**"Culture and Human Rights: The Wroclaw Commentaries"**

**TEMPLATE 6 FOR AN ADDITIONAL ARTICLE – Legal Instruments***NOTE: This template provides a rough idea of envisaged content; if necessary, you can adapt it to better suit your keyword. Additional templates exist for institutional keywords and smaller or larger articles!*

Please write/insert text into the boxes on the right side! **The overall length of this article should not exceed 2-3 columns**, i.e. 100-150 lines or 5-7500 letters (without spaces!) in the format below (Times New Roman 10 pt.). **If you need more space in one box, try to save a corresponding number of lines in other parts of the article** or contact the Editors.

**References** are to be specified in Section 6 and should then be summarized in the text as: [KUOPILA, 2000] for court cases or (Scovazzi, 2013) for literature. We don't have footnotes! Please use official shortcuts for journals, conventions or institutions, which will later be added to a *List of Abbreviations*. Suggested links to other potential keywords should be indicated like this: >> *Discrimination.*

As regards **content and style of the text**, we would like to refer to the concept of the *Wroclaw Commentaries:*

Most of the keyword entries of the *Wroclaw Commentaries* review the relationship between culture, human rights and policies, state practices or societal attitudes. While the Handbook approaches issues mostly from a legal point of view, interdisciplinary elements are also part of the methodology. Entries will normally focus on the cultural (vis-a-vis e.g. the political, economic or social) dimension of human rights – however, in some cases this dimension may still have to be fully developed. Clearly, the concept of the *Wroclaw Commentaries* relies on authors who are able to present and discuss their topic with an open mind, being both precise as regards references and conclusions as well as intelligible for readers coming from different professional fields.

Please remember that the printed Handbook provides comprehensive introductory articles covering the main subject areas (cf. Outline). Therefore, you can fully concentrate on your keyword issue(s)! Once completed, **save the article**, using the keyword and your name, like in this example: *Roma-Bunjes.doc,* then press the **Send button!**

**Title (Keyword):   
Author:   
Initials** (e.g. K.Ch.):   
**Mail @ / Telephone** (for editorial contacts, will not be published!!):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **GUIDE** | **YOUR TEXT** |
| ***Abstract:***  *(Advice: Write the abstract and insert relevant catchwords below only after the regular article has been written!)* | *This part of the template text to be replaced by your original abstract. Abstracts should not exceed the limit of two to four sentences or* ***4 to 8 lines****!* |
| **Catchwords:**  Format example: **Diversity / UNESCO / Cultural expressions** | **Please replace this text with** **3-5 catchwords** for the subject index and for the "Search" function on the related website. |
| **1. Short presentation of the origin, main purpose, status and administering bodies of the legal instrument:**  Please note the suggested lines for this section of the article! If you need more space, try to save a corresponding number of lines in other parts of the article or contact your Managing Editor. | **Please replace this text with** **your contribution**. Before writing the abstract and the main catchwords, you should **start here with your regular article (up to 12 lines)**. |
| **2. Significance or uptake of the legal instrument, e.g. in laws, court rulings, especially of the ECtHR, as well as important opinions in the literature (in your interpretation):**  Note: This section should address a legal instrument first in the light of European and/or international conventions and court cases, where relevant also in different national contexts, e.g. in constitutions, laws or jurisdiction. In addition, it could also take up recent opinions in the literature as well as political declarations or statements made by stakeholders, etc. to illustrate achievements or problems. | Please replace this text with your contribution **(up to 24 lines)** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **3. Significance of the legal instrument in rulings of the ECtHR and other courts or decisions of other competent bodies:**  Note: If the instrument is not or only rarely addressed by (or relevant for) the ECtHR, other courts or competent decision making bodies, this section could be shorter. However, it could explore potential links to decisions made in related fields or refer to such links made in documents of parliaments or governments. | Please replace this text with your contribution **(up to 24 lines)** |
| **4. Prevailing and important dissenting/minority opinions in the literature:**  Note:Depending on the coverage of the legal instrument in the literature, especially in culture-related contexts, this section could be longer or shorter. In addition, you could also consider references to statements of stakeholders or policy makers. | Please replace this text with your contribution **(up to 24 lines)** |
| **5. Conclusions, including consequences for issue-related legal and policy issues or debates:**  Note: Conclusions should suggest mainly the potential significance of the above findings for specific issues and related policies in the wider cultural sphere (incl. media, heritage, minorities, etc.), highlighting tendencies or solutions that could be relevant in future conflicts. | Please replace this text with your contribution **(up to 24 lines)** |
| **6. Key references (including online resources):**  Note: The WRO Commentaries use these formats:  ***Books***: Freestone, David (ed.): *The 1982 Law of the Sea Convention at 30 : successes, challenges and new agendas*, Leiden: Nijhoff (2013)  ***Articles***: Scovazzi, Tullio: "The Law of the Sea Convention and Underwater Cultural Heritage", in David Freestone (ed.): *The 1982 Law of the Sea Convention at 30 : successes, challenges and new agendas*, Leiden: Nijhoff (2013)  ***Cases (only if relevant in section 3 or for conclusions, e.g. indicating new tendencies or conflicts!):***  KUOPILA v. FINLAND (ECtHR 27/04/2000, [27752/95](http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/sites/eng/Pages/search.aspx)) ***Websites***: [www.culturalpolicies.net](http://www.culturalpolicies.net) (accessed 4/2014) | Please replace this text with your contribution **(up to 10 references or 24 lines**) |

Please add **a very short CV focusing on your current or recent work** (up to 60 words and, where available, a link to a website with more information) that you would like to see on www.culture-rights.net!