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Abstract
Globalization is characterized by the growing interconnectedness between states and societies, which facilitates transnational flows, networks, and fundamental movements that transform the meaning of nation-states (Aas, 2013: 227). It is important to understand the impact of these processes on international policy and law. One area of international law impacted by globalization are laws pertaining to human rights. These laws have been established in the form of various treaties and human rights institutions, which articulate a global human rights standard. There is much debate about human rights standards, including the charge that these laws propagate western ethnocentric values and that this universal implementation is problematic. This study explores cultural contexts and the implementation of human rights law through a comparative frame analysis of International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights state party reports. This comparative analysis utilizes the most recent state party reports for the United States, Turkey, and Namibia. Findings suggest that these state party reports reflect a process of cultural framing and that the responses within the reports can be characterized as primarily symbolic in nature. It is concluded that differing cultural contexts for each country analyzed produce reports that reflect a legally cynical response to the human rights standards set forth by the ICCPR.
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Introduction:

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) is a treaty that was adopted in 1966 and was designed to create a universal human rights standard. Countries who ratify this treaty are responsible for periodic reports. These state party reports describe how the standards set forth in the treaty are being implemented. These standards are embodied in 47 different articles which outline various human rights standards from equality before the law, equal political representation, to clerical responsibilities such as state party reports. Following the initial state party report, every four years, countries are responsible to submit periodic reports that further identify how they have implemented and carry out the various articles within the treaty. These reports are reviewed by a committee made up of 18 independent experts which are elected for a term of 4 years from countries who have signed the treaty. This committee reads these reports and provides a list of issues or concerns that they feel each individual country needs to address. Countries respond to the issues and concerns in their state party reports. The committee convenes in Geneva every year on three different occasions to discuss, review, and write reports on submitted state party reports and concluding remarks (United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner Website).

Within criminology, institutional research has had a primarily domestic focus, such as local law enforcement. Within criminological literature, there has been little focus on global human rights institutions. There is some research that has looked at perceptions of human rights institutions such as the International Tribunal for Former Yugoslavia (See: Ivkovich and Hagan, 2011), whereas other literature specifically calls on criminologists to have a greater focus on
international criminal justice institutions such as the International Criminal Court (Rothe & Mullins, 2010). The relative absence of studies in criminology addressing human rights institutions and their implementation suggest that criminologists ignore the importance these institutions have. Institutions provide a framework and mechanisms for society that guide action (Karstedt, 2010: 17), and are therefore of crucial importance to study. Furthermore, political science literature describes human rights institutions as tools used to promote human rights, in addition to being tools that guide society to confront human rights violations (Oberlietner, 2007). Institutions such as the International criminal court, are tasked with preventing and holding actors accountable for crimes that are often widespread and impact large segments of societies. The size and severity of crimes these institutions are tasked with addressing, like genocide, make these institutions a domain of research of paramount importance within criminology.

Arguably, human rights institutions are a product of the growing global diffusion of human rights standards rooted in human rights ideology as a result of past historical events. A history of human rights shows that the foundation on which human rights institutions and ideologies was established long before World War II (Oberleitner, 2007). Human rights have been a political issue since the 1800’s in regards to slavery, evolving into a global issue in the early 1900’s with the creation of the Treaty of Versailles (Oberleitner, 2007). After World War II, there were political endeavors to fight for basic universal human rights standards, which resulted in one of the first human rights instruments adopted by the United Nations at the 1948 Convention (Lippman, 1985). Throughout the remaining decades of the 20th century, mass atrocities throughout the globe became the concern of political leaders and human rights advocates, which paved the way for a growing interest in human rights.
This shift towards human rights accountability has been described as the “justice cascade” (Sikkink and Kim, 2013). The justice cascade refers to a trend of holding political leaders accountable for human rights violations (Sikkink, 2011). Beginning with the Nuremberg and Tokyo trials, the justice cascade resulted in trying the atrocities that took place during World War II in court (Sikkink and Kim, 2013). This growing interest in human rights, catalyzed by historical events, has subsequently lead to the creation of many global human rights institutions such as the International Criminal Court, International Tribunal for Former Yugoslavia, and the United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner. These institutions were intended to hold nations accountable for their human rights violations (Oberleitner, 2007). These institutions have risen out of complicated historical events. We have very little understanding the impact these institutions and their policy have across the globe.

Thus, unlike traditional law enforcement and criminal justice institutions, human rights institutions are fairly new. It is important for criminological research to analyze these newly established institutions. By examining the effectiveness of human rights institutions in these early stages, criminologists may be able to inform policy changes to improve the implementation of an international human rights standard. One instrument which embodies a broad list of universal human rights standard, is the ICCPR (See Appendix A for list of Articles).

With the emergence of human rights institutions, we have to ask ourselves whether these human rights indeed may be implemented universally, across all different cultural contexts. This study analyzes the most recent International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights state party reports by the United States, Turkey, and Namibia to better understand how each country reports
on the implementation of the human rights standards set forth by the treaty. The study uses critical collective framing theory and legal cynicism to guide the analysis. The analysis looks at varying frames between countries which ultimately inform each countries legally cynical responses within their state party reports.

This study explores cultural contexts and the implementation of human rights law through a comparative frame analysis of International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights state party reports. Are human rights institutions successful in implementing universal human rights standards? With debates surrounding the diffusion of global norms, there is variability in perceptions of what constitutes a human right. Depending on the cultural context, a society’s perceptions of serious human rights violations may vary, and we would expect that particular human rights will not be fully implemented, or implemented at all. We cannot possibly answer this broad question in the proposed study. Instead, we attempt to address a much more specific research question: What can comparative frame analysis of state party reports on the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights tell us about the implementation of human rights law in three distinctly different national contexts (US, Turkey, Namibia)? More specifically, we conduct a comparative analysis in order to understand how each country interprets these rights through each country’s most recent state party report. To foreshadow our findings, the analysis suggests that the responses provided by the periodic reports are primarily symbolic in nature. We interpret the framing of responses within state party reports for the ICCPR as symbolic responses reflecting national social construction of reality and their cultural frames.
Theory and Review of Literature:

Literature around human rights provides critiques that argue these global standards and policies reflect a western ethnocentric perspective of the world, which tends to ignore national distinctions (Aas, 2012). Globalization and the end of the Cold War era promoted the spread of western judicial approaches to criminal justice systems around the world (Alter 2011: 411). Research has been conducted on the global diffusion of standards in the context of women’s rights, suggesting that globally the general population has become more accepting and aware of women’s rights (Pierotti, 2013). The globalization of women’s rights, more broadly the globalization of western values, has been an arena for much debate in global and comparative criminology. This literature calls for researchers to acknowledge and understand ethnocentric biases in their research while also moving beyond a cultural relativism (Nelken 2009; Coyle and Boyle 2010; Banks and Baker 2015). Thus, past research shows the importance of being aware of varying cultures and contexts when implementing international law.

