2; \textit{see also} European Human Rights Charter, \textit{supra} note 64, art. 8, on the right to political participation.
\item \textsuperscript{145} Global Charter-Agenda, \textit{supra} note 64, at 13.
\item \textsuperscript{146} World Charter for the Right to the City, \textit{supra} note 88, art. 2, ¶ 1.2. The World Charter further has an article dedicated to political participation, indicating that “[a]ll citizens have the right to participate in local political life through the free and democratic election of their local representatives, as well as in all the decisions that affect local policies of urban planning, production, renovation, improvement, and management.” \textit{Id.} art. 8, ¶ 1.
\item \textsuperscript{147} Mexico City Charter, \textit{supra} note 93, art. 2.
\item \textsuperscript{148} \textit{Id.} art. 3.2.3. The Preamble proclaims “the right of all persons and civil society organizations to participate—actively and at the highest possible level—in the determination of public policies.” \textit{Id.} at 6.
\item \textsuperscript{149} Jonathan Darling, \textit{Defying the Demand to ‘Go Home’: From Human Rights Cities to the Urbanisation of Human Rights}, in \textit{GLOBAL URBAN JUSTICE: THE RISE OF HUMAN RIGHTS CITIES}, \textit{supra} note 10, at 121, 127.
\item \textsuperscript{150} Chueca, \textit{supra} note 71, at 108.
\item \textsuperscript{151} \textit{HRC August 2015 Report}, \textit{supra} note 9, ¶ 8.
\item \textsuperscript{152} \textit{Id.}
\end{itemize}
\end{flushright}
Lake City’s CEDAW Resolution, the Mayor’s Office facilitated community dialogues on women’s equality in various physical locations and online, resulting in a focus on educational and employment opportunities. Following its CEDAW Ordinance, San Francisco convened a task force, comprising of local government representatives and community members, to help develop gender analysis guidelines for city programs, budgets, and services and to review the city department’s reports on implementation. According to the San Francisco Department on the Status of Women, “[t]he heart of the ordinance is the participatory process that it puts in place.” Likewise, Eugene seeks public input on service provision and encourages city departments to implement Public Participation Guidelines. As a member of Eugene’s Human Rights Commission explained, “The assumption is that those closest to a given human rights problem know it best and that their participation is helping to address the human rights violations to which they have been subject is highly empowering for people.” This explanation is in line with the principle of subsidiarity, which encourages decision-making and resolution of problems by those most affected, as well as the concept of “nothing about us without us,” which requires the participation of affected groups in the development of policy.


156 Neubeck, supra note 13, at 248.

157 Id.


159 With roots in Central Europe, the concept of “nothing about us without us” has served as a rallying cry for disability activists. See, e.g., Norman Davies, Heart of Europe: The Past in Poland’s Present 261 (2d ed. 2001) (recounting the Polish slogan “[n]othing concerning us can be settled without us”). See generally Bertalan Szemere, Hungary, From 1848 to 1860 (1860) (historical recount of Hungary during the Revolution of 1848 by a Hungarian poet and nationalist); James I. Charlton, Nothing About Us Without Us: Disability Oppression and Empowerment 17 (2000). The concept has also served as a rallying cry for marginalized groups affected by HIV. See Open Soc’y Inst., “Nothing About Us Without Us”—Greater, Meaningful Involvement of People Who Use Illegal Drugs: A Public Health, Ethical, and Human Rights Imperative, at vii–viii (2008), https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/reports/monitor/nothing-about-us-without-us [https://perma.cc/DG2M-HPN4].
Broad community participation is particularly useful when it comes to the practicalities of fulfilling the positive dimension of rights. For instance, social and economic rights require progressive realization “to the maximum of available resources.” Local communities can assist governments in identifying needs, prioritizing resources, and measuring progress over time to ensure compliance. City officials are also more directly accountable to communities and have incentives to provide services effectively to all residents. Inhabitants can directly see the benefits of these services, and cities compete for residents based on services provided. Furthermore, services can attract visitors and spur economic development. Cities have experience and incentives in resolving competing interests. As Cynthia Soohoo notes, “When it comes to actually figuring out the policies and trade-offs that are inherent in the long process of rights realisation, the city is where the action is.”

Moreover, human rights do not just call for participation, but can also serve as a mobilizing force stimulating increased participation. Human rights are much more than the legal framework in which they are codified. They provide a language to articulate and mobilize around justice concerns. Jonathan Darling explains, “The value of human rights . . . is in mobilizing a language and a vision bigger than the urban scale, a means to draw in and mobilize different interest groups behind pluralist projects of social justice.” For instance, in Eugene, advocates used the human rights framework, which includes a right to housing, to mobilize and push the city to address homelessness. Many CEDAW resolutions in U.S. cities, in fact, are mostly symbolic, mainly directed at mobilization and building a movement for national ratification of CEDAW and integrating

161 Graham et al., supra note 125, at 185, 194; see also U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, Annual Rep. of the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, ¶ 9, U.N. Doc. No. A/HRC/42/22 (July 2, 2019) [hereinafter Annual Rep. of the U.N. High Commissioner] (noting the role that local governments play “in ensuring the progressive realization of economic and social rights, such as the right to adequate housing”).
162 The Promise and Limits of Local Human Rights, supra note 113, at 621, 625.
163 From Principles to Practice, supra note 108, at 86.
164 Soohoo, supra note 10, at 274.
166 Darling, supra note 149, at 123.
167 Neubeck, supra note 13, at 251–52.
human rights standards at the national level.\textsuperscript{168} While a city’s adoption of human rights can create a focus for activism, it is also itself a product of mobilization. As discussed above, the very development of the Mexico City Charter entailed an extensive participatory process, which included public events, consultations, radio programs, and even a children’s painting contest.\textsuperscript{169} San Francisco’s CEDAW Ordinance built on years of advocacy by local women’s groups and included a large public hearing.\textsuperscript{170}

Additionally, the human rights cities movement has an expansive definition of rights holders and participants, moving beyond the citizen paradigm at the national level. Instead, the various human rights city instruments focus on “residents” and “inhabitants.” For instance, the Global Charter-Agenda specifies that its provisions “apply to all city inhabitants, individually and collectively without discrimination . . . . A city inhabitant is any person that [sic] lives within its territory even if without fixed domicile.”\textsuperscript{171} Likewise, the European Charter for the Safeguarding of Human Rights in the City’s provisions “apply to all persons who inhabit the signatory cities, irrespective of their nationality.”\textsuperscript{172} Under the World Charter, “all the persons who inhabit a city, whether permanently or transitonally, are considered its citizens.”\textsuperscript{173} The Mexico City Charter goes even further, recognizing the rights of visitors to the city.\textsuperscript{174} Human rights cities thus remake the concept of

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{168} Catherine Powell, Dialogic Federalism: Constitutional Possibilities for Incorporation of Human Rights Law in the United States, 150 U. PA. L. REV. 245, 276, 279 (2001) (“The ‘adoption’ of human rights treaties and standards at the state and local levels largely represents a form of communication through which people and communities, who are effectively able to mobilize at the local level, signify the need for the federal government to play a more active role in human rights lawmaking. In fact, many of the ordinances and resolutions adopted by state and local governments explicitly call for the federal government to adopt particular human rights treaties and standards.”).
  \item \textsuperscript{169} Mexico City Charter, supra note 93, at 3.
  \item \textsuperscript{170} MENON, supra note 104, at 1; GENDER EQUITY THROUGH HUMAN RIGHTS, supra note 47, at 8.
  \item \textsuperscript{171} Global Charter-Agenda, supra note 64, at 2.
  \item \textsuperscript{172} European Human Rights Charter, supra note 64, art. 2, ¶ 1. The European Charter also expresses a “wish to see the right of municipal suffrage extended to the entire adult resident non-national population who has resided in the city for more than two years.” Id. art. 8, ¶ 2.
  \item \textsuperscript{173} World Charter for the Right to the City, supra note 88, art. 1, ¶ 5; see also id. art. 19, ¶ 1 (calling for “collective political participation of all inhabitants.”).
  \item \textsuperscript{174} Mexico City Charter, supra note 93, at 6.
\end{itemize}
citizenship so that it is organically rooted in people’s relationship to a place and community, rather than tied to a legal construct.\textsuperscript{175}

The “sanctuary city” movement across the United States, protecting undocumented immigrants and limiting local cooperation with federal immigration enforcement, is in line with this expansive definition of rights holders to include all inhabitants. Indeed, even in the face of pressure from the Trump administration and cuts in federal funding, mayors of various U.S. cities have held firm to their sanctuary policies.\textsuperscript{176} For instance, San Francisco Mayor Edwin Lee said, “San Francisco is a sanctuary city and will not waiver in its commitment to protect the rights of all its residents” and announced expansion of a city fund to provide legal services to all immigrants, including the undocumented.\textsuperscript{177} Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel likewise declared, “Chicago has in the past been a sanctuary city . . . It will always be a sanctuary city.”\textsuperscript{178}

In the U.S. context, localizing human rights is particularly critical, where federalism concerns curtail implementation of rights touching on matters typically under state jurisdiction, including social welfare, family relations, and criminal law, as discussed below. Cities have the potential to democratize human rights and spark creative implementation. Classic accounts recognize cities as “laboratories of democracy”\textsuperscript{179} and “laboratories of change that foster innovation and collaboration.”\textsuperscript{180} As JoAnn Kamuf Ward notes, “[U.S.] cities have long been sites of experimentation in participatory democracy in an effort to respond to community needs.”\textsuperscript{181} Cities have pioneered laws and policies on diverse

\textsuperscript{175} In positing a right to the city, Lefebvre himself proposed that “the right to the city implies nothing less than a revolutionary concept of citizenship . . . one not tied to membership to membership to a polity but to the practice of shaping urban space.” Darling, supra note 149, at 127.


