

# TREATY BODY MONITOR

International Service for Human Rights



Human Rights Monitor Series

## COMMITTEE ON THE ELIMINATION OF ALL FORMS OF RACIAL DISCRIMINATION 72<sup>ND</sup> SESSION UNITED STATES, 4<sup>TH</sup>, 5<sup>TH</sup>, AND 6<sup>TH</sup> COMBINED PERIODIC REPORT 21-22 FEBRUARY 2008

Information submitted to the Committee .....	1
Themes and issues .....	2
Status of the Convention in domestic law .....	4
‘Race-neutral’ legislation .....	4
Criminal justice system .....	5
Immigration .....	6
Education .....	6
Employment .....	7
Indigenous peoples .....	7
Other issues .....	7
Conclusions and next steps .....	8

### Information submitted to the Committee

On 1 May 2007, the United States (US) submitted its combined 4<sup>th</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup>, and 6<sup>th</sup> periodic reports to the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (the Committee) regarding its implementation of the *International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination* (the Convention).<sup>1</sup> The Convention entered into force in the US on 21 October 1994 with several reservations.<sup>2</sup> The lengthy State report focused primarily on national jurisprudence shaping federal law on discrimination, non-discrimination in education, employment and housing, and the criminal justice system. Specifically, the delegation noted recent reforms in its awareness-raising campaigns, improvement in the enforcement of federal civil rights laws through the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), and the prosecutorial work of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice.

<sup>1</sup> CERD/C/USA/6, 1 May 2007. Available at [www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/cerds72.htm](http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/cerds72.htm).

<sup>2</sup> Available at [www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/ratification/2.htm](http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/ratification/2.htm).

Prior to the review of the US, the Committee provided the list of issues to the State party.<sup>3</sup> The Committee was mainly concerned with racial profiling, *de facto* segregation in public schools, and disproportionate representation of blacks in the criminal justice system. The Committee also asked specific questions about the possible discriminatory use of the death penalty and immigration policy, particularly for those coming from predominantly Muslim countries. The delegation replied orally to these questions during the session.

US Human Rights Network, a non-governmental organisation (NGO), sent a summary of reactions to the State report from a coalition of 18 US-based NGOs to the Committee.<sup>4</sup> The summary was critical of the US and its policies on racial discrimination. The principal critiques included discriminatory laws passed in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks in the name of security, structural racism in State institutions, the demise of special measures such as affirmative action, the State's failure to regulate private acts of discrimination, high procedural burdens placed on complainants to demonstrate discrimination, and the persistent inadequacy of social services, including healthcare, education, and employment, for minorities. Major recommendations made by the NGOs to the Government include:

- Support for affirmative action measures;
- Assure accessibility of social services to cultural and linguistic minorities;
- Abolishment of the 'plenary powers doctrine' that allows the State to unilaterally seize indigenous lands;
- Implementation of screening mechanisms to prevent racial discrimination in detention and incarceration of children;
- Increased funding for law enforcement training on sexual violence;
- Enactment of laws to address *de facto* inequalities in education;
- Adoption of a constitutional amendment to guarantee the fundamental right to education.

## Themes and issues

The US presented its report to the Committee at Palais des Nations, whereas all the other States were reviewed at Palais Wilson. The meeting was moved to accommodate the large US delegation.

The US delegation was headed by Mr Warren Tichenor, Permanent Representative to the United Nations and Other International Organisations in Geneva. A number of other delegates participated in the dialogue with the Committee, namely Ms Grace Cheong Becker, Acting Assistant Attorney General of the Department of Justice (DOJ) Civil Rights Division, Ms Leslie Silverman, Vice Chair of EEOC, and Mr Karl Artman from the Department of Indian Affairs.

The delegation's lengthy opening statement attempted not only to highlight the State's progress since its last report to the Committee, but also to clarify the increasingly complex way in which the US deals with race. The US has neither amended its position on the Convention nor passed any additional protective federal legislation since its last communication with the Committee. Nevertheless, the delegation claimed that its improved enforcement of existing domestic legislation has been successful in combating racial discrimination. For instance, Ms Becker pointed to several reforms which enforce the prohibition of racial profiling. She noted the recent release of racial profiling guidelines,<sup>5</sup> provisions that authorise the Attorney General to prosecute alleged perpetrators, training for law enforcement personnel, and restrictions on funding for

---

<sup>3</sup> Available at [www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/cerds72.htm](http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/cerds72.htm).