As such this study will look at dominant social, political, and religious frames for the three countries, the United States, Turkey, and Namibia. Sociologists assume that individual and collective reality is constructed through a subjective lens by which we interpret the world (Berger & Luckman, 1991). Goffman states that frames provide meanings to a situation or “schemata for interpretation” (1974). More specifically, the social construction of reality does inform cultural frames. Cultural frames allow for individuals to experience the world through a frame based on a set of beliefs and experiences (Goffman, 1974). This paper looks at national political, social, and religious histories to inform a cultural frame for each respective country.
studied. In this, we draw from a more recent variant of framing theory, which is, critical collective framing theory (Hagan, 2012).

Critical collective framing theory describes how the elite, or those in power, define what is legal or illegal (Hagan, 2012). Here, it is argued that the social construction of reality for each country informs a cultural frame, which shapes what the elite and people in power define as legal or illegal. Debates surrounding woman’s rights, including female genital cutting (See: Boyle & Corl, 2010), provide an example of how a dominant frame can inform what is legal or illegal. Although female genital cutting, in a western frame, has been seen as malevolent, literature acknowledges that the issue is complicated. That, in some circumstances, female genital cutting is part of cultural practice. As such, nation states vary in whether they frame female genital cutting as legal or illegal.

In this study, critical collective frames inform how responses are framed within the state party reports, or how each country ultimately constructs their implementation of a universal human rights standard. The responses within the state party reports will portray what human rights standards and issues are most important for each nation. Much literature within political science acknowledge that human rights laws, policies, and instruments are symbolic in nature (See: Von Bernstoff, 2008; Hathaway 2002). Symbolic, in the sense that human rights laws and policies do little to change how nations address their human rights issues. As such, we argue that the reports are primarily symbolic in nature. For the purpose of this study, the symbolic responses within this state party report are interpreted as reflecting legal cynicism.
Legal cynicism is traditionally rooted in literature regarding community and police relations (See: Kirk & Papachristos, 2011; Peterson Et al, 2006; Sampson & Bartusch, 1998). Specifically, what drives positive or negative perception of police by a community. More recently, there have been developments in the operationalization of legal cynicism as demonstrated by Kirk and Papachristos whose research has taken into account cultural frames (2011). These authors argued that there are certain cultural frames which drive legal cynicism, or a community’s refusal to solve disputes through traditional legal institutions. It is argued that culture is important to understand why certain people are more or less likely to trust the police. Drawing upon anthropological literature of culture, they construct a definition of cultural frames that describes a repertoire of evaluations schema, scripts, and frames, which individuals use to understand and negotiate the social world (Swidler, 1986: 273).

Traditionally, legal cynicism has been rooted in understanding community contexts and perceptions of police. Hagan and colleagues expand upon the literature to understand legal cynicism in the context of international law (2015). Using Kirk and Papachristos definition of legal cynicism (2011), Hagan et al make two arguments. Their first argument is that legal cynicism by the United States government drove the US to invade Iraq. Here they argue that this legal cynicism was informed by a cultural frame of criminal militarism. This criminal militarism was driven by a false assumption that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction, which ultimately lead to the United States ignoring international pre-emptive war laws. Second, looking at actions by the United States and their military in Iraq, it is argued that troops in Iraq created legal cynicism among local Iraq community members towards United States military and the United States as a whole. This paper expands upon the first argument, which demonstrates how the
United States legal cynicism resulted in the US ignoring international law (Hagan et al, 2015), and we employ this in the context of international human rights law.

A major difference between Kirk and Papachristos’s definition of legal cynicism as compared to past definitions like Sampson and Bartusch who looked at neighborhood disadvantage (1998), is their focus on cultural frames. They argue that legal cynicism is contextual and that every individual may be legally cynical to police and legal institutions for differing reasons. Every community has different frames which inform the residents’ perception of the world. These perceptions are a consequence of personal experiences and the people within that social context. Therefore, two communities may have legally cynical views of the police, but the cultural context will inform the distinct perceptions of the police and legal institutions in these communities (Kirk and Papachristos, 2011).

Thus, the study draws from Hagan and colleagues (2015) adaptation of Kirk and Papachistos’ definition of legal cynicism in the context of international law. This paper analyzes the reports produced by the US, Turkey and Namibia, and explores how the cultural context informs the perceptions of the ICCPR. We use dominant historical, political, social, and religious frames to inform how each country interprets their particular implementation of the ICCPR. These national cultural frames may be viewed as critical collective frames that shape how the elite and those in power frame what is legal or illegal. These critical collective frames will inform how each countries implementation of the ICCPR standards are symbolic, or legally cynical in nature.
Current Study:

The current study uses the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the most recent state party reports as completed by the United States, Turkey, and Namibia, to better understand the implementation of the instrument’s human rights standards. With debates around ethnocentric biases, literature acknowledges that perceptions of specific human rights issues vary by dominant political and social frames. This paper attempts to expand upon this literature by looking at how three counties, the United States, Turkey and Namibia implement a broad list of human rights standards set forth by the ICCPR.

Literature within political science has described the effect of human rights law as symbolic (See: Von Bernstoff, 2008; Hathaway 2002). Very little literature has investigated what causes these symbolic applications of international human rights law. As such, this study will use critical collective framing theory to understand the dominant frames which inform how the elite and those in power define what is legal or illegal. The analysis of each country’s state party report will focus on the framing of responses when describing the implementation of each article. Taking varying social, cultural, and religious frames into account, each county’s critical collective frame will be used to understand the implementation of human rights standards largely derived from western ethnocentric values. This critical collective frame will be used to better understand what we interpret as largely symbolic responses in their state party reports. As such, this study will move beyond past research in political science, and use criminological theory, that is, legal cynicism, to better understand what makes the implementation of human rights law
symbolic. Through this analysis, we can better understand the implementation of these universal human standards produced by international institutions.