\textsuperscript{177} Kopan, supra note 176.

\textsuperscript{178} Feller, supra note 176.


\textsuperscript{180} From Principles to Practice, supra note 108, at 87.

\textsuperscript{181} Id.
issues, such as civil rights protection and addressing climate change. They provide an opportunity to test programs before scaling up and expanding them. Cities have certain characteristics that may spur innovation. Closer to communities, they have better opportunity to engage residents and initiate new partnerships. Called upon to deliver practical results, cities tend be more solution-oriented and less mired in partisan politics. Cities also serve as crossroads of diverse people and ideas.

Furthermore, cities have the potential to redefine human rights practice, where realization of rights goes beyond top-down protection by government to require bottom-up participation by inhabitants. Emily Graham and colleagues describe a move away from “singular, top down, state-focused strategies in favour of multi-dimensional, multi-actor, contextual and bottom-up, grassroots approaches.” According to the U.S. Human Rights Network,

[The Human Rights cities model flips the script of how policy is formulated and implemented, and it engages residents in the work of defining community needs and problems in developing effective solutions to those problems. This approach expands the resources available to governments by mobilizing citizens into the work of policy development and implementation.]

This move also blurs the line between rights holders and duty bearers. Barbara Oomen remarks, “[C]ities with their ‘pragmatism instead of politics’ seem to enable the formation of stakeholder alliances—between

---

182 Id. at 89; Soohoo, supra note 10, at 275.
184 Soohoo, supra note 10, at 275; From Principles to Practice, supra note 108, at 87.
185 See Johnson, supra note 183 at 132; Soohoo, supra note 10 at 275; From Principles to Practice, supra note 108, at 87.
186 Soohoo, supra note 10 at 257.
187 Graham et al., supra note 125, at 179; see also Starl, supra note 68, at 215 (describing a “bottom-up approach to democratic participation in rule-making as opposed to mere protection by governments”); Soohoo, supra note 10, at 257 (“Human rights cities invert the traditional analysis. Instead of focusing on the national government as the main instigator of change, human rights cities reflect a bottom up approach where local communities articulate a commitment to human rights and decide how to implement and give expression to their commitment.”).
188 The Human Rights Cities Movement, supra note 6. The Network further explains that this “bottom-up approach expands the possibilities for creating new solutions by tapping the ‘political imagination’ of residents working together to define the kind of city they want and to engage constructively in the work of building and governing such a city.” Id.
authorities and civil society, between local and international actors—that transgress the classic divide between rights holders and duty bearers and move away from a legalistic approach to human rights.”

Thus, the human rights city movement is not just about reforming government and claiming rights, but also more ambitiously creating a culture of human rights and fundamentally reshaping society. The Gwangju Declaration, for instance, focuses on both the “socio-political process,” as well as the “local community.”

Accountability in human rights cities, another pillar of the human rights-based approach, therefore, expands beyond legal action to engage at multiple levels of responsibility. While the government may have obligations that are legally binding, responsibility may also lie in various economic and social entities and in individuals. Stacy Lozner describes a deliberative model of compliance, which relies on “participatory deliberation, mechanisms for transparency, and capacity building.”

Norms are internalized “rather than coerced by anticipation of enforcement.” Accountability thus relies on social dialogue. Social accountability approaches, which entail community monitoring of resource allocation and service delivery against policy commitments to ensure community needs, may provide a mechanism for this dialogue.

The Global Charter Agenda envisions a pivotal role for city inhabitants in accountability processes, including public consultation to evaluate

---

189 Oomen, supra note 10, at 3–4.
190 Gwangju Declaration, supra note 16, ¶ 3.
191 UNDG-HRWG, supra note 131 (recognizing that “[s]tates and other duty-bearers are answerable for the observance of human rights”). According to the Gwangju Declaration, “[e]ffective accountability mechanisms need to be developed to make city government accountable to its pledges and commitments. Monitoring mechanisms, including human rights indicators for human rights impact assessment, should be established.” Gwangju Declaration, supra note 16, ¶ 14. The Global Charter Agenda calls for “specific indicators for the fulfillment of each of the rights,” actions plans, and bodies responsible for “implementation, follow-up and evaluation.” Global Charter Agenda, supra note 64, at 14.
192 Lozner, supra note 155, at 784.
193 Id.
194 Community monitoring tools include: (1) community scorecards and qualitative evaluations by communities of public services, projects, or institutions, (2) citizen report cards or user surveys providing quantitative feedback on the quality and accessibility of services, (3) social audits or community assessments of the impact of public projects or services, and (4) applied budget monitoring, where communities analyze and advocate around plans for raising and spending public resources. Jamila Headley, How Social Accountability Protects Health Rights, OPEN SOCIETY FOUND.: VOICES (May 16, 2014), https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/voices/how-social-accountability-protects-health-rights [https://perma.cc/76YM-HGZR].
implementation, while the World Charter calls for jointly established monitoring mechanisms. The Mexico City Charter likewise emphasizes “the social participation of all persons in the design, monitoring, and evaluation of urban policy.”

B. REQUIREMENTS FOR PARTICIPATION

However, meaningful participation requires education and a commitment to non-discrimination. The Gwangju Declaration devotes a section to “human rights education,” explaining that “[u]ntil all inhabitants know and own their human rights, there can never be a human rights city.” The World Charter for the Right to the City calls for human rights training and education for all “public agents.” Eugene provides human rights education to both city staff and residents. According to one of Eugene’s human rights commissioners, human rights work would be ineffective without this training. Similarly, under San Francisco’s CEDAW Ordinance, all city departments participate in regular human rights trainings. Given the centrality of participation and education to the human rights city concept, it is no coincidence that PDHRE was a driving force behind the human rights cities movement. PDHRE aims at social transformation through human rights education and engagement and conceives of human rights cities as a crucial building block. As discussed above, PDHRE’s model entails extensive public consultation prior to designation of a human rights city. One of the first tasks of a steering committee composed of various segments of the population and city officials is to roll out human rights education, followed by citizen human rights assessments. Shulamith Koenig, the founding president of

195 Global Charter-Agenda, supra note 64, at 13.
196 World Charter for the Right to the City, supra note 88, art. 18, ¶ 4.
197 Mexico City Charter, supra note 93, art. 3.1.2.
198 Gwangju Declaration, supra note 16, ¶ 9.
199 World Charter for the Right to the City, supra note 88, art. 18, ¶ 2.
200 Neubeck, supra note 13, at 242, 245.
201 Id. The Gwangju Declaration specifically stresses the importance of human rights education for government officials. Gwangju Declaration, supra note 16, ¶ 12.
202 Thinking Globally, Acting Locally, supra note 108, at 269.
203 Oomen, supra note 10, at 14–15; Chueca, supra note 71, at 103.
204 Soohoo, supra note 10, at 266.
205 Id. at 271.
PDHRE, characterizes “the formation of local communities-of-learning” as the basis for human rights cities.206

However, in the United States, there is generally a serious gap in human rights education,207 which will need to be addressed for cities to play a significant role as human rights actors. In the meantime, advocates have creatively used human rights reporting as an educational tool on human rights framing to address local issues. Analyses from these reports inform both formal reporting before U.N. bodies, as well as domestic advocacy.208 An example is the pioneering work of the National Homelessness Law Center to address the criminalization of homelessness, which has used international human rights processes to trigger meetings with government officials and educate them on human rights standards.209 Regularly integrating human rights in civics courses and trainings for government officials could potentially be transformative.

Moreover, effective participation requires a commitment to non-discrimination and creating space for minority voices and marginalized groups. Human rights city instruments recognize this link. The Gwangju Declaration emphasizes the importance of participation and “consultation among all stakeholders,” providing special consideration to “[s]ocially and economically disadvantaged groups, such as women, immigrants, and disabled persons.”210 The Mexico City Charter articulates a right “to participate in decision making on public issues, including populations

206 Shulamith Koenig, Foreward to MARKS ET AL., HUMAN RIGHTS CITIES: CIVIC ENGAGEMENT FOR SOCIETAL DEVELOPMENT, supra note 7, at 10. Shulamith Koenig explains, “These are municipal spaces where citizens learn about human rights as relevant to their daily lives and concerns.” Id.

207 Neubeck, supra note 13, at 245; From Principles to Practice, supra note 108, at 98; Risa E. Kaufman, Human Rights in the United States: Reclaiming the History and Ensuring the Future, 40 COLUM. HUM. RTS. L. REV. 149, 154 (2008) [hereinafter Reclaiming the History] (book review) (“[T]he United States attempts to avoid accountability by not publicizing both its reports to the U.N. treaty bodies and the recommendations from these bodies, as well as by failing to educate the public about its treaty obligations.”).

208 Melish, supra note 158, at 430.


210 Gwangju Declaration, supra note 16, ¶ 13.
subject to discrimination.”

Cities are not uniform and encompass different interests and perspectives. Communities are multidimensional with regard to geography, culture, politics, and power, requiring attention to diverse voices and “an awareness of the complexity of the tensions that exist as well as the connections—both self-identified and externally imposed.”

As rights are contested and negotiated, participation has significant implications. Cities, however, bring a particular “ability to fuse together conditions of proximate diversity and relational connections.” Meaningful participation can provide an opportunity for diverse voices to shape a new reality and “re-imagine social boundaries.”