<sup>4</sup> Available at [www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/cerds72.htm](http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/cerds72.htm).

<sup>5</sup> The Department of Homeland Security adopted these guidelines as agency policy. For more information on these guidelines, please see [www.usdoj.gov/opa/pr/2003/June/racial\\_profiling\\_fact\\_sheet.pdf](http://www.usdoj.gov/opa/pr/2003/June/racial_profiling_fact_sheet.pdf).

agencies that profile. At the state level, state governments have passed legislation requiring local police departments to collect demographic data on people arrested, prosecuted, and convicted.

The delegation also stated that since the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks, prosecuting hate crimes remains a top priority, and several federal agencies have established outreach programmes to sensitise communities to Islam. Ms Silverman admitted that over the past six years, the number of complaints regarding ‘Muslim backlash’ has doubled. Ms Becker intervened to state that though hate crimes are generally prosecuted at the state level, the DOJ has investigated over 800 allegations of discrimination against South Asians since September 2001. The State stressed, however, that despite this alarming rise, the EEOC has awarded monetary relief to Muslims who substantiate harassment claims. As an example of this, Ms Silverman pointed to a case from August 2007, where several Muslims who were wrongfully dismissed each received a \$25,000 settlement.

Many of the Committee’s questions to which the US was responding dealt with racial disparities in the different stages of the criminal justice system, from arrest to sentencing. In its list of issues, the Committee asked the US to explain why blacks are arrested and convicted at higher rates and sentenced for longer periods than whites. The delegation replied that the reasons for these disparities are ‘complex’, and moreover, insisted that US federal law guarantees equal treatment. Several members of the delegation argued that the higher rates of prosecution and conviction for blacks are merely correlative and do not clearly demonstrate that blacks are ‘targeted’ by State personnel.<sup>6</sup> The US also claimed that systemic racial discrimination in the criminal justice system is unlikely because all criminal defendants are entitled to due process, regardless of their race. In an attempt to assure the Committee that the State does take some responsibility for racial discrimination, the delegation confirmed the State’s efforts to redress harms caused by racial discrimination. The delegation asserted that ‘poor outcomes’ are the responsibility of non-governmental actors, who are in the best position to provide relief. The US delegation was also quick to point out that under some federal statutes, in order to prove discrimination, an individual need only show that he has been disproportionately impacted by a given law based on his race.

In response to questions about racial disparities in poverty, housing, education, labour, and access to social services, the US continually claimed that the statistics in these areas are simply correlative and do not prove that blacks are discriminated against. While the delegation did not dispute the data, it did acknowledge that any ameliorative action taken to narrow such gaps needs to be done in a race-neutral manner.

In the last part of its opening statement, the State quickly reviewed key policies regarding American Indians,<sup>7</sup> the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina,<sup>8</sup> healthcare,<sup>9</sup> education,<sup>10</sup> immigration,<sup>11</sup> labour,<sup>12</sup> and US military detainees.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> The delegation provided what it believed to be a helpful counter-example: the fact that paedophiles are overwhelmingly white men does not demonstrate racial discrimination.

<sup>7</sup> Mr Artman stated that while federal Indian law covers the Government’s relationship with the indigenous ‘tribes’, many of these communities retain their own justice systems, as well as cultural and spiritual laws.

<sup>8</sup> According to the delegation, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) expended \$7.7 billion on relief efforts.

<sup>9</sup> The delegation stated that providing universal healthcare remains a top priority of the Government. Existing service programmes like Medicaid are critical, as are awareness-raising campaigns on prenatal, sexual, and reproductive health.

<sup>10</sup> The State party sought in recent years to reduce the high school dropout rate among minorities, as well as to conduct annual academic assessments of students’ progress and improve services for disabled students.

<sup>11</sup> All workers in the US, including undocumented workers, are entitled to protections under US labour law. The delegation claimed that US employers do not inquire into workers’ immigration status.

<sup>12</sup> Federal law prohibits employers from discriminating against their employees, intentionally or unintentionally, if they employ more than 15 individuals.

<sup>13</sup> The delegation claimed that the *International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination* (the Convention) does not extend to enemy combatants detained at the US military installation at Guantanamo Bay. These detainees, the delegation claimed, enjoy adequate due process because they have access to judicial review.