**Methods:**

The United States, Turkey, and Namibia were chosen because their political, social, and religious histories are all distinct from each other, which is viewed as a useful comparative design (See for example, Marshall and Marshall 1983). These countries were chosen because they all differ in their dominant religions, government structures, and political histories, which likely will result in differences in framing and structures of their state party reports. The main methodology is content analysis of the ICCPR reports. The study uses the United States 2012 state party report, Turkey’s 2011 state party report, and Namibia’s 2015 state party report. The reports do not come from the same year as each country varies in when they publish their state party report. As such, this study uses the most recently completed state party report for each country. These reports come from the United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner website (Retrieved from: [http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CCPR/Pages/CCPRIndex.aspx](http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/CCPR/Pages/CCPRIndex.aspx)).

The coding was completed using the NVivo software, where coding took place in two stages. The initial coding process used a code list derived from the broad list of issues laid out within each article of the treaty, such as equality before the law, political rights, immigration, education, and health care. A second coding process involved the use of codes derived from emerging themes.
The coding process was completed using a code list with 29 parent codes and a number of child nodes within the structure. The coding process was completed in two stages. The initial coding process was completed, where relevant text within the reports were coded to the correct theme. After the initial analysis was completed, a matrix coding command was completed on NVIVO. This command created an output with a matrix where on the y-axis the different codes were listed and the x-axis displayed the three countries (See: Appendix B). This matrix output presents a frequency table for number of times each code was used for each country. This output was used to look at codes that may have been underutilized in the first round or seemed low based on initial impressions. As such, a second coding process was completed in order to be thorough in whether the reports were coded to accurately represent topics and themes within each report.

The original codes, which encompass most of the codes, are based on the 27 different human rights standards represented in the first 27 articles of the treaty (See: Appendix A). The second coding process was completed with the implementation of two new codes, CRCL/CRD/CRL (Civil Rights Division and Civil Rights and Civil Liberties within the Department of Justice and Department of Education) and constitution/legislation. The codes used most after two rounds of coding were rights of minorities, constitution/legislation, CRCL/CRD/CRL, and women’s rights.

**Rights of Minorities:**

Rights of minorities code was used when there was discussion around rights of minorities in the context of racial, ethnic, linguistic, religious, and sexual minority populations. There were
sub-codes for each of these categories. In addition, there was a sub code “institutional racism” that captured references to institutional discrimination, police violence towards minorities, and racial profiling. Text was coded when there was reference to policy, legislation, or issues around minorities. For example, in the United States state party, this code was used when there was discussion of racial inequality in the context of the criminal justice system, health, education, and housing, or when policy and legislation was cited around these issues. In the context of Turkey, this code was used when there was discussion around issues or legislation in the context of religious, ethnic, and linguistic minorities in the reports. Finally, in the context of Namibia, this code was used when policy, legislation, or issues were discussed in the context of the race, indigenous populations, and tribal communities.

*Constitution/Legislation:*

The constitution/legislation theme was one of the most frequently used codes, in Turkey and Namibia’s reports. The code was used anytime a specific constitutional article was referenced or used within each state party report when discussing the implementation of a specific article of the ICCPR. It was also used anytime a constitutional quote was used verbatim as a response within the state party reports. In addition, for the country Turkey, this code was also used to capture large quotes of legislation and policy that had no discussion on how the legislation or policy was being used to implement specific articles of the treaty.

*CRCL/CRD/CRL:*

A code was created that was almost exclusively used for the United States. This code was used to capture captured anytime there was a discussion about any the Civil Rights and Civil
Liberties division within the DOJ, Civil Rights Division within the Department of Education, or similar federal agencies tasked with investigating complaints of institutional discrimination. Although this code was almost exclusively used in the United States state party report, there were a few times it was used in other countries reports when they referenced a federal agency tasked with looking into or investigating complaints of discrimination.

Women’s Rights:

Finally, women’s rights came up frequently for all three countries. This code was used whenever issues of women’s rights were discussed in the context of education, politics, employment, marriage, and victimization. Almost uniformly across countries, the code was used when legislation, policy, or issues were discussed in the context of domestic violence, equal pay, rights in marriage, property rights, education, and participation/representation in politics.

Analysis:

This study compares similarities and differences across the United States, Turkey and Namibia in order to explain the potential commonalities with regard to frames and legal cynicism. To inform the comparative analysis, each country’s political, social, and religious histories are used to interpret the responses within each state party report. We describe the three countries dominant political ideologies that have shaped framing of legislation and criminal law, their dominant religious beliefs, and understanding of communities and populations who have historically been oppressed or disadvantaged in an attempt to better understand how state party reports are framed. Finally, we use literature looking at the effectiveness of legislation cited in the state party to better understand the potential effectiveness of legislation that is cited in
addressing the human rights standards set forth by the treaty. To inform what issues and themes are discussed, coding was completed.

The analysis uses the frequency and density tables to have a better understanding of what issues and themes are discussed throughout each individual state party report. Appendix 2 provides a frequency table which shows the frequency in which codes are used across the three different countries. To give a more thorough understanding of how much content was captured by codes, density graphs are used to look at the percent coverage of each code for the overall report, and the count of words within each code to inform what themes are discussed in the analysis for each country.

Analysis and interpretation of the reports for each country is driven by literature around the most common themes identified in each report. This literature is used to interpret the framing and context for most dense and frequently coded themes. The interpretation will construct a critical collective frame for each country to inform why each country is legally cynical to the universal human rights standards set forth by the ICCPR.

*United States:*

The history of the United States reflects a society with great racial tension and segregation. There have been many strides in the past 100 years through legislation that’s pushes for more equality. Despite these strides, during the Reagan and Clinton presidency criminal justice policy around drugs and street crime further exacerbated institutional oppression of racial minorities. These racially disparate policies have been framed as the answer to crime and drugs by the elite and those in power, but have been scrutinized for their implications (Hagan, 2012).
Much literature describes these criminal justice policies as an extension of Jim Crow laws and document racially disparate outcomes as portrayed in arrest and incarceration statistics (Alexander, 2010). As such, the United States state party report is highly reflective of this history and current racially disparate policies. Despite documented trends and policy initiatives to address institutionalized racism there is very little research that supports claims that these policy initiatives have been successful. Many of the responses in the state party report acknowledge steps that need to be made in regards to race in the United States.