C. EQUALITY AND NON-DISCRIMINATION

Cities can play a critical role in addressing inequality and discrimination, especially when it comes to gender. Adopting a human rights approach proactively addresses discrimination, including disparate impacts and systemic concerns, and encourages the collection of disaggregated data. It further advances women’s rights where jurisdiction has often served as a barrier. Locally based, human rights cities can help resolve tensions between global human rights standards and cultural norms, essential for the realization of women’s rights.

Cities can help advance non-discrimination, a key pillar of the human rights-based approach, which affirms the equality and inherent dignity of all human beings and the need to focus programs proactively on “marginalized, disadvantaged, and excluded groups.” The various human rights city instruments espouse this concept. The EU Framework for Reinforcing Rights Locally defines a human rights city as “an

211 Mexico City Charter, supra note 93, art. 3.1.1. According to the World Charter for the Right to the City, “Cities should open institutionalized forms and spaces for broad, direct, equitable and democratic participation by male and female citizens in the processes of planning, elaboration, approval, management and evaluation of public policies and budgets.” World Charter for the Right to City, supra note 88, art. 3, ¶ 1.

212 Darling, supra note 149, at 126.


214 Darling, supra note 149, at 123.

215 Id. at 126; see also Chueca, supra note 71, at 108 (noting that establishing better dialogue to incorporate perspectives of marginalized groups “could lead to the redefinition of the existing social contract to the benefit of subaltern groups”).

216 UNDG-HRWG, supra note 131.
inclusive city that ensures equal rights for all.” The World Charter for the Right to the City sets out equality and non-discrimination as a strategic foundation of the right to the city. The European Charter for the Safeguarding of Human Rights in the City dedicates an article to equality and non-discrimination and urges the adoption of “active policies in support of the most vulnerable of the population.”

Human rights cities in the United States have embraced human rights law’s proactive approach to non-discrimination, addressing disparate impact and systemic barriers. Unlike national standards, focused on responding to complaints and discriminatory intent, human rights call for proactively mitigating factors perpetuating inequality and addressing disparate impact, regardless of intent. Human rights aim at “substantive equality,” or equality in outcomes, and not just “formal equality,” or the non-discriminatory application of rules common in U.S. law. Human rights further focus on systemic solutions that prevent inequality, rather than remedying individual injustice. Advocates for San Francisco’s CEDAW Ordinance were drawn to this proactive orientation. The San Francisco Commission on the Status of Women explained that they were concerned with fairness in both process and result and wanted to “ensure conditions that will enable women to achieve full equality with men.”

The resulting ordinance requires an analysis of city resources, policies,

---

217 EU Framework, supra note 20, at 12 (further noting that a human rights city “ensures that everyone’s rights are equally respected and protected, particularly for those people who are most vulnerable to human rights violations and social exclusion, in particular Roma and other minorities, migrants, refugees and asylum seekers, persons with disabilities, children and youth, elderly people and homeless persons”).

218 World Charter for the Right to the City, supra note 88, art. 2, ¶ 3.

219 European Human Rights Charter, supra note 64, art. 2.

220 Id. art. 4, ¶ 3.

221 Hum. Rts. Comm., General Comment No. 18: Non-discrimination, ¶ 6, U.N. Doc. HRI/GEN/1/Rev.1 (July 29, 1989) [hereinafter General Comment No. 18]; Reclaiming the History, supra note 207, at 156 (noting that international instruments, unlike the U.S. Constitution, “define discrimination broadly, so as to include any act with discriminatory effects or impact, and require the government to provide a remedy, including measures to rectify past discrimination”). Scholars, such as Olatunde Johnson, point to constraints in the current U.S. framework, which include “[s]trains on the private attorney-general regime and the limited efficacy of ex post enforcement regimes in addressing structural exclusion.” Johnson, supra note 183, at 140–41.

222 General Comment No. 18, supra note 221, ¶ 8, 10; GENDER EQUITY THROUGH HUMAN RIGHTS, supra note 47, at 5.

223 Challenging a Climate of Hate, supra note 2, at 162–63; From Principles to Practice, supra note 108, at 84.
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services, and actions to advance women’s and girls’ equality.\textsuperscript{226} It looks beyond deliberate exclusion to address “structures of decision-making, patterns of interaction, and cultural norms . . . that are not immediately discernible at the level of the individual.”\textsuperscript{227} Similarly, Eugene’s efforts to address discrimination aim at prevention and not just remedies and include unintentional or passive discrimination.\textsuperscript{228}

Cities that have taken human rights responsibilities seriously have also dedicated efforts to the collection and reporting of disaggregated data, critical to tackling discriminatory impacts. This is in accordance with international human rights obligations,\textsuperscript{229} which recognize that disaggregated data enables a better understanding of the causes and impacts of discrimination and more effective solutions that target underlying, systemic concerns.\textsuperscript{230} After Miami-Dade County passed a CEDAW Ordinance in 2015, its Commission on the Status of Women has focused on data collection on employment, health and safety, and education.\textsuperscript{231} Similarly, the Los Angeles CEDAW Executive Directive triggered release of a gender-study with data disaggregated by zip codes and City Council Districts.\textsuperscript{232} Likewise, San Francisco invested in
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\textsuperscript{230} Challenging a Climate of Hate, supra note 2, at 171–72.

\textsuperscript{231} The Miami-Dade Commission for Women publishes annual reports on the status of women under the Miami-Dade CEDAW Ordinance. Miami-Dade Cnty. Comm’n for Women, Status of Women Annual Reports, https://www.miamidade.gov/global/government/boards/commission-for-women.page [https://perma.cc/LU74-R2FP]; see also World Charter for the Right to the City, supra note 88, art. 18, ¶ 4 (“Cities should establish, together with their inhabitants, evaluation and monitoring mechanisms through an effective system of . . . indicators, with gender differentiation.”) (emphasis omitted).

disaggregated data collection, including forming a working group to guide efforts and develop benchmarks for measuring progress.233 According to San Francisco’s Department on the Status of Women, “data collection has been integral to the city’s ability to measure and quantify the status of women, and to the city’s ability to develop policies to effect change.”234 Emily Murase from the San Francisco’s Department on the Status of Women further remarked on the impact of data collection and gender analyses on the city workforce, services, and budget: “[o]nce you start counting it, things start to happen.”235

The adoption of human rights standards at the city level is particularly significant for women’s equality, where jurisdiction has often served as a barrier to progress.236 In the United States, social welfare and family matters, which are of great importance to women’s equality, are considered the domain of state and local authorities,237 making local leadership essential. After ratifying the ICCPR, the United States specifically highlighted marriage, divorce, and the care of children as areas governed by state and local authorities.238 Federal statutes generally give states primary authority over programs focused on women and children.239 In United States v. Morrison, the U.S. Supreme Court even held that Congress overstepped its powers by authorizing federal courts to address civil claims by survivors of gender-based violence.240 This holding has hampered the United States’ ability to ratify treaties promoting women’s equality. In 1952, Secretary of State Dulles explained that the United States should not be a party to CEDAW since the “equal political status” of women was not a “proper field for exercise of the treatymaking power.”241 The theme of international law intruding into gender and family relations also emerged in hearings on the Bricker Amendment, discussed below.242 Opponents of human rights treaties
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expressed alarm at “surrendering American domestic matters to the norm setting of the international community.”243

Historically, jurisdiction has been used to block women’s rights by relying on a false public-private distinction. Family was considered a private domain free from state oversight. Judith Resnik describes “a painful history of using jurisdiction as a justification for patriarchal control”244 “first by a claim that the family was itself a jurisdiction free from state superintendence and then by arguing that the family was a specially situated arena sheltered from government intrusion.”245 At an extreme, under the law of coverture, women’s legal identity and will were once considered subsumed in that of their husbands.246 Thus, the public sphere was defined to exclude families and the world of women. Falling outside the public sphere, women were often invisible to the law.

However, laws support a particular kind of family with public import. Families are embedded in society, requiring its support. Recognizing this social dimension, feminists perceived the private realm as “the heart of politics,” and the post-1968 women’s movement adopted the slogan: “the personal is political.”247 President Jimmy Carter echoed this slogan in calling for CEDAW’s ratification: “[H]uman rights in general and women’s rights in particular are matters of legitimate concern to the international community and are not subjects with exclusively domestic ramifications.”248 Thus, it is not surprising that pioneering work on human rights at the city level in the United States has focused on CEDAW with the Cities for CEDAW movement.

Building on this movement, U.S. cities have further challenged domestic violence through a human rights lens. By 2016, more than twenty cities had passed resolutions declaring freedom from domestic violence a human right.249 The resolutions in Austin and Travis County,

244 Categorical Federalism, supra note 236, at 625.
245 Id.
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248 Law’s Migration, supra note 104, at 1657. In fact, women’s suffrage in the United States was part of a global effort, where activists worked through networks across countries. Id. at 1576–77, 1584.
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Texas further requested the local Family Violence Task Force to produce biannual reports, evaluating practices and procedures and issuing recommendations for improvement.\textsuperscript{250} Tompkins County’s resolution calls for “a study of the causes of local domestic violence incidents and of the gaps and barriers in local governments’ service delivery to survivors of domestic violence, with the goals of preventing domestic violence, strengthening the county-wide response to domestic violence, and improving the provision of services to survivors.”\textsuperscript{251} When Miami-Dade County updated its anti-discrimination ordinance, it added victims of domestic violence to its list of protected classes, referencing its resolution on freedom from domestic violence.\textsuperscript{252}

Many of these resolutions resulted from advocacy in reaction to the tragic \textit{Town of Castle Rock v. Gonzales} case,\textsuperscript{253} which typifies the narrow, negative view of rights in the United States and fails to recognize government responsibility to act with due diligence to prevent violations. In that case, in violation of a restraining order, Mr. Gonzales abducted his three daughters.\textsuperscript{254} Although Ms. Gonzales (now Lenahan) repeatedly contacted the police, and the restraining order called for mandatory arrest upon violation, the police failed to investigate, and later that night, Mr. Gonzales was discovered with the bodies of his three daughters.\textsuperscript{255} The Supreme Court then held that no rights were violated as there is no constitutional right to protection by the state or individual interest in enforcement of a restraining order.\textsuperscript{256} This holding reflects the prevalent negative view of rights in the United States, where the Constitution is perceived as telling states what they may do, rather than what they must

\textsuperscript{250} Id.