Following the delegation's statement, Mr Scicileanos, the Committee rapporteur on the US, took the floor. As the Committee had done in its written questions, Mr Scicileanos pressed the State to explain racial disparities in various aspects of US social life. With respect to the Convention, he requested more information on how the State reviews compliance with the Convention, and whether the US intends to withdraw its reservation to Article 4 regarding hate speech. On the issue of indigenous rights, the Mr Scicileanos cited the joint NGO submission, which noted the State's use of its 'plenary power' to seize sacred land. Mr Scicileanos called on the US to return sacred lands to the indigenous people and seek their consent before initiating development projects on their land.

### **Status of the Convention in domestic law**

The Committee first addressed the status of the Convention in US law. When the State acceded to the Convention in 1994, it submitted several reservations.<sup>14</sup> Mr Robert Harris from the DOJ explained the reasons behind each of each of these reservations. The US declined to say whether it will withdraw any of its reservations, opting instead to explain why it must maintain them. The delegation claimed that the US needs to keep its reservation to Article 7 regarding the State's commitment to proactively combat prejudice and foster diversity because US society is 'shaped' by the principle of non-interference. Regarding special measures such as affirmative action, Mr Harris stated that racial classifications are welcome so long as they satisfy the 'strict scrutiny test'.<sup>15</sup> He went on to argue that the US reservation to Article 4 will remain because the Supreme Court already distinguishes between constitutionally protected free speech and speech that poses a 'true threat' (and thus is not protected by the First Amendment).<sup>16</sup> Moreover, the US does not criminalise racial superiority 'ideas'; rather, the State relies on civil society to assure that such notions do not gain traction.

Committee member Mr Peter did not hide his dissatisfaction with the US, saying he was 'shocked' by the State's poor ratification of the Convention. He urged the US to ratify the *Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* (ICCPR-OP2) on the abolition of the death penalty.<sup>17</sup> When pressed to explain why the US has not joined more international treaties, the delegation responded that it rather not be a party than be in breach of an international agreement. Mr Harris from the DOJ underscored that the US has a 'traditional' view of international law, whereby obligations are only binding if States consent to being so bound.

In its concluding observations,<sup>18</sup> the Committee thanked the US for its constructive engagement with the Committee and for its detailed responses to questions. The Committee was encouraged by the reauthorisations of the Violence against Women Act of 1994 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as well as the work of the DoJ, EEOC, and Department of Housing and Urban Development.

### **'Race-neutral' legislation**

The Committee raised a number of issues regarding seemingly race-neutral laws which adversely affect marginalised communities. For example, Committee member Mr Kjaerum discussed voter ID laws, which

---

<sup>14</sup> Article 2(1) (non-discrimination generally); Article 3 (desegregation); Article 4 (condemnation of racial superior ideas and organisations); Article 5 (equal enjoyment of rights); Article 7 (combating prejudices); and Article 22 (competence of the International Court of Justice). The US also issued interpretative declarations on Article 14 (communications) and accepted the amendment to Article 8(6) (funding for Committee members).

<sup>15</sup> The 'strict scrutiny test' test is a standard of judicial review that evolved to help define the scope of the Equal Protection Clause of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the US Constitution. To pass this test, the law or policy in question must be justified by a 'compelling governmental interest' that is 'narrowly tailored' to achieve that interest, and must be done by the 'least restrictive means' necessary.

<sup>16</sup> See *Virginia v. Black*. The US Supreme Court struck down a state statute against cross burning, holding that the statute could not declare cross burning is *prima facie* evidence of the intent to intimidate. Rather, the act itself could be considered a protected form of speech.

<sup>17</sup> Available at [www2.ohchr.org/english/law/ccpr-death.htm](http://www2.ohchr.org/english/law/ccpr-death.htm).