The content within the United States state party report largely documents the history of racial inequality in society. The report is done in such a way by giving vague statements about how the U.S. still needs to better address issues of discrimination in society. In addition, throughout the report dated legislation and reactive agency policy is described to indicate how the U.S. are implementing human rights standards around equality. As the analysis will show, the critical collective frame which informs policy is consistent with John Hagan in his book, *Who are the Criminals?*. Our analysis of the U.S. 2011 state party report shows how this critical collective frame is constructed and illustrates how the United States is legally cynical to the human rights standards set forth by the treaty.

Within their report, the United States offers a brief introduction with remarks by President Obama on the treaty and a discussion on how the report is structured. Following the brief introduction, the report is broken down into sections based on the first 27 articles of the treaty which lays out specific human rights which each country should afford their constituents. Within these sections, the United States discuss a broad array of human rights such as the rights
of indigenous populations, the rights of minorities in the context of education, race and the
criminal justice system, race and housing, race and employment, protections for the LGBTQ
community, rights of immigrants, women's rights, freedom of thought, expression, assembly, and
association, rights of prisoners, and political rights. Most of the sections are framed where a
specific population is of focus. The populations of focus most frequently in the United States
report are low income black and Latino communities who are structurally disadvantaged in
various facets of society such as the in the criminal justice system, education, housing and
healthcare.

The analysis of this paper focuses on the most used codes in the report for the United
States state party report. The report was coded 650 times within the report, where four codes
made up made up 42% of the coding (n=274). For the purpose of interpretation institutional
racism and rights of minorities were combined (n=161) because of their overlap in themes within
the report. Codes in regard to racial minorities (mostly in reference to African American and
Latin American populations) make up 78.7% of the coding for racial minorities (n=147).
Reference to investigative agencies, such as CRCL and CRD within the DOJ and ED, to address
disparities in various facets of society was used 62 times throughout the report. Finally, the third
most used code was women’s rights (n=51). See appendix B for complete frequency table.

In addition to looking at frequency, analysis was run using NVIVO to look at coding
density. Two graphs were created, the first graph looks at the number of words coded for the top
20 used codes, and another graph looks at the percent coverage of each codes. As such, the three
codes most densely used for the United States report were rights of minorities,
CRCL/CRD/CRCL, and women’s rights. The density analysis gives a more accurate representation of what content is captured within each report. See table 1 and appendix C and D for graphs.

**Table 1:**

![United States: Percent Coverage by Code](image)

As apparent in the themes coded, the United States ICCPR reports largely reflect a history of a racially disparate criminal justice system propelled by an era of racially charged policy around the war on drugs and street crime. The United States, through their responses in the 2011 periodic report produces a discourse that largely understands these issues and acknowledges racism as a fabric of the modern criminal and social policy. This can be characterized through a quote from the report, “Despite the many protections available under law, there is continuing concern about unwarranted racial disparities in some aspects of the justice system”. While recognizing these issues, the United States does little to describe how they are addressing these issues. The US report begins each section regarding each individual human
rights standard by quoting their constitution. Because there is very little discussion on how each
constitutional article is being implemented in the context of human rights, much leaves to be
desired in reporting how each human rights standard is being implemented.

The United States focuses on institutional racism and rights of minorities in the context of
education, employment, criminal justice system, housing, hate crimes, and health care
throughout their report. When discussing racial disparity in the criminal justice system the report
often references the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or the constitution to describe equality before the
law. Following most descriptions of institutional racism and rights of minorities, the reports
often state that despite efforts, there are still many shortcomings as portrayed in this quote:

“Despite the legal protections in force and the work to ensure equal access to health
care, some civil society representatives have raised concerns regarding racial and ethnic
disparities in access to health services, including reproductive health services for women,
and in some health indices in the population.”

However, when the report refers to policy to discuss the implementation of the human rights
standards, it fails to acknowledge that in some circumstances, legislation has been empirically
proven to have no impact on the issue at hand. One such response within the report states, “the
Fair Sentencing Act, which President Obama signed on August 3, 2010, reduces sentencing
disparities between powder cocaine and crack cocaine offenses, capping a long effort to address
the fact that those convicted of crack cocaine offenses are more likely to be members of racial
minorities”. Despite their claim, research shows its inability to have an impact on racial disparity
in the criminal justice system (Hyser, 2012).
Furthermore, for every single article within the report that addresses equality, the United States cites investigative agencies within the Department of Education such as the Office of Civil Rights and agencies such as the Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, and Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Institute within the department of homeland security in which they describe specific cases that were successful in holding individuals or agencies accountable for discriminatory practices. These governmental organizations were referenced to have the capacity to investigate suspected racism or structural inequality from complaints in the context of education, the criminal justice system, the military, housing, and employment.

Despite describing individual case studies and their successful investigations and sanctions, the report does little to describe how these institutions are going to address the broader institutionalized discriminatory practices besides taking one case at a time in the context of equal housing opportunities, racial profiling, racial disparity in the criminal justice system, police brutality, and equal access to healthcare. Rather, they reference the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the United States constitution in order to show how they are implementing human rights standards such as equality before the law (non-discrimination and minority rights), procedural fairness, and individual liberty.

In addition, article 2 within the ICCPR treaty describes that, where legislation lacks in addressing the rights of all people, it is necessary for the state to take “necessary steps, in accordance with its constitutional processes and with the provision of the present Covenant, to adopt laws or other measures as may be necessary to give effect to rights recognized in the present Covenant”. Despite this clause, the United States seems to ignore this article. This is characterized by the fact that most sections end in statements like, “Despite the many protections
available under law, there is continuing concern about unwarranted racial disparities in some aspects of the justice system. Concerns relate to issues such as racial profiling, as well as disproportionate rates of incarceration in communities of color”. In contradiction to article 2, the United States recognizes their shortcomings, but do little to address these issues.

In sum, the United States responses reflect their history of race relations and its connections to racially disparate policy. When citing legislation that focuses on specific issues, such as racial disparity in the criminal justice system, they do a poor job at citing legislation that has been empirically supported to address the issues at hand. Finally, the report heavily relies on referring to internal governmental institutions and their capacities to investigate these many issues informed by race issues in America. In regards to most articles within the treaty, the United States, states that institutional discriminatory practices can be investigated through the CRD and CRCL within the DOJ, ED, and DHS. Rather, these agencies are cited as having the capacity to investigate discriminatory practices, train professionals to avoid or recognize discriminatory practices, and having the ability to take referrals. These agencies are reactive in nature and do nothing to prevent discriminatory practices, in turn do little to implement specific articles of the treaty around equality.