\textsuperscript{251} Tompkins County, N.Y., Resolution Declaring Freedom from Domestic Violence as a Human Rights (Mar. 4, 2015) [hereinafter \textit{Tompkins Resolution}].


\textsuperscript{253} E.g., \textit{Tompkins Resolution, supra} note 251 (“WHEREAS, in 2011, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights found in Jessica Lenahan (Gonzales) \textit{v.} United States that the United States’ failure to protect women from gender-based violence constitutes discrimination and a human rights violation and urged the United States to enact law and policy reforms at all levels to protect survivors of domestic violence and their children . . . “).
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do. This approach, however, relies on an action/inaction distinction that is often as arbitrary and false as the one between public and private space, since the government is heavily involved in maintaining the baseline status quo.

Human rights, by contrast, recognize government responsibility “not only to refrain from encouraging acts of violence against women but actively to intervene in preventing such acts from taking place.” Radhika Coomarasway, the first Special Rapporteur on Violence against Women, went so far as to state that “[p]erhaps the greatest cause of violence against women is government inaction with regard to crimes of violence against women.” Human rights instruments define a “due diligence” standard, requiring government “to exercise due diligence to prevent, investigate, punish and provide reparations for acts of violence.”

After losing in the Supreme Court, Ms. Lenahan took her case to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. The Commission concluded that the United States failed to act with due diligence to protect Jessica and her daughters from domestic violence in violation of its obligations not to discriminate and to ensure equal protection before the law, as well as the daughters’ right to life. The Commission called for both individual and systemic remedies. It recommended investigation and reparations with regards to Ms. Lenahan’s case, as well as an investigation of “systemic failures” and updated legislation, policies and protocols. The Committee further called for “the eradication of

257 Ezer, supra note 46, at 6–7. An example of this is the DeShaney case decided by the Supreme Court in 1989, holding that no rights were violated when four-year-old child, Joshua, was beaten by his father to the point of brain damage. DeShaney v. Winnebago Cty. Dep’t Soc. Servs., 489 U.S. 189, 191 (1989). In this case, the government returned Joshua to his father’s home, and a social worker stood by and “dutifully recorded” incidents of abuse in her file. Id. at 193. When told of Joshua’s last beating, the social worker said, “I just knew the phone would ring some day and Joshua would be dead.” Id. at 209.
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discriminatory socio-cultural patterns that impede women and children’s full protection from domestic violence acts, including programs to train public officials in all branches of the administration of justice and police, and comprehensive prevention programs. This call then sparked a movement for better policies and procedures to be taken up by cities, as well as at the national level with Department of Justice guidance.

The use of jurisdiction to suppress women’s equality is not unique to the United States. For instance, in many countries with a history of colonialism, customary law—operating alongside statutory law—governs family or private life and has been used to “carve[ ] out a space where human rights protections are denied and discrimination can flourish.”

Human rights cities have the potential to resolve the inherent tension between local customs and global rights standards, which is especially critical to the realization of women’s rights as they are often bound up in cultural norms. Anchored in local initiatives, city efforts to implement human rights can counter accusations that they undermine local traditions and values. It is no accident that Rosario, Argentina became the first human rights city in 1997 due to the efforts of a women’s rights organization working with PDHRE in preparation for the U.N. World Conference on Women in Beijing. In this way, adopting a human rights...
framework has important implications for equality and non-discrimination. It leads to a more proactive and systemic approach, facilitates efforts to collect disaggregated data, and dismantles jurisdictional barriers to women’s equality.

IV. CITES AS HUMAN RIGHTS ACTORS IN THE INTERNATIONAL SPHERE

While the international human rights regime has traditionally focused on national governments, it recognizes a role for cities, increasingly appreciating their importance. However, the international human rights regime is still unclear as to how best to engage with cities, marking an important area for further development. At minimum, international human rights bodies should regularly interrogate the relationship between the state and local governments, engage in dialogue with local governments, and call for local consultations to enrich human rights reporting by states and civil society. The addition of Office of the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights (“OHCHR”) staff with local expertise would enable higher levels of engagement by treaty bodies and assistance to city initiatives that would strengthen implementation of human rights at the local level.

A. A TRADITIONAL FOCUS ON NATIONAL AUTHORITY

International law privileges national authority. As the U.N. Human Rights Council notes, “[a]s a matter of international law, the State is one single entity, regardless of its unitary or federal nature and internal administrative division.”270 The national government represents the state in the international sphere and assumes responsibility for all treaty obligations.271 Thus, the various international human rights bodies primarily address the national government, and the national government is internationally held responsible for failures at the local level.273 The underlying assumption is that national governments have the power to
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273 Powell, supra note 168, at 294; By Some Other Means, supra note 49, at 118–19.
ensure implementation of treaty obligations by subnational entities.\textsuperscript{274} Indeed, under the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, states “may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform a treaty.”\textsuperscript{275}

\textbf{B. INCREASING RECOGNITION OF THE ROLE OF CITIES}

At the same time, international law recognizes a role for local government, and international bodies are increasingly engaging with local authorities. This follows from growing decentralization of state authority and is in line with the principle of subsidiarity. Cities that adopt a human rights framework deliberately embrace an international dimension. However, international human rights bodies have not developed a systematic approach for engaging with local authorities and persist in looking to national governments to resolve all violations.\textsuperscript{276} This gap is particularly problematic in federalist countries, like the United States, where much of the responsibility for human rights implementation falls on localities, and the federal government is limited in its ability to control local actions.

Human rights law recognizes that human rights obligations apply to all levels of government. For instance, the ICCPR calls for its provisions to “extend to all parts of the federal states without any limitations or exceptions.”\textsuperscript{277} Similarly, the U.N. Special Rapporteur on adequate housing affirms that obligations “extend to all levels of government and to any exercise of government authority.”\textsuperscript{278} Moreover, international law

\begin{footnotes}
\item[274] Starl, \textit{supra} note 68, at 202.
\item[277] ICCPR, \textit{supra} note 37, art. 50; see also Hum. Rts. Comm., General Comment No. 31: Nature of the General Legal Obligation on States Parties to the Covenant, ¶ 4, U.N. Doc. No. CCPR/C/21/Rev.1/Add.13 (2004) (referencing Article 50 and noting that all “public or governmental authorities, at whatever level—national, regional or local—are in a position to engage the responsibility of the State Party”).
\item[278] Farha, \textit{supra} note 123, ¶ 9.
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provides for delegation of treaty implementation provisions to local authorities.279

International human rights bodies are increasingly engaging with localities. The U.N. Special Rapporteurs, independent human rights experts with particular thematic or country mandates,280 are leading the way. They frequently reference local examples in their country reports,281 and the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing, in particular, has focused attention on subnational entities and has dedicated one of her U.N. reports to this area.282 However, even the Special Rapporteurs are “careful to reinforce at every stage that the federal government is subject to international human rights treaty obligations, not states or local communities.”283 They address their communications to the national government, and in response, states rarely indicate what they have conveyed to local authorities and actions taken at the local level to address violations.284

The U.N. human rights treaty bodies are also paying increasing attention to local authorities. The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (“CERD”), monitoring compliance with ICERD, for instance, has recognized that “the autonomy of municipalities has acted ‘as a major obstacle’ to achieving non-discrimination in access to social housing.”285 CEDCR, monitoring compliance with the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (“ICCESR”),286 has pointed to the need to include the right to adequate housing in subnational laws.287 In a 2011 decision, the Human Rights Committee (“HRC”),
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monitoring compliance with the ICCPR, found that the forced eviction of a Roma community initiated by the Sofia Metropolitan Municipality in Bulgaria violated the ICCPR’s prohibition against “arbitrary or unlawful interference with . . . privacy, family, [and] home.” Bulgarıa then used the Committee’s decision to compel the municipality not to complete the eviction. In a 2008 decision, the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (“CEDAW Committee”), monitoring compliance with CEDAW, likewise grappled with municipal actions in the housing context. It found that a local housing authority in Canada violated spouses’ equal rights to property in its treatment of an indigenous woman subjected to domestic violence and dispossessed of her home.

Other U.N. human rights bodies are also engaging with local governments. In 2015, the Human Rights Council’s Advisory Committee prepared a report on the role of local government in human rights protection, including best practices and challenges. The High Commissioner for Human Rights then followed up on this in 2019 with a report on local government and human rights. The Human Rights Council’s Universal Periodic Reviews (“UPR”), or peer reviews of a country’s human rights record by U.N. member states, increasingly include local and regional perspectives. However, the recommendations largely focus on human rights obligations at the national level.

Local governments are also playing a greater role in global agenda setting. San Francisco, for instance, is a regular participant at sessions of
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the U.N. Commission on the Status of Women. Moreover, cities are particularly engaged on environmental issues.

One factor behind this increasing attention to the local level is the growing decentralization of authority and transfer of public functions to local government. Decentralization has been on the rise since the 1990s, and services previously provided by the state are increasingly devolved to urban centers. The goal is to “enhance participatory democracy and transparency,” making services more responsive to people’s needs. However, this has also meant that states must increasingly rely on local governments to implement their human rights obligations. Nonetheless, the human rights implications of decentralization have received scant consideration.

