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

**Template 3 for AN additional WEB ARTICLE – Long entry (Issue-Keyword)***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:**

**Professional background/Position:**

**Initials** (e.g. K.Ch.):

**Mail @ / Telephone** (for editorial contacts, will not be published!!):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **GUIDE** | **YOUR TEXT** |
| ***Abstract:****Abstracts should not exceed the limit of* ***three to five sentences or 10 to 15 lines or 500-750 letters****!**(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.*  |
| **6 to 10 Catchwords:**Format example: **Roma / Sinti / 'Travellers' / Mobility / Discrimination / 'Roma Decade'** | **Please replace this text with catchwords** for the subject index and for the "Search" function on the related website.  |
| **1. Definition / explanation of keyword-related issue(s),** possibly exemplified by a few cases. **Length: between 15 and 25 lines or 750-1250 letters!**Please note the suggested lines/letters for this and the following section(s) 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**.  |
| **2. Core messages from European / other legal instruments (author's position)** **Length: between 40 and 50 lines or 2000-2500 letters!**Note: This section should address keyword-issues in the light of European and/or international conventions, where relevant. However, it could also take up selected national specificities, e.g. in constitutions and laws, as well as political declarations, empirical evidence, etc. to illustrate problems. | Please replace this text with your contribution  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **3. The essence of court rulings, especially of the ECtHR, or decisions of other competent bodies.** **Length: between 35 and 45 lines or 1750-2250 letters!**Note: If the issue has not yet been directly addressed by the ECtHR, other courts or competent decision making bodies, this section could be shorter. However, it could explore potential links to political decisions made in related fields or refer to such links in documents of parliaments, NGOs and other stakeholders. | Please replace this text with your contribution  |
| **4. Prevailing and important dissenting/minority opinions in the literature.** **Length: between 40 and 50 lines or 2000-2500 letters!**Note: If the issue is not yet covered properly in the literature, this section could be shorter. However, you could also consider references to statements made by stakeholders. | Please replace this text with your contribution  |
| **5. Conclusions, including consequences for issue-related legal and policy issues or debates.** **Length: between 40 and 50 lines or 2000-2500 letters!**Note: Conclusions should suggest mainly the potential significance of the above findings for the concrete issue at stake (or for the wider cultural sphere) and related policies, pointing out tendencies or solutions that could be relevant in future conflicts. | Please replace this text with your contribution  |
| **6. Key references** (including online resources).**Length: Up to 15 references or 35 to 45 lines or 1750-2250 letters!**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 for your text/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 4/2016) | Please replace this text with your contribution  |

Please add **a short CV focusing on your current or recent work** (up to 70 words and, where available, a link to a website with more information) that you would like to see on www.culture-rights.net!