Ultimately, most sections end with ubiquitous statements like, “Despite the numerous laws and policies designed to ensure equal access to housing, racial disparities in housing and lending are of continuing concern”, which does little to reassure that much is being done to better improve the implementation of the human rights standards as presented in the treaty. As such, the implementation of the treaty is consistent with literature around the symbolic nature of international human rights law. Therefore, the implementation of the treaty can be characterized
as legally cynical. This legal cynicism is informed by critical collective framing theory. This critical collective framing is the same as described by Hagan in his book “Who are the criminals?” (2012). Within this book, Hagan describes that criminal justice policy is characterized by race and structural inequality in the United States. Therefore, those in power frame legislation and policy based on their own self-interest. The United States critical collective frame eclipses their ability to objectively implement these human rights standards, especially in the context of equality before the law. As a result, we feel it is justified to characterize the United States responses to the implementation of the ICCPR as legally cynical.

Turkey:

Turkey is a country with a strong history of inequality of women, inequality of religious minorities, suspect freedom of expression through the media, and unequal access to education (Falk, 2011). Turkey’s state party report reflects these historical themes. The report does very little to describe how specific legislation and policy is being used to implement various human rights standards, rather they quote large passage of their constitutions and legislation for all articles of the treaty.

This analysis is constructed around the interpretation of the reports based on critical collective framing theory and legal cynicism. As will be described, Turkey’s history of women’s rights and rights of linguistic, ethnic and religious minorities are reflected throughout the report. The report does little to describe how legislation and constitutional articles are being used to actually implement human rights standard in the treaty. In addition, where policy is cited in the Turkey’s report, we are aware of the existence of literature which describes Turkey’s inability to
make change because of dominant social and cultural frames. As such, the analysis shows how dominant social and cultural frames inform a critical collective frame, which ultimately describes Turkey’s legally cynical responses with their state party report.

The beginning of the report, within the introduction, describes where the information is collected. It states that most of the information, statistics, and figures were prepared by their Ministry of Foreign affairs. The report starts off with Article 1, Equality before the Law, but cites no legislation. The Turkish report is structured to have a section for most articles, but some of the articles are the treaty are coupled and addressed in one section. There are common themes that develop within the report, one of which is the focus of women in society in regards to equality before the law, domestic violence, education, property rights, and representations in politics. Another common theme that develops through coding, is the discussion of religious minorities in society. The report spends most of the time quoting constitutional rights, along with quoting large passages of legislation, but does very little to explain how the constitution and legislation is being used to implement the human rights standards set forth by the treaty. Using qualitative coding, the most common human rights were women’s rights and rights of minorities. Women’s rights and rights of religious minorities are discussed in the context of education, representation in politics, rights of property ownership, and equal opportunity in employment.

Turkey’s report was coded 602 times, where three of the codes were used 44% of the time (n=263). The most used code in Turkey’s report was Constitution/Legislation (n=106). This code is operationalized as any references to the constitution for the implementation of a human rights standard or large passages of legislation with no explanation on how it is being used to
implement a specific human rights standard. The second most used code is women’s rights (n=87). This code was used whenever women’s rights were referenced. In the case of Turkey, this code was used in the context of women’s rights in education, employment, marriage, property, and politics. The third most used code in the report was rights of minorities (n=70). This was used when the report referenced the rights of religious, ethnic, and linguistic minority rights in Turkey. See appendix B for full frequency table.

In addition to looking at frequency of reports, coding density graphs were created to look at the most used codes based on percent coverage and number of words coded (See Graphs: Table 2 and Appendix C and D). This analysis showed the codes which contain the most content are constitution/legislation, women’s rights, and rights of minorities. As such, the analysis and interpretation of Turkey’s report mostly revolve around issues related to the use of these codes. In addition to coding, we also use topics discussed in literature around human rights and Turkey to inform the interpretation of the reports.

Table 2:
The report reflects a history of turmoil for women in Turkish society, which is amply documented in literature around these issues. Turkey cites a number of legislation changes they have made to increase rights for women. Despite the continued development of legislation regarding women, much research shows that laws that have passed, have little to no effect on the society and culture around women’s rights (Ecevit, 2007). As a result, cultural, social, and religious practices continue to inhibit positive change. In addition, much research describes these policy changes and initiatives as political facades. These facades around the promise to increase women’s rights are interpreted by many as an attempt to look favorably for Turkey’s bid to enter the European Union (Ecevit, 2007).

One of the policies referenced within the state party report is Turkey’s ratification of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). Despite their ratification of this treaty, research states that there is much work that needs to be done for the full spectrum of women’s rights, from education, employment, representation in politics, and violence against women (Levin, 2007).

In addition, the report cites a plethora of new civil and penal codes that address women’s rights. Despite the detailed documentation of policies passed as a result of women’s movements in Turkey (Ecevit, 2007), literature continues to express concern for the lack of implementation of the laws socially and culturally around women (Levin, 2007). Despite an exorbitant amount of change on paper, there is still a large concern for women’s rights and family violence in Turkey as described in reports by Human Rights Watch. These reports describe that 42% of all women over the age of 15 have been victim to physical or sexual violence (Gulik, 2011). In addition,
Human Rights Watch reports describe the growing concern around the rollback of human rights in Turkey under the Leadership of Tayyip Erdogan (Sinclair-Webb, 2014).

Rights of religious, ethnic, and linguistic minorities is another issue discussed throughout the report. Turkey has had a history wrought with problematic relationships with religious, ethnic, and linguistic minorities since Turkey became a democracy (O’Niel, 2007). The report mostly talks about rights of these minorities in the context of education. The report describes that education for linguistic and religious minorities has historically been a problem. Access to education in language other than native Turkish tongue or education without a religious bias is described to be an issue. They claim that the increase in private schools which teach in non-native Turkish language is helping this issue. Despite their claim that education is being more inclusive, Turkey still fails to provide adequate and equal access of education to racial, ethnic, and religious minorities, but also women (Gok and Ilgaz, 2007). In addition to education, radio and media presented in non-native languages has been an issue. Within the report, Turkey claims that steps have been made to increase access of media outlets in other languages. Despite these claims, critics still expresses concern around un-censored media (Amnesty International).