Growing decentralization is in line with the principle of subsidiarity, also espoused by international law. Under this principle, central authority should be subsidiary, “performing only those tasks which cannot be performed at a more local level.” This principle encourages the resolution of problems “where they occur, by those who understand them best, and by those who are most affected by them.” Decision-making lies “closest to the people” with redress “at the immediate site of abuse.” The European Charter for the Safeguarding of Human Rights in the City adheres to this principle, calling for the operation of public services “on the administrative level closest to the people.”
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The principle of subsidiarity is fundamental to international law. States play the primary role in enforcing human rights obligations, and international and regional bodies serve in a supportive capacity, intervening only when domestic resolution is ineffective. Accordingly, exhaustion of domestic remedies is a requirement prior to consideration of a complaint at the international or regional levels. Additionally, the European Court of Human Rights developed the doctrine of “margin of appreciation,” granting states a degree of latitude and discretion in interpreting rights and addressing violations. Furthermore, this doctrine provides room for a state’s unique culture, history, and legal system to inform implementation. Through periodic reviews, treaty bodies serve a mostly supervisory and monitoring function with the aim of strengthening domestic processes. This limited monitoring role enables local shaping and relevance of rights, as well as democratic participation. As Kaufman explains, “[B]y respecting and enabling the primacy of local institutions, the human rights system ensures that human rights values and approaches reflect the concerns and needs of local communities, allowing for a more ‘authentic,’ effective and relevant approach to rights protection.” In this way, although the international human rights regime focuses on the national level, a strong role for local governments aligns with its principles.

For their part, cities that adopt human rights standards are eager for international engagement. The Global Charter-Agenda for Human Rights in the City explicitly pledges collaboration with international human rights mechanisms. In its description of the human rights cities movement, the U.S. Human Rights Network points to its value in “offer[ing] a rich body of international human rights law that validates and reinforces local claims” and “connect[ing] local communities with a global human rights movement.” The human rights framework is inherently international, providing cities with access to global networks. This includes formal
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actors in the human rights system, as well as informal relations. According to Michele Grigolo, “[w]hat makes the human rights city is a web of formal and informal networks that include international . . . governmental and non-governmental organisations.”

These international connections further provide a cosmopolitan identity and may bring political, social, and economic benefits. For instance, conceiving itself as an “international city,” the City of York in the United Kingdom embraced the global framing of human rights. Commissioner Patricia L. Gatling, who chaired the New York City Commission on Human Rights, recognized that rights protection contributes to a global city, which draws people and economic opportunities: “[C]reating and maintaining an open city in terms of housing, lending, employment, and public accommodation is a critical part of attracting business and individuals to New York City and keeping them here.”

C. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BETTER ENGAGEMENT

While international human rights bodies may be limited in their capacity to review local practices comprehensively, as the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing notes, “there is room for considerably more engagement with the responsibilities of subnational governments” at the international level. Human rights bodies already acknowledge the essential role of local authorities and just need to take the next step, systematically applying the implications to their mandate. They can interrogate the relationship between the state and local governments, engage in dialogue with local governments, and call for local consultation. Higher level engagement and the strengthening of local initiatives would be possible with additional support from OHCHR.

One area that would especially benefit from sustained attention by international human rights bodies is the relationship between the national
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2022] LOCALIZING HUMAN RIGHTS IN CITIES

government and localities. Accountability requires clarity about which responsibilities lie with which level of government. \(^{323}\) Moreover, the various levels of government should be reinforcing and complementing each other. \(^{324}\) In the housing realm, CESCR has called for “coordination between ministries and regional and local authorities to reconcile related policies.” \(^{325}\) In a General Comment, the Committee on the Rights of the Child (“CRC Committee”), responsible for monitoring compliance with the Convention on the Rights of the Child (“CRC”), \(^{326}\) provides additional guidance, requiring states to ensure localities “have the necessary financial, human and other resources effectively to discharge responsibilities.” \(^{327}\) The CRC Committee further highlighted the important monitoring role of the national government and expressed concern with parity among localities, calling for “safeguards” to ensure “devolution does not lead to discrimination in the enjoyment of rights by children in different regions.” \(^{328}\) These concerns apply to monitoring the enforcement of rights more generally by the various human rights bodies.

International human rights bodies, perhaps most controversially, can also engage in dialogue with local governments. In the General Comment referenced above, the CRC Committee was quick to stress that ultimate responsibility for human rights obligations lies with the national government, which “must retain powers to require full compliance with the Convention by devolved administrations or local authorities.” \(^{329}\) While national governments should by no means be excused from their treaty responsibilities, it is a wilful fallacy to pretend that they always have the power to ensure local compliance, even if this is what they ardently desire. \(^{330}\) Human rights bodies can address recommendations to
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\(^{327}\) Comm. on the Rts. of the Child, General Comment No. 5: General Measures of Implementation of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, U.N. Doc. CRC/GC/2003/5, ¶ 6 (Nov. 23, 2003) [hereinafter U.N. Comm. on the Rts. of the Child]. In its report, the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee likewise pointed to the need for local authorities to have “necessary powers and financial resources” to fulfill their human rights obligations. \(HRC\) \(August\ 2015\ Report, supra\ note 9, ¶ 22.\)
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\(^{330}\) For example, the Supreme Court clarified that the executive branch cannot compel compliance with treaty obligations by states or localities absent implementing legislation. Medellin v. Texas, 552 U.S. 491, 498–99 (2008).
both the national and local levels and follow up with national governments to ensure recommendations are conveyed to local authorities. In its report, the Human Rights Council Advisory Committee calls for consistent dissemination of UPR recommendations and concluding observations by treaty bodies to local governments.  

Additionally, international human rights bodies can emphasize the importance of local consultation to inform state and NGO reports. The Human Rights Council Advisory Committee specifically recommended that “United Nations mechanisms . . . encourage States to engage in a dialogue with local governments” and highlighted the importance of involving local government in the UPR process to “improve the quality of the follow-up to the accepted recommendations.” The High Commissioner of Human Rights similarly called for local governments to be “increasingly involved in the work of regional and international human rights mechanisms” and “more engaged” in both the preparation of state reports and delegations attending reviews. Meaningful engagement with local authorities need not entail a separate reporting process for treaty bodies with cities, which could be quite burdensome, but rather attention to the local dimension in both government and NGO shadow reports. Human rights bodies already digest and benefit from “a very large number of ‘shadow reports’ from NGOs on many countries and on many issues,” which is critical to assessing state compliance. At a basic level, human rights bodies should incorporate a local lens in analyzing these reports, focusing on relations between national and local authorities and egregious violations at the local level.
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334 Cities, Human Rights and Accountability, supra note 276, at 32. Berkeley is exceptional in submitting its own reports to treaty bodies, viewing this as a temporary measure to deepen engagement at the national level and stimulate consultation with local governments. Id.

335 For instance, the U.S. Human Rights Network compiles a shadow report for the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, bringing together experiences from communities around the United States. The Human Rights Cities Movement, supra note 6, at 3 n.7.

Higher-level analysis would be further possible with additional OHCHR support by dedicated staff with local government expertise. Cities that embrace a human rights framework indicate a desire to be governed by human rights standards and engage internationally. Designation as a human rights city can serve as a basis for resources and accountability for human rights implementation. However, international human rights bodies are generally not prepared to engage with cities, missing this opportunity. OHCHR currently supports the various U.N. human rights bodies in standard-setting and monitoring, as well as governments in human rights implementation in eighty-five field offices. The addition of dedicated staff with local government expertise and a mandate to aid city initiatives could be transformative. In this way, international human rights bodies can play an important role in strengthening human rights enforcement by deepening engagement with localities. A good starting point is to investigate the relationship between states and localities, including the division of responsibility and authority, access to resources and support at the local level, the existence of regional disparities, and monitoring and coordination by the national government. Human rights bodies should also address specific recommendations to localities and follow up with national governments to ensure they are conveyed, encouraging local consultation and dialogue. Additional OHCHR support would enable higher level engagement by international human rights bodies and assistance to strengthen local human rights initiatives.

V. CITIES AS HUMAN RIGHTS ACTORS IN THE UNITED STATES

In the United States, cities have the potential to serve as important human rights actors. Federalism-based concerns with impinging on state jurisdiction contribute to current U.S. ambivalence towards human rights. Although human rights are heralded in foreign policy, they are barely implemented domestically. While operating within federal and state boundaries, cities have the potential to democratize human rights.

337 The U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights has recognized “the need for closer liaison between United Nations entities and local government to ensure proper preparation of reports and follow-up to recommendations.” Annual Rep. of the U.N. High Commissioner, supra note 158, ¶ 48.

338 OHCHR, for instance, serves as the Secretariat of the Human Rights Council and, for each country review, prepares a compilation of relevant materials from treaty bodies and Special Rapporteurs, as well as a summary of NGO submissions. What We Do: An Overview, supra note 269.
Realization of human rights by cities requires the national government to also play a role, recommending the enactment of implementing legislation at state and local level, setting minimum standards, creating a forum for the exchange of strategies and practices, providing technical and financial support, and engaging with international human rights bodies on both successes and challenges.

A. U.S. AMBIVALENCE TOWARDS HUMAN RIGHTS

Ambivalence characterizes the United States’ relationship with human rights. On the one hand, the United States has served as a champion of human rights, contributing to development of the international human rights regime, and integrating human rights concerns in its foreign policy. At the same time, domestic human rights implementation is anemic with the United States remaining reluctant to ratify human rights treaties, imposing limitations on the few treaties it has ratified, and taking minimal steps to enforce them. Federalism concerns with addressing matters within state jurisdiction is one factor behind this poor implementation. Human rights cities can alleviate these concerns.