<sup>18</sup> CERD/C/USA/CO/6, February 2008, available at [www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/cerds72.htm](http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cerd/cerds72.htm).

require all voters to present identification before voting. These laws appear race-neutral since they refer to ‘individuals’ rather than members of specific racial classifications, but tend to have a disparate impact on minority groups for whom it is more difficult to secure appropriate documentation. Mr Kjaerum wanted the delegation to explain how it handles such unattended consequences. Instead of directly addressing Mr Kjaerum’s question, the delegation stated instead that some federal statutes only require a showing of ‘disparate impact’<sup>19</sup> to show discrimination, and cited relevant domestic legislation.<sup>20</sup>

### **Criminal justice system**

Several Committee members cited alarming statistics regarding the disproportionate number of minorities in custody. Committee member Mr de Gouttes expressed his concern about ‘obvious’ racial disparities in the use of capital punishment, as well as the different sentencing schemes for drug possession. Commonly known as ‘mandatory minimum’ laws, these rules punish possession of crack (typically used by blacks) much more severely than possession of cocaine (typically used by whites). The delegation countered that the US Sentencing Commission recently reduced punishments for crack possession, and Congress has also taken the issue under advisement. Mr Kjaerum questioned whether non-nationals were subject to discrimination in prison, but the delegation did not respond.

In response to comments about capital punishment, the State assured the Committee that the death penalty is not used lightly. Moreover, most crime is committed by blacks against blacks. Regarding racial disparities in crime in general, a member of the delegation, Mr Ralph Boyd,<sup>21</sup> shrugged off these statistics merely as a ‘flag’ for the State, but stressed that it is a ‘call to action’ for American society to remedy such racial disparities.

In response to the Committee’s questions about racial profiling, Mr Boyd enthusiastically agreed that relying on racial stereotypes is inappropriate. He informed the Committee that the State has responded to such practices by developing ‘clear’ guidelines to train law enforcement personnel to recognise situations in which using race to determine the identity of a criminal suspect is incompatible with ‘social values’. However, Mr Boyd stopped short of dismissing this practice, saying that in some criminal situations, it may be appropriate to take race into consideration.

Committee members Mr Lindgren, Mr Alves, and Mr Peter expressed concern about the numbers of juveniles being sentenced to life in prison. Mr Lindgren noted that most life sentences for juveniles are given when the juvenile did not commit a violent act, but rather he simply aided or abetted another crime.<sup>22</sup> The delegation appeared unfazed by these questions, stating that such sentences are warranted as long as the courts respect the defendants’ right to due process. Furthermore, Mr Rothenberg of the DOJ pointed out that there is no proof that race is a determinative factor in sentencing juveniles to life.

With respect to Committee questions about police brutality, Ms Becker cited statistics from her own Civil Rights Division of the DOJ. She reported that the number of police brutality cases filed has increased by 25 percent, and the number of convictions secured by the DOJ has risen by 53 percent in the past five years.

One of the more specific issues addressed by the Committee was the lack of voting rights for many individuals convicted of felonies. While each state’s law is different, Committee member Kjaerum criticised the national policy allowing its states to ‘disenfranchise’ 5.3 million potential voters. He urged the delegation to take federal action to restore the rights of ‘at least some’ of these convicts.

---

<sup>19</sup> Disparate impact is a legal theory for proving unlawful employment discrimination. The petitioner can prove illegal employment discrimination by demonstrating that he or she was discriminated against on the basis of his or her race.

<sup>20</sup> Civil Rights Act and the Voting Rights Act.

<sup>21</sup> Mr Boyd was until recently a member of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination.

<sup>22</sup> Based on the ‘felony murder rule’ operating in some US criminal jurisdictions, a defendant may be convicted of murder if the felony he committed proximately caused a murder.

## Immigration

Immigration was an especially popular topic during the session. With respect to immigration policy in general, a representative of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) assured the Committee that non-citizens are fully protected under US law, and listed several examples of such protection. The representative insisted that employers cannot discriminate against employees based on immigration status, all non-citizen children have a right to free primary and secondary education, federal emergency assistance is provided without regard to racial status,<sup>23</sup> and moreover, foreigners can apply for asylum and appeal their cases to the Board of Immigration Appeals. The Committee remained unconvinced, expressing particular concern about the raids on immigrants conducted by the DHS Immigration Control and Enforcement Department (ICE). Appearing slightly flustered, the delegation ran through an extensive list of ‘factors’ that determine when ICE will detain a non-national, including his ‘flight risk’, ‘dangerousness’, and ‘available alternatives’. The delegation also repeatedly assured the Committee that the Government is improving oversight mechanisms and developing performance-based international standards to increase the transparency of the DHS.