Another human rights issue discussed is freedom of speech, more specifically in the context of the media. Turkey has a long history of censorship of the media despite their claims of free speech in accordance of law since the country’s inception (Çatalbaş, 2007). Despite continued critical writing and media coverage surrounding free speech in Turkey, Turkey mention free speech in the media only eight times within the state party report. Their responses discuss new legislation such as the new Press Law of 2004, and new penal codes in 2005 that
“includes a more liberal approach to the freedom of expression”. Although these laws have been passed, concerns around incarceration for speaking unfavorably about the government in the media is still an issue. As described in Human Rights Watch reports, President Erdogan has used state of emergency decree in 2016, in order to suppress and shut down 23 TV and radio stations affiliated with opposition parties and the Kurds. In addition, there has been a growing trend to use terrorism laws to prosecute journalists (“Silencing Turkey’s Media”, 2016). Furthermore, the government has been pressuring media outlets, use fines, threaten with use of force, and interference with editorial independence as tactics to silence and suppress free speech in the media (“Silencing Turkey’s Media”, 2016).

Turkey’s lackluster discussion of free speech in the media leaves much to be desired, especially when research around human rights in Turkey readily looks at free speech. Although they claim that there is a loosening of restrictions on free press, Turkey still has not made speech completely free as characterized by quotes from their state party report such as “The new Press Law (2004) diminishes substantially the penalties for offences committed through press. Within the new system, penalties such as imprisonment”.

Turkey offers many different penal codes and policies passed in recent years. But, these policies presented have been empirically cited as having little to no effect on the broad issues, specifically around the rights of women. One of the most common codes in the analysis of Turkey’s report is their quotation of their constitution and legislation. Many of these quotations have no context or explanation of how they are being used to implement the human rights standards they are referencing. In addition, certain human rights issues of concern such as freedom of speech is barely touched upon with their state party report despite focus on the issue
in the international media, academic research, and reports by NGO’s such as Human Rights Watch.

In sum, Turkey’s report at face value looks very substantive. That being said, a large proportion of the responses come in the form of lengthy legal and constitutional quotes which offer little on how they are being implemented in the context of the ICCPR articles. When legislation is cited and explained in the context of expanding women’s rights, much research shows the miniscule effect these policies have on women’s rights. Finally, the report also contains many responses describing their participation or membership in various international groups that pursue rights for specific populations, but do little to explain how participation and membership expand the rights for the populations. Turkey’s social, political, and religious history portray a society where women and religious minorities were not equal despite decades of social movements and attempts at reform. Critical collective framing theory builds on this history around poor women’s rights, rights of religious, ethnic minorities, and linguistic minorities, in addition to freedom of speech and expression to suggest that the elite and those in power (i.e. the producers of the state report) frame their responses around these dominant political, social, and religious frames. As such, Turkey’s state report reflects, in our view, a legally cynical implementation of the treaty.

Namibia:

Unlike the other two countries, Namibia starts its report with concluding remarks in regards to their last state party report, in which they reply to comments made by the UN committee who reviewed their report. The report is much shorter than the other reports and is
only 41 pages, including title page, table of contents, references and a 16 page concluding remark. This report mainly focuses on equality of women, rights of indigenous populations, and institutional racism. Much of their discussion within their reports are not detailed, and lack an explanation on how certain legislation or constitutional rights are being applied in the context of the implementation of the treaty.

Within Namibia’s report, codes were used 247 times. The low number of codes can be attributed to the shorter report. As such, the usage of codes are far more dispersed. The top three codes used in the report are constitution (n=52), women’s rights (n=32), and right to fair or speedy trial (n=26). For interpretation purposes and to make reports more comparable, the fourth most used code will be used over right to fair or speedy trial, which falls under the larger umbrella of the rights of minorities (n=19). The constitution code was used in Namibia’s report whenever the constitution was referenced or quoted. Women’s rights was coded when discussing a plethora of women’s rights, such as rights in marriage, political participation, right to property, and rights to education. These three codes make up 41.7% of coding analysis (n=103). See appendix B for full frequency table.

In addition to looking at frequency of codes, graphs were created to look at the density of codes in the context of percent coverage and word count for each code. For Namibia, there is variation between what codes make up the most used based on percent coverage and word count. The use of the constitution and women’s right codes are consistently top three most used codes, and for comparison purposes, rights of minorities will be discussed (See Table 3 and appendix C
and D for full results). As such, the analysis will focus mostly on the use of the codes constitution, women’s rights, and rights of minorities.

Table 3:

![Bar chart showing Namibia's percent coverage by codes](chart.png)

Their report largely reflects their short history as a democracy and a country whose past government institutionalized apartheid. Within Article 2, which is where Namibia is supposed to describe how they are implementing the covenant, Namibia only cites their constitution. Every single human rights standard set forth by the treaty is supported by the Namibian constitution. With a country that has battled colonization by the west and Apartheid rule by a minority white government, they have a total of four responses on how they are implementing equality before the law and rights of minorities, all of which lack any substantive policy on how they are implementing equal rights despite, race, sex, ethnicity, and religion. As characterized by this quote:
“Article 10 of the Namibian Constitution provides for equality before the law and freedom from discrimination on the grounds of sex, race, colour, ethnic origin, religion, creed or social or economic status. This is the closest that the Namibian Constitution gets to the recognition of group or minority rights; the persons protected by the provisions are all said to belong to a certain group, whether a natural or one formed by choice.”

As portrayed in the above quote, Namibia does little to support the claim they are even implementing Article 26, equality and equal protection before the law.

Namibia spends most of the state party report citing their constitution, but does little to cite policy that is being used to better implement the human rights standards set forth by the treaty. Their report lacks detail and clarity on how the treaty is being implemented beyond the scope that they have a constitution that affords most of these rights. Throughout the report they recognized their racially segregated history, but do little to propose or explain legislation that will fix their human rights issues. In addition to the report, there is very little academic research explicitly about Namibia’s government, society, legislation, and race relations. The only research that looks at these things, is outdated and published in 1977, “Namibia: The Effects of Apartheid on Culture and education”, which is before the country became its own autonomous state. The outdated research describes the widespread and institutionalized oppression of ethnic minorities, indigenous populations, and even the majority black populations (O’Callaghan, 1977). In addition, resources like Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International have no reports that discuss their current human rights situation. Therefore, there is very little research that can be used to interpret the report beyond what is presented.
In our view, Namibia’s report is legally cynical to the human rights standards set forth by the treaty. Namibia’s legal cynicism isn’t as clear as the other two countries in that the critical collective frame used to inform the legal cynicism is a little more fragmented. It could be that those in power feel that the constitution is in fact implementing the human rights standards relative to where they were in the past. Or, the report is completed in order simply to fulfill the expectations of members of the international community. This could possibly be explained by the African continent’s reliance on resources from international partners. Furthermore, it could quite possibly reflect that Namibia also has a history of racial tension and inequality institutionalized through Apartheid, and that is still a frame through which they interpret their society. Unfortunately, there is very little research, academic and non-academic, to make a clear empirical argument. Despite this, analysis of the report combined with historical insights suggests that the dominant Namibian frames in the context of race informs its’ legally cynical responses around the implementation of most articles within the treaty, but more specifically around equal rights.