U.S. engagement with human rights is rife with contradictions. While the United States claims that human rights principles are part of its national ideology and has played a “prominent role” in developing international human rights instruments, it has failed to ratify many of them. Eleanor Roosevelt chaired a multi-country working group that drafted the UDHR in 1948, laying the basis for the international human rights regime. The United States has continued to be an important contributor to various human rights treaties, including ones it has not ratified, like the CRC, CEDAW, and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (“CRPD”). As mentioned above, the United
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States has ratified ICCPR, ICERD, and CAT—three of the core international human rights treaties.\(^{346}\) It has further ratified the Genocide Convention,\(^{347}\) two optional protocols to the CRC, which address the rights of children in armed conflict and trafficking in children, and a series of International Labour Organization (“ILO”) treaties on labor rights.\(^{348}\)

At the regional level, the United States has ratified the Charter of the Organization of American States (“OAS Charter”).\(^{349}\) Significant gaps in ratification include the ICESCR—the counterpart to the ICCPR considered part of the international bill of rights\(^{350}\)—CRC, CEDAW, and CRPD.\(^{351}\) The United States is the only country that has not ratified the CRC\(^{352}\) and the only developed country that has not ratified CEDAW.\(^{353}\) However, the United States has at least taken a step towards ratification of these treaties with the President signing them, but the treaties continue to await ratification by the Senate.\(^{354}\) The United States is also particularly wary of the protocols accompanying many international treaties, which enable treaty bodies to serve a quasi-judicial function and review individual complaints upon exhaustion of domestic remedies.\(^{355}\) Despite
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these major gaps, the United States has nonetheless committed to comply with a broad spectrum of rights with bipartisan support under both Democratic and Republican administrations.\footnote{356}{Id. at 395–96.}

However, even for the treaties that the United States has ratified, the United States has imposed limitations through the Senate by regularly attaching Reservations, Understandings, and Declarations (“RUDs”).\footnote{357}{Cities, Human Rights and Accountability, supra note 276, at 29; Johanna Kalb, Dynamic Federalism in Human Rights Treaty Implementation, 84 Tul. L. Rev. 1025, 1059 n.185 (2010).} This generally includes a declaration that the human rights treaty is not self-executing,\footnote{358}{Powell, supra note 168, at 258–59; see also 138 Cong. Rec. S8,068–71 (daily ed. Apr. 2, 1992) [hereinafter Cong. Rec. S8,068–71] (hearing on the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights).} aimed to “clarify that the Covenant will not create a private cause of action in U.S. Courts.”\footnote{359}{S. Rep. No. 102-23, at 20 (1992).} In reporting to the Human Rights Committee monitoring compliance with the ICCPR, the U.S. government explained that “this declaration did not limit the international obligations of the United States under the Covenant. Rather, it means that, as a matter of domestic law, the Covenant does not, by itself, create private rights directly enforceable in U.S. courts.”\footnote{360}{Initial Report to the Human Rights Committee, supra note 237, ¶ 8.} This leaves open, however, the possibility of using the ICCPR in conjunction with domestic provisions in litigation,\footnote{361}{The U.S. government further explained that “the fundamental rights and freedoms protected by the Covenant are already guaranteed as a matter of U.S. law, either by virtue of constitutional protections or enacted statutes, and can be effectively asserted and enforced by individuals in the judicial system on those bases,” seeming to indicate that constitutional protections and statutes should be interpreted as consistent with the ICCPR. Initial Report to the Human Rights Committee, supra note 237, ¶ 8.} and a few courts have in fact referred to the ICCPR as an aid in interpretation.\footnote{362}{E.g., Roper v. Simmons, 543 U.S. 551, 576 (2005); Sterling v. Cupp, 625 P.2d 123, 131 n.21 (Or. 1981). However, interestingly, U.S. courts reference the UDHR, although a non-binding declaration, more frequently than in any other country. Hurst Hannum, The Status of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in National and International Law, 25 Ga. J. Int’l & Comp. L. 287, 304 (1995).} Nonetheless, the use of international human rights law in litigation in the United States is sparse.\footnote{363}{Justices Scalia, Rhenquist, and Thomas have frowned on the use of any international law, warning they jeopardized American constitutional protections. Law’s Migration, supra note 104, at 1568, 1570 n.13.}

Non-self-executing declarations are not unusual or unique to the United States. Various countries use them to promote democratic deliberation around the meaning of broad treaty provisions, prior to
subjecting duty bearers to court action and calling for judicial interpretation. Thus, treaties are first given locally relevant content through implementing legislation. However, aside from CAT and the Genocide Convention, the United States has failed to enact federal implementing legislation for human rights treaties it has ratified. The United States ratified the ICCPR back in 1992, and, at this point, falls short of its obligations by still not having enacted implementing legislation for this treaty decades later.

In 2008, another impact of a non-self-executing treaty surfaced when the Supreme Court clarified in *Medellin v. Texas* that absent implementing legislation, the executive branch cannot compel compliance with treaty obligations by states or localities. In 1969, the United States ratified the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, recognizing the rights of non-nationals charged with crimes to assistance from their consulates. The Bush administration issued a memorandum directing state compliance with this convention. However, in *Medellin*, the Supreme Court held that the state of Texas was not obliged to abide by this federal executive order, considering that Congress had not yet passed implementing legislation. Interestingly, the Supreme Court decision confirms that states still have an international obligation, but it cannot be enforced by the federal government without implementing legislation. In his concurrence, Justice Stevens explains, “One consequence of our form of government is that sometimes States must shoulder the primary responsibility for protecting the honor and integrity of the Nation.”

This seems to call for a parallel relationship for states and localities with international bodies, in addition to that of the U.S. government.
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In ratifying human rights treaties, the Senate has additionally attached a federalism “understanding,” clarifying that state and local governments are responsible for implementing treaty obligations in areas within their jurisdiction. For instance, the understanding to the ICCPR states:

[T]he United States understands that this Covenant shall be implemented by the Federal Government to the extent that it exercises legislative and judicial jurisdiction over the matters covered therein, and otherwise by state and local governments; to the extent that state and local governments exercise jurisdiction over such matters, the Federal Government shall take measures appropriate to the Federal system to the end that the competent authorities of the state or local governments may take appropriate measures for the full fulfillment of the Covenant. 374

Similar understandings attach to CERD, CAT, and the Genocide Convention. 375 According to the legislative history, the United States used an understanding rather than a reservation because “the intent is not to modify or limit U.S. undertakings under the Covenant but rather to put our future treaty partners on notice with regard to the implications of our federal system concerning implementation.” 376 In its initial report to the HRC, the United States likewise explained:

This provision is not a reservation and does not modify or limit the international obligations of the United States under the Covenant. Rather, it addresses the essentially domestic issue of how the Covenant will be implemented within the U.S. federal system. It serves to emphasize domestically that there was no intent to alter the constitutional balance of authority between the federal government on the one hand and the state and local governments on the other, or to use the provisions of the

Covenant to federalize matters now within the competence of the states.\textsuperscript{377} The United States thus acknowledges that it is fully bound by its treaty obligations, but there are certain areas where states and municipalities must take the lead.

This federalism understanding results from an inherent tension in U.S. law. Under the Constitution, the federal government has exclusive authority to enter into treaties.\textsuperscript{378} In fact, due to the failure of the Articles of Confederation, the Constitution specifically created national institutions to “articulate uniform positions”\textsuperscript{379} and prevent “balkanization of foreign policy and international affairs.”\textsuperscript{380} Moreover, under the Constitution’s Supremacy Clause, international treaties are the “supreme law of the land”\textsuperscript{381} and binding on states, including for matters generally under state jurisdiction. In Missouri v. Holland, the Supreme Court held that treaty power authorizes legislation under the Constitution’s Necessary and Proper Clause in areas outside traditional congressional authority.\textsuperscript{382} The Court explained, “No doubt the great body of private relations usually fall within the control of [a] [s]tate, but a treaty may override its power.”\textsuperscript{383} Human rights treaties, which focus on the protection of diverse rights, often intersect with areas of law historically reserved to states,\textsuperscript{384} such as social welfare, family relations, and criminal law.\textsuperscript{385} In its initial report to the HRC, the United States highlighted the following matters governed by state and local authorities: “education, public health, business organization, work conditions, marriage and divorce, the care of children, and exercise of ordinary police power.”\textsuperscript{386}

The prospect of human rights treaties in these areas raised trepidation around upsetting the balance of power between the states and federal government and eroding state sovereignty. This led to several political attempts to overturn Holland. The most significant attempt took place in
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the 1950s, when Senator Bricker of Ohio called for a constitutional amendment.\footnote{Kalb, supra note 357, at 1032–33.} Under the proposed Bricker Amendment, “[a] treaty shall become effective as internal law . . . only through legislation by Congress which it could enact under its delegated powers in the absence of such a treaty,”\footnote{The Promise and Limits of Local Human Rights, supra note 113, at 606.} Thus, Senator Bricker sought to limit the potential impact of international treaties. He was particularly keen “to insure that international agreements would not lead to United Nations interference on moral, liberal, social and economic policies and legislation in the United States.”\footnote{Law’s Migration, supra note 104, at 1606–07 (quoting DUANE TANENBAUM, THE BRICKER AMENDMENT CONTROVERSY: A TEST OF EISENHOWER’S POLITICAL LEADERSHIP 31 (1988)).} Although the Bricker Amendment did not pass, as Louis Henkin describes, the “ghost” of Bricker lives on through the federalism understandings attached to treaties.\footnote{Louis Henkin, Comment, U.S. Ratification of Human Rights Conventions: The Ghost of Senator Bricker, 89 AM. J. INT’L L. 341, 348–50 (1995); see also Kalb, supra note 357, at 1033–34; Law’s Migration, supra note 104, at 1606–08; Powell, supra note 168, at 265–66.}