While many Committee members sympathised with the pressures the US faces in the wake of the attacks of 11 September 2001 to prevent further acts of terrorism, they also expressed their concern that such pressures have led to a legitimisation of anti-Muslim and anti-South Asian sentiments. Regarding Muslim immigrants, the State mentioned that DHS is working to redress and prevent incidents of anti-Muslim discrimination. Committee member Mr Kemal asked the US for an update regarding its policy on immigration from South Asia and the Middle East. Students from these regions, he lamented, have suffered because of stringent immigration rules. The State reported that overall, immigration from predominantly Muslim countries has increased between 2003 and 2006, and DHS is trying to expedite foreign student applications. When pressed to explain its policy on renditions, the US delegation quickly dismissed the issue as outside of the Committee’s competence.

A few Committee members requested more information about whether the US intends to build a ‘border fence’ along the US-Mexico border to block migration. In response, the delegation acknowledged that there is legislation pending on this issue, but insisted that it is ‘animated’ by discriminatory intent.

## Education

Committee member Mr Diancou urged the Government to be more active in promoting non-discrimination in schools, particularly private schools. Committee member Mr Lahiri was slightly less upbeat, lamenting the demise of affirmative action programmes in the US. Taking a more pointed tone, Committee member Mr Alves pressed the delegation to explain why it claims affirmative action has not worked in the US and why it continues to prohibit the use of quotas to improve diversity in education. The Committee also cited recent Supreme Court decisions<sup>24</sup> that seemingly overrule the landmark decision in *Brown v. Board of Education*,<sup>25</sup> which mandated racial integration in public schools. The State responded by citing a 2003 Supreme Court decision that approved the use of race in admissions at the University of Michigan Law School.<sup>26</sup> This case, it argued, demonstrates that some race-conscious measures do satisfy the strict scrutiny standard.<sup>27</sup> Committee

---

<sup>23</sup> Interestingly, the delegation stopped short of referring to ‘immigration status’, opting instead to assure assistance for ‘all races’.

<sup>24</sup> *Meredith v. Jefferson, Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District*.

<sup>25</sup> *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* (1954). In this case, the Supreme Court held de jure racial segregation was unconstitutional and required that public schools be racially integrated. Additional information available at [www.oyez.org/cases/1950-1959/1954/1954\\_1](http://www.oyez.org/cases/1950-1959/1954/1954_1).

<sup>26</sup> *Grutter v. Bollinger* (2003). The Supreme Court determined that the University could use race as part of its admissions process as long as race was simply treated as a ‘positive factor.’ The use of race by the undergraduate program at the same University was invalidated because the admissions committee assigned race as numerical value (*Gratz v. Bollinger*, 2003). Additional information available at [www.oyez.org/cases/2000-2009/2002/2002\\_02\\_241](http://www.oyez.org/cases/2000-2009/2002/2002_02_241).

<sup>27</sup> The ‘strict scrutiny test’ test is a standard of judicial review that evolved to help define the scope of the Equal Protection Clause of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the US Constitution. To pass this test, the law or policy in question must be justified by a ‘compelling

member Mr Lindgren dismissed the delegation's answers as 'too legalistic', and asked the delegation to explain, in a simpler manner, why affirmative action is so vilified in the US. The State repeated its argument that race-conscious education policies are legitimate so long as they satisfy strict scrutiny. The Committee was particularly charged about this issue, prompting a member of the US delegation to say that narrowing the educational gap between whites and minorities is the most important step toward improving race relations.

### **Employment**

The Committee also asked several questions about non-discrimination in the area of employment. In response to questions from Committee member Mr Kjaerum, the delegation admitted that the 'nexus' between racial minorities and various kinds of poverty is undeniable. According to Ms Silverman of the EEOC, a pending employment law will uncap damages in employment discrimination cases. Ms Becker also noted that the US Commission on Civil Rights serves as a watchdog of the Government, and issues reports as well as recommendations to prevent employment discrimination in Government agencies and departments. While assuring the Committee that the State effectively enforces non-discrimination laws, Ms Silverman also noted a recent initiative to further intensify enforcement efforts entitled 'Eradicating Racism and Colour Discrimination from Employment'.

### **Indigenous peoples**

Several Committee members expressed concern about discrimination against indigenous populations in the US. The Committee inquired how the Federal Government assesses the cost of indigenous land, the provisions to protect sacred land, and the fate of the Western Shoshone and indigenous people in Alaska and Hawaii. Committee member Mr Ewomsan suggested that the US dedicate new resources to remedy the situation of indigenous peoples.