Comparison across Countries:

Across all countries, one finding is that the same themes: rights of minorities, constitution, and rights of women are present. This can be seen in the frequency table and coverage graphs in Table 4 and Appendices C and D. Despite similar codes being used, the framing of issues in the reports vary drastically by country. These variations are reflective of their differences in political, social, and religious histories and cultures. As such, the variation in topics discussed, differences in the length and structure of reports, differences in how policy and
legislation is used to argue the implementation of each human right standard raise the question of whether a universal implementation of the ICCPR is possible. Despite similarities in their themes, the content and context within these themes vary greatly between each country.

**Table 4:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes Used</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>Namibia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Minorities</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOJ/CRCL/CRD/CRL</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Rights</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Codes</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rights of Minorities:*

Although all three countries most frequently discussed rights of minorities in their reports, there are difference in the context of rights. In the case of the United States, rights of minorities is coded in the context of black and Latino populations. In addition, the code is used when discussing issues of inequality, disparities in the criminal justice system, racial profiling, and police brutality.

In the case of Turkey, rights of minorities are discussed in the context of religious, ethnic, and linguistic. The code mostly encompasses responses around unequal access to education, entertainment and education in non-dominant languages, and intolerance towards religious minorities.
Finally, in the case of Namibia, rights of minorities are discussed in the context of indigenous, tribal, and ethnic minorities. In addition, despite being the majority, black populations are the minority in position of power, leaving them to institutional discrimination consequential to past Apartheid politics.

*Women’s Rights:*

Women’s rights are discussed across the countries as well. In the context of the United States, this code was used to capture issues and legislation around domestic violence, equal pay, and representation in politics. Whereas, in the context of Turkey, women’s rights were discussed in the context of marriage, equality of education, representation in politics, political participation, domestic violence, and right to property. Finally, Namibia discussed women’s rights in the context of marriage, age of consent, and property rights. In their report, Namibia recognizes their issues around women’s rights and how far behind they fall in contrast to most countries.

*Constitution/Legislation:*

The constitution/legislation code was used across all three countries, but most frequently within Turkey’s and Namibia’s reports. In the case of the United States, the reference to their constitution was used more sparingly, mostly just to cite the fact that there is a constitutional article that embodies a specific human rights article within the ICCPR. In the case of Tukey, the use of the constitution code is used with less scrutiny. The code covers large quotations of their constitutional articles within the report with no context or discussion on how the constitutional article is being used to implement various human rights articles. In addition, this code covers large quotations of legislation. Similarly to their constitutional quotes, these quotes make up
large segments of their responses and offer no explanation on how they are being used in the context of the ICCPR articles. Finally, Namibia references their constitution within each section of their state party report, and uses it as a substantial proportion of their responses. In some cases, it is used as the only response in how they are implementing specific articles of the Treaty.

In sum, despite similarity in the themes discussed in each report, contexts of the themes vary greatly by the countries own unique political, social, and religious histories. These differences can be seen in the discussion of various human rights in the context of equality before the law in the context of women’s rights and the rights of minorities. As such, each country has varying critical collective frames, as informed by their dominant frames, to better inform the responses within each state party report. For example, the United States history of race relations and racial disparate policies inform the critical collective frame which informs responses around the rights of minorities in the treaty. Turkey’s history around women’s rights and rights of religious, ethnic, and linguistic minorities explain the framing of responses in their report, which in turn inform their critical collective frame. Finally, Namibia’s young government and extensive Apartheid history inform their critical collective frame in regards to policy around equality within their society within the report. As such, the framing of responses inform the social construction in which each country interprets the human rights standard set forth by the treaty. In sum, all of their unique critical collective frames inform each country’s, symbolic, or legally cynical implementation of the human rights standards within the ICCPR.
Discussion:

Globalization is characterized by the growing interconnectedness between states and societies around the world. This growing interconnection forges transnational flows, networks, and fundamental movements that transform the meaning of nation-states (Aas, 2013: 227). It is important to understand the policy implications and impact of these processes. Global interconnectedness has produced universal standards in the form of international laws. One area of international law of crucial importance pertain to laws surrounding human rights. Establishing universal human rights values, which protect the security of vulnerable populations, have been met with great discord and a lot of discussion. Debates between international actors involving human rights standards include the charge that the standards propagate western ethnocentric values (See: Boyle & Corl, 2010; Nelken, 2009; Pierotti, 2013). In addition, some argue that the farther legal norms fall from the core values of local context, the more likely the values and laws will be contested (Halliday and Osinsky, 2006: 466), which challenges the universal applicability of human rights standards. With variation in legal norms across nations, it is imperative to understand this debate and respond to the call for a fuller understanding of cultural contexts. As such, the analysis of the most recent state party reports for the United States, Turkey, and Namibia attempt to gain a fuller understanding around the implementation of a universal, western derived, human rights standards.

The state party reports by the United States, Turkey, Namibia are highly reflective of these countries social, religious, and cultural histories. The United States history of race and how this translated into policy during the Reagan presidency (Hagan, 2012), is largely reflected in the
framing of their responses in the state party report. Similarly, Turkey and Namibia construct their state party reports through a lens that is informed by their histories as well. Turkey focuses on the rights of women and religious minorities, which historically, have fallen by the wayside. Namibia largely recognizes their shortcomings with race relations and institutional racism, which is highly reflective of their history of Apartheid regimes. As such, each country’s responses, legislation, policy, and constitutions are molded by their social, political, religious histories. Although each country is legally cynical, the critical collective frames which inform these outcomes vary across each country.

With some variation in the themes discussed, but clear difference in the context of their respective human rights, should there be guidelines or variations in expectations for different countries? Comparing and contrasting these reports raises many concerns about the universal expectations implied by the treaty. Although, based on frequency of coding, it seems as though issues are similarly discussed, the context of the issues are very different. When looking past the frequency in which codes for each country is used, the differences in the reports become more apparent.