As a result, domestic implementation of human rights treaties in the United States is lukewarm at best. These treaties are not well-known among policymakers or the public, and the federal government has invested little in raising awareness.\footnote{From Principles to Practice, supra note 108, at 81.} In addition to failing to adopt implementing legislation, the United States, in stark contrast with European counterparts, has neglected to designate a national human rights institution or to assess the human rights impacts of proposed initiatives.\footnote{The Promise and Limits of Local Human Rights, supra note 113, at 605. Ten countries urged the United States to establish a national human rights institution during its Universal Periodic Review, and civil society shadow reports to international human rights bodies repeatedly articulate this need. By Some Other Means, supra note 49, at 1985.} As Tara Melish characterizes, the United States “has appeared to flinch and even recoil, when it comes to direct domestic application of human rights norms.”\footnote{Melish, supra note 158, at 391.}

At the same time, human rights has historically been a cornerstone of U.S. foreign policy.\footnote{E.g., Antony J. Blinken (Secretary of State), U.S. Dep’t of State, Remarks to the 46th Session of the Human Rights Council (Feb. 22, 2021), https://www.state.gov/remarks-to-the-46th-session-of-the-human-rights-council [https://perma.cc/36NM-ARX5] (“The United States is placing democracy and human rights at the center of our foreign policy, because they are essential for peace and stability.”).} Human rights justifications figure prominently in decisions to support certain foreign leaders, limit military aid, or engage in
military force. Additionally, the United States links economic assistance to countries’ human rights performance, and the State Department compiles reports annually on human rights across the globe. Not only did the United States play a leading role in the founding of the international human rights regime, but it has also provided political and financial support to the various international human rights bodies. In this way, U.S. support for human rights “has generally been directed as a way to improve external, rather than internal, conditions,” linked to a belief in American exceptionalism. Tara Melish examines the paradox of a country “outwardly prodigious” and inwardly parsimonious and Louis Henkin evocatively describes a cathedral of human rights, where the United States is not a pillar, but a flying buttress, supporting human rights from the outside and unwilling to subject itself to scrutiny.

However, as Tara Melish points out, this is not the whole story. The United States has generally engaged well when it comes to domestic human rights assessments in the international and regional spheres, although this was not the case under the Trump Administration. For its
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periodic reports, the United States has historically prepared extensive and
detailed submissions to the relevant international bodies, encouraging civil
society involvement. The United States has also attended dialogues
with these bodies with high-level, interagency delegations, participating
actively and making constructive interventions. In responding to
questions, the United States mostly exhibits openness with the exception
of two areas: the intersection of human rights with humanitarian law and
with the law of armed conflict outside the territorial boundaries of the
United States. Through its vigorous engagement, the United States has
sought to set an example for other countries, highlighting the value of
dialogue with international human rights bodies. These dialogues can
advance rights by “providing an international spotlight for gross abuses,
giving voice to individuals and civil society groups seeking greater human
rights protections and transparency at home, and providing legitimacy to
domestic human rights and democracy movements.” The United States
has further historically extended invitations to Special Rapporteurs to
investigate protection of particular rights in the United States and has
engaged in briefing and arguments at the Inter-American Human Rights
Commission. Prior to the Trump Administration, the State Department
also started to broaden its human rights oversight from an exclusive focus
on other countries to some domestic analysis. This article adds to this
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analysis, arguing that an important part of the human rights story in the United States consists of human rights initiatives at city level.

B. FEDERALISM SUGGESTS A HUMAN RIGHTS ROLE FOR CITIES

The federalism context in the United States points to an important role for cities as human rights actors. Indeed, the federal government has recognized the role of state and local governments in treaty implementation. City initiatives to advance human rights locally challenge a discourse that focuses on human rights as foreign or distant concerns to be protected abroad rather than at home.412 However, cities also operate within certain boundaries and are subject to both national and state preemption.

Federalism in the United States suggests an active role for state and local governments in implementing human rights treaty obligations and leadership in certain areas, such as social welfare, family relations, and criminal law. The United States has, in fact, repeatedly emphasized the role of state and local governments in treaty implementation. Starting in 2009, the State Department has involved states and localities in its treaty reporting.413 In 2010, for instance, the State Department’s Legal Advisor, Harold Koh, sent a letter to all state governors and states and local human rights commissions, requesting their input on U.S. compliance with the ICPR, CERD, and CAT.414 Similarly, in 2015, in addressing the National Association of Attorneys General, Mary McLeod, the State Department’s Acting Legal Advisor, affirmed, “It is only throughout robust efforts at all levels of government—federal, state, territorial, and local—that we can live up to the obligations we have undertaken for ourselves.”415 Moreover, she stressed,
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[O]ur efforts at the federal level are only one small component of our efforts as a nation. Because ours is a Federal system, it is largely through the work of officials like you—acting at the state, territorial, and local level—that the United States ensures compliance with its human rights treaty obligations.416

Local representatives, including former Mayor of Salt Lake City and former Attorney General of New Mexico,417 have further joined the U.S. delegation in U.N. hearings before the treaty monitoring bodies.418

Cities, in particular, can play an important role in democratizing human rights. Catherine Powell points to a “democratic deficit” inherent in the development of international law in the United States.419 This is due to the lack of transparency in treaty negotiations, as well as ratification of treaties by the Senate without an opportunity for input from the House, unlike domestic legislation.420 Rectifying this requires translation of international law to the domestic context through “broad-based democratic deliberation,”421 “democratizing the implementation of international law norms.”422 Cities provide a good forum to do this. Indeed, cities are at the forefront of human rights implementation in the United States, and scholars have referred to them as the “vanguard”423 and “first movers”424 on human rights domestication.

While cities could potentially be significant human rights actors, they must operate within certain boundaries. They cannot usurp the role of the national government, and they face the challenge of national and state preemption. The Constitution’s Compact Clause limits the ability of sub-national authorities to enter into agreements, encroaching on national power to conduct foreign affairs.425 The federal courts have “vigorously policed” this boundary under the federal preemption doctrine,426 ensuring
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the nation can speak “with ‘one voice’ in foreign affairs.”427 In Crosby v. National Foreign Trade Council, the Supreme Court struck down a Massachusetts law banning goods from Burma due to forced labor concerns, finding that it interfered with more calibrated federal sanctions.428 In American Insurance Association v. Garamendi, the Supreme Court further indicated that executive action was sufficient to preempt state legislation, even when not in direct conflict, given the possibility of future tension with federal policy.429

Cities are additionally subject to preemption by state law. Until the last century, cities operated under the severe constraints of the Dillon Rule, which only allowed localities to exercise authority expressly granted by the state.430 However, this has since flipped with almost all states endorsing some form of home rule and allowing localities to exercise powers not expressly reserved to the states, including setting up local constitutions.431 States, nonetheless, can always preempt city action through new laws and judicial interpretation. For instance, states have passed laws preempting restaurant smoking bans, domestic partnership benefits, and rent control, and some state courts have found city living wage ordinances impermissible intrusions on state power.432 While human rights initiatives at the city level will not always succeed, cities provide an important, additional forum for advocacy and human rights implementation.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BETTER ENGAGEMENT

While the federal government cannot direct states and localities to comply with treaties, it can play an important facilitating role. To fulfill its treaty obligations, the national government should recommend the enactment of implementing legislation at state and local levels, set minimum standards, create a forum for exchange of strategies and practices, provide technical and financial support, and engage with international human rights bodies on both successes and challenges.
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As an initial matter, when the United States ratifies a treaty with a federalism understanding, it should also reach out to states recommending the enactment of implementing legislation at local level. According to Johanna Kalb, the federalism understanding itself “presents a directive to state authorities to pass implementing legislation that enforces treaty rights and norms in those areas.”

Perhaps some of the local human rights initiatives can fill the role of implementing legislation. The federal government should support these efforts and publicize them as good examples, and international human rights bodies should follow up with the United States on this point.

In setting minimum national standards, the federal government would provide critical guidance to states and localities. Drawing on Justice Breyer’s dissent in Sanchez-Llamas v. Oregon, Johanna Kalb argues for an approach in which the federal government defines a minimum “‘floor below’ which the states may not fall, but then leaves the specifics of implementation and remedy” up to them. This would be in line with existing practice, in which “federal law provides a minimum ‘floor’ against which varying state policies are tested and ultimately approved or rejected.” This would also respond to the request of U.S. mayors and local human rights agencies for federal guidance. Currently, there are no national-level reports and guidelines on practices to respect, protect, and fulfill rights.

By setting minimum standards, the national government would also act as an important check and balance against runaway localism. Risa Kaufman reflects on the “tension between valuing human rights localism and ensuring promotion and adherence to a universal set of human rights norms and standards,” which points to a “mediating role” for the federal government. The Advisory Committee to the Human Rights Council likewise recognized that while “[t]he degree of self-government enjoyed by local authorities can be regarded as a key element of genuine democracy,” “local independence should have certain limits clearly prescribed by law, and mechanisms should be available for supervising the
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legality of local authorities’ activities.” The U.S. government should thus play a monitoring and supervisory role.

Another gap, related to the lack of national standards, is the lack of coordination. Without a national human rights institution, there is no entity reviewing and sharing strategies and programs for human rights implementation at the local level. Such an entity would bolster local efforts by identifying best practices, spotlighting violations, providing a clearinghouse for information and tools, and facilitating exchanges amongst localities. U.S. advocates and localities have repeatedly expressed “the desire for independent, expert reviews that situate their progress” and take account of local context and challenges. A national coordinating role is further in line with the Constitution’s mandate to avoid balkanization. The Special Rapporteur on adequate housing also recognizes a role for national government in developing and monitoring national standards, “comparing programmes and outcomes in different regions and localities.”