The observed differences in how specific human rights are discussed can be attributed to the varying frames by which each country interprets their society, which raises concerns about the universal applicability of the ICCPR. What might be defined as a human right by the treaty, may not be interpreted as important by all countries who have ratified the treaty. These concerns of universality extend to other international human rights institutions and instruments. Chances are, themes found within the ICCPR state party reports, are also present in the implementation of
other international human rights instruments and institutions. As such, these critical collective frames, largely inform the framing of each countries responses, ultimately results in lackluster implementations of these standards. Consistent with other research, it is necessary to be cognizant of the variations of cultures when applying western ethnocentric standards in non-western contexts.

**Conclusion:**

This study is an exploratory study which aims to expand upon the concept of legal cynicism in order to explain what has often been expressed through rhetoric that laws and treaties are “symbolic” in their application (See: Von Bernstoff, 2008; Hathaway 2002). Therefore, it is not intended to create generalizations about symbolic applications of international human rights instruments, institutions, and law, but legal cynicism is used to better understand these three countries report on their implementation of the ICCPR.

In addition, a limitation to this study is the focus on one set of state reports, and not including past state party reports for each country. Two of the three countries in this study have completed multiple state party reports between their ratification of the treaty and the current time. For example, the United States has completed three reports at three different time periods, whereas Namibia has completed two different reports at two different time periods.

This study brings to light the complexities and difficulties in cross-national research. Furthermore, political leaders periodically change, which makes it difficult to get a full understanding of how human rights issues are being addressed. The 2011 periodic report for the U.S. was completed during the Obama administration, but one can assume that a state party
report completed by the current Trump administration would focus on different issues.

Furthermore, ease and access to information varies by country. Using Namibia as a case study has shed light on disparities in available documentation, research and writing across countries in regards to human rights, politics, and culture.

Most theory has been developed and tested in the United States (Clinard & Abott, 1973:3), this study addresses this issue by expanding criminological theory to a more global level. Since this study uses individual countries as unit of observations, the study expands upon our understanding of legal cynicism beyond the community context within the United States, and uses this theoretical framework to better understand varying contexts in relation to the implementation of international laws to better describe symbolic applications of international human rights laws and institutions.

Utilizing government reports for this analysis relates to earlier work on the “social production of crime rates” (Black, 1970). It is argued that reports are an outcome of organizational processes and should be understood as such. The analysis of the ICCPR state party reports expands upon this idea to show that this phenomenon is in fact present in other governmental reports outside the scope of crime rates and police data. This study shows that these state party reports are in fact productions of social and cultural frames.

Finally, this study expands the scope of criminology. Although research in other domains like political science, law, and public policy have written extensively about human rights, human rights institutions, and their application (See: Alter 2011; Oberlietner, 2007; Sikkink & Kim, 2013), there is very little literature that uses criminological or sociological theory to explain or
understand human rights institutions. Rather, the literature comes from a legalistic approach that does not take into account cultural, historic, or social contexts. There is a need for criminological work focusing on the implementation of international human rights laws. Therefore, this study draws from criminological theorizing related to critical collective framing theory and legal cynicism to argue that the state party reports are largely symbolic in nature.

Legal cynicism and many other criminological theories have mostly been tested in the United States. This study shows the utility that western criminological theory can have as a framework to interpret phenomena that have been highlighted in other disciplines, such as the symbolic nature of international law around human rights. Criminologists need to be more open minded in the application and utility of criminological theory in non-traditional domains. With the evolution of criminological theories e.g. legal cynicism and its refinement by Kirks and Papachristos (2011), criminologist are able to apply criminological theory to understand complex phenomena cross-culturally rather than just across community contexts within a single country.

Critical collective framing theory and legal cynicism provide a framework to interpret these reports. It allows us to take into consideration the unique frames each country uses when producing these reports, reflecting their interpretation of the importance of specific human rights standards. The United States, Turkey, and Namibia are different countries with unique political, social, and religious histories that have molded their current national context. Therefore, we need more debate and research on how these instruments should change to better incorporate varying cultural contexts in their implementation. Finally, I argue that a equal universal interpretation of universal human rights is not possible (yet). Much more research within criminology needs to be
completed in regards to human rights and human rights institutions. Specifically, more research needs to be done on international criminal justice institutions such as the International Criminal Court and the International Court of Justice which carry out the implementation of international human rights standards. Unlike treaty instruments, these institutions have sovereignty to carry out punitive and judicial measures to countries who do not meet specific human rights standards. Research needs to investigate these institutions to better understand jurisprudence of these legal bodies, their decision making processes, and their distribution of judicial power in the context of human rights.
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Appendices

Appendix A:

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (Articles 1-27):

Article 1- Self Determination
Article 2- Equal Protection of Rights in the Covenant
Article 3- Equal Rights of Men and Women
Article 4- States of Emergency
Article 5- Non-Derogable nature of fundamental rights
Article 6- Right to Life
Article 7- Freedom from torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment
Article 8- Prohibition of Slavery
Article 9 – Liberty and security of person
Article 10 – Treatment of persons deprived of their liberty
Article 11 – Freedom from imprisonment for breach of contractual obligation
Article 12 – Freedom of movement
Article 13 – Expulsion of aliens
Article 14 – Right to fair trial
Article 15 – Prohibition of ex post facto laws
Article 16 – Recognition as a person under the law
Article 17 – Freedom from arbitrary interference with privacy, family, home
Article 18 – Freedom of thought, conscience and religion
Article 19 – Freedom of opinion and expression
Article 20 – Prohibition of propaganda relating to war or racial, national or religious hatred
Article 21 – Freedom of assembly
Article 22 – Freedom of association
Article 23 – Protection of the family
Article 24 – Protection of children
Article 25 – Access to the political system
Article 26 – Equality before the law
Article 27 – The rights of minorities to culture, religion, and language
Appendix B:

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>Namibia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boards—Cooperation—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Alien</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death Penalty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOJ—CRD-CRCL—</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Access to Land</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality before the Law</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of Assembly</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of Association</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of Movement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of Press, Expression, and Religion</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marriage Rights</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Rights</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisons or Prisoners</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibition of Slavery</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Children</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life or Right to Life</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to Fair or Speedy Trial</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to Liberty and Security</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right to Privacy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Minorities</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rights of Workers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of emergency</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torture</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Rights</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>655</strong></td>
<td><strong>602</strong></td>
<td><strong>237</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C:

Top Codes By Percent Coverage

Appendix D:

Top Codes by Word Count