The federal government should also provide technical and financial assistance to spur human rights compliance. The High Commissioner for Human Rights has pointed to the need “to train local government officials and local actors on human rights.” In the United States, there is an especially big gap in human rights education and training. Mayors have explicitly reached out for federal support in building “their capacity to bolster human rights compliance,” but there has been no response. Along with training and guidance, mayors and local human rights agencies have also requested financial resources. As discussed above, the CRC Committee has directed states to make sure localities “have the necessary financial, human and other resources effectively to discharge responsibilities.”
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to make sure municipalities have sufficient resources to ensure access to water.\footnote{Farha, supra note 123, ¶ 12 (“National level governments usually have greater capacity ... to finance housing programmes, regulate mortgages and credit, fund housing subsidy and income support programmes, and oversee taxation and resource allocation.”).} The Special Rapporteur on adequate housing further notes, “[n]ational level governments are often better placed to ensure a fair distribution of resources, so that areas with fewer resources and greater needs are not simply left to fend for themselves.”\footnote{Id.} Thus, the U.S. government can help assure the resources needed for the realization of human rights.

By providing resources, the national government can also incentivize human rights compliance. According to the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing, national governments may influence local policies through “incentives, conditions, priorities or required outcomes linked to the provision of funding for locally administered programmes.”\footnote{Id.} Olatunde Johnson argues for greater use of “spending carrots” to spur local innovation advancing civil rights in the United States.\footnote{Id. at 142; see also Tars et al., supra note 209, at 958–959 (describing the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s (“HUD”) provision of funding to incentivize communities to end the criminalization of homelessness).}

As a potential model, she points to an initiative by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Department of Transportation, and Environmental Protection Agency to provide funding to state and local efforts for “sustainable communities,” including affordable housing, improved transportation infrastructure, and environmental efficiency.\footnote{Id.} Similarly, the Department of Labor has initiated a grants program for public-private partnerships providing training opportunities in “high-growth occupations and industries” with a focus on historically excluded groups.\footnote{Id.}

Finally, the United States should meaningfully engage with international human rights bodies on both successes and challenges at the local level. Currently, U.S. inclusion of localities in treaty body reviews takes the form of cherry-picking, focusing on highlights rather than aiming at a genuine human rights assessment. Local and state representatives are specifically selected to showcase the “most favorable examples of human
rights progress.” The State Department’s letter to U.S. Governors characterized participation as “vital opportunities to demonstrate to the world our country’s commitment to protecting human rights domestically.” While the United States should continue to present local achievements at treaty reviews, it needs to also present difficulties for the reviews to be useful. Federal communications should thus encourage localities to engage in dialogue with civil society, sharing both successes and challenges. If done well, participation in treaty reporting has the potential to open communication between the federal and local governments on key issues. Additionally, as discussed above, in addressing their recommendations only to the federal government, international human rights bodies lose an opportunity to provide guidance at the local level. Currently, “[a]ny measure of local human rights accountability arising from local participation in the treaty monitoring process is at best, a by-product.”

It is time to address these gaps. The national government can create an enabling environment for human rights compliance at the local level by setting standards, facilitating information exchanges, providing guidance and resources, and engaging with localities on both successes and challenges.

VI. THE ROLE OF CITY NETWORKS

While cities may be at the bottom of the vertical hierarchy of authority, they can also exert influence horizontally over their peers. The European Charter for the Safeguarding of Human Rights in the City devotes an article to “international municipal cooperation.” Signatory cities commit to cooperate with local authorities from developing countries and recognize the importance of partnership beyond “urban and national frontiers.” Likewise, the Global Charter-Agenda for Human Rights in the City espouses “transnational local cooperation,” and signatories “are encouraged to develop contact with neighboring cities and territories with the aim of building caring communities and regional
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capitals. “Horizontal diffusion” of laws and legal strategies takes place through both formal associations, as well as informal networks. Strengthening peer networks can thus serve to advance human rights implementation. Peer networks are already prioritizing human rights and can take a more active role with support from government. In fact, they can help the national government fulfill its coordination role by working with cities to set up and evaluate programs, compiling good practices, helping address challenges, and convening discussions on different issues. Additionally, they can support initiatives by individual cities focused on particular rights or themes. Through peer exchanges and reviews, they can also increase accountability for local human rights implementation.

A. TRANSLOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

Judith Resnik points to the proliferation of translocal organizations of government actors, such as the U.S. Conference of Mayors (“USCM”) and National League of Cities, and their role in transmitting ideas. These translocal organizations can serve as forums to share information, principles, laws, and strategies. In 2013, USCM adopted a resolution committing to implement international human rights and recognizing mayors’ frontline role. In 2014, UCSM declared CEDAW “a valuable tool for local governance.” UCSM also launched the U.S. Coalition of Cities against Racism and Discrimination, in collaboration with the U.S. State Department and UNESCO. Additionally, human rights cities in
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the United States have joined to form the National Human Rights Cities Alliance, as discussed above. The role of translocal organizations is also apparent at the international level. In 2004, United Cities and Local Governments (“UCLG”) was established to serve as the “voice of local government before the international community,” succeeding the International Union of Local Authorities founded in 1913. UCLG has served as the institutional home of the European Charter for the Safeguarding of Human Rights in the City and adopted the Global-Charter Agenda for Human Rights in the City in 2011. The Advisory Committee to the Human Rights Council noted the role international city networks such as UCLG could play in “developing toolkits, foster[ing] research, provid[ing] opportunities for peer-to-peer learning and creat[ing] communities for action.” The Council of Europe and European Union have also created governance structures focused on local authorities, including a Council of Europe monitoring committee on local and regional human rights implementation, which issues reports with comparative data every five years. These various translocal organizations can be a valuable resource for implementing human rights locally.

B. CITY PARTNERSHIPS

In addition to translocal organizations, individual cities may form partnerships, and a city may decide to lead on a particular issue. The United States has a Sister Cities Program, connecting U.S. cities, counties, and states with foreign counterparts in over 140 countries. Initially developed during the Cold War by President Eisenhower as part of...
“people-to-people” diplomacy, the program is now supported by Sister Cities International, which seeks “to promote peace through mutual respect, understanding, and cooperation—one individual, one community at a time.” The network currently prioritizes exchange in arts and culture, youth and education, business and trade, and community development and technology. This exchange could also potentially serve as a platform to promote human rights. Additionally, cities may take a leadership role on particular human rights. In the United States, most prominently, is San Francisco’s Women’s Commission, which has played an important role in the Cities for CEDAW Campaign.

C. INFORMAL NETWORKS

Informal networks among city dwellers can further facilitate human rights diffusion. Cities are interconnected through a web of trade and commerce, carrying not just goods, but also ideas and legal frameworks across borders. Cities are often trend-setters and can instigate social change. Cities cover the majority of the world’s population, and policies adopted by large cities impact many people and have reverberating effects, influencing nearby localities. Much of the power of cities stems from their inhabitants. City inhabitants belong to numerous networks and are known for their mobility and diversity. Civil society groups play an essential advocacy role, generating and disseminating ideas across boundaries, linked by technology and conferences. Moreover, professionals, such as lawyers and judges, can exert an impact on their peers.
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D. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR BETTER ENGAGEMENT

City networks provide another vehicle for strengthening human rights implementation. Indeed, there is an increasing focus on human rights by translocal organizations as part of their mandate, which can grow with government support. The national government can partner with translocal organizations, such as the U.S. National Human Rights Network and National Human Rights Cities Alliance, to facilitate coordination and exchange among cities. Translocal organizations can take a more active role by helping cities to set up and evaluate programs, compiling good practices, assisting with challenges, and convening topical discussions. Additionally, translocal organizations can provide greater support for leadership initiatives taken by particular cities, such as San Francisco’s role in the Cities for CEDAW Campaign. With encouragement, more cities can spearhead and help proliferate initiatives that focus on different aspects of human rights. Peer exchanges can also increase accountability for human rights implementation at the local level, complementing international and national efforts.

VII. CONCLUSION

Over the last two decades, cities have emerged as human rights actors. Cities have a particular contribution to bringing a human rights approach to governance and creating the conditions for the fulfillment of rights. Cities bring a participatory and community-centered approach to the implementation of rights and an expansive definition of participants, rooted in communities rather than the legal concept of citizenship. Human rights initiatives at the city level further entail a robust approach to equality with a focus on systemic remedies, addressing disparate impacts and jurisdictional barriers to women’s rights. The rise of human rights cities is particularly relevant in countries like the United States, where federalism has served as an obstacle to human rights practice domestically.

However, engagement with cities on human rights at both the international and national levels is still at its infancy. At minimum,
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international human rights bodies should regularly interrogate the relationship between the state and local governments, dialogue with local governments, and call for local consultations to enrich human rights reporting by states and civil society. The addition of OHCHR staff with city expertise would enable deeper engagement and the strengthening of local human rights initiatives. The U.S. government has also fallen short of its responsibilities. It should call on cities and states to enact implementing legislation for treaties that have been ratified. It should further set minimum standards for implementation, provide resources, facilitate exchange, and engage with international human rights bodies on both successes and challenges. In light of current gaps at the international and federal levels, peer networks can play an especially useful role. They can support coordination and accountability of local initiatives, as well as leadership by individual cities on different rights or themes. As human rights continue to evolve with standards and practices informing and shaping each other, cities comprise an important frontier and are potentially powerful partners in the human rights project.