Committee member Mr Avtenomov declared that was 'not satisfied' with the delegation's answers on American Indians, and that the Federal Government must recognise indigenous populations. Mr Karl Lundren from the Department of Interior, retorted that it is for the US to decide which peoples to recognise, since such decisions are based on a clear set of 'objective' criteria established by the State. And while the delegation acknowledged that indigenous people were and continue to be unfairly deprived of their lands, it summarily dismissed the Committee's suggestions that the State use its 'plenary power' to reclaim land and return it to the Indians. The delegation argued that review of such activities is beyond the competence of the Committee. Nevertheless, to demonstrate that the Government is taking action to protect indigenous peoples, the delegation was quick to mention its initiative to increase healthcare services to these communities, as well as the 'settlement' mechanism available for indigenous peoples in Alaska. The State did not, however, elaborate on these initiatives. The delegation did not respond to Committee member Mr Cali Tzay's request for an update on the situation of Black Hills Indians.

### **Other issues**

Committee member Mr Kemal raised the sole issue regarding health during the discussion, asking what the State intends to do about rising rates of HIV/AIDS infection among minorities, particularly black women. While the delegation conceded that HIV/AIDS treatment requires a significant amount of resources, it did no more than simply claim that the State is 'increasing strategies' to treat and prevent the spread of the disease.

---

Governmental interest' that is 'narrowly tailored' to achieve that interest, and must be done by the 'least restrictive means' necessary.

Several members of the Committee also expressed their frustration with the US for its non-participation from the upcoming Durban Preparatory Committee.<sup>28</sup> Committee member Mr Murillo-Martinez even called the US decision to abstain as ‘inconsistent’ given its alleged position at the forefront of the fight against racial discrimination. The delegation claimed that its absence from the event is due to its belief that Israel is being unfairly targeted. It however asserted that it does not have ideological objections to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action itself.

The US delegation did not respond to the Committee’s inquiries into the protection of transgendered individuals and the content of the pending Civil Rights Act of 2008.

### Conclusions and next steps

The Chairperson thanked the delegation for its presentation and applauded the progress it has made thus far. The Committee closed its discussion with observations and comments. Mr Lahiri was particularly critical of the US, saying that given the State’s ‘history of racism’ and rhetoric on multiculturalism, he expected the US to be more eager to implement Committee recommendations and work toward compliance with the Convention.

In its concluding observations, the Committee issued several recommendations, including that the US adopt a definition of racial discrimination that prohibits practices that have discriminatory effects, withdraw or limit the scope of its reservations to Articles 2 and 4 of the Convention, extend protections against discrimination to cover private conduct, establish a national human rights institution, and intensify its efforts to combat racial profiling.

The Committee asked the State to respond to the Committee’s concerns in its next report, which the US was invited to submit as a combined seventh, eighth, and ninth report in 2011.

*Last revised and updated: 5 May 2008.*

---

<sup>28</sup> The Durban Preparatory Committee for the Durban Review Conference was established by Human Rights Council *Resolution 3/2* to decide the modalities for the Durban Review Conference on racial discrimination, scheduled for 2009. Additional information available at [www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/racism/groups/prep\\_committee\\_durban/index.htm](http://www2.ohchr.org/english/issues/racism/groups/prep_committee_durban/index.htm).

## **TREATY BODY MONITOR STAFF**

**Michael Ineichen**, Human Rights Officer, Geneva

**Gareth Sweeney**, Deputy Manager, Geneva

## **AUTHORS OF THE US REPORT**

**Ashwini Habbu**, Intern

## **ABOUT THE PUBLICATION**

The *Treaty Body Monitor* forms part of the Human Rights Monitor Series produced by ISHR. It reports on each country reviewed by the six treaty bodies (all but the Committee on the Rights of the Child) and provides an overview of every treaty body session. It is currently an online publication that can be found at <http://www.ishr.ch/hrm>.

## **COMMENTS AND FURTHER INFORMATION**

We would welcome your feedback on this publication so please send any comments and suggestions to [information@ishr.ch](mailto:information@ishr.ch). You can check the latest Treaty Body Monitor reports published on [www.ishr.ch](http://www.ishr.ch).

## **COPYRIGHT AND DISTRIBUTION**

Copyright © 2008 International Service for Human Rights

Material from this publication may be reproduced for training, teaching or other non-commercial purposes as long as ISHR is fully acknowledged. You can also distribute this publication and link to it from your website as long as ISHR is fully acknowledged as the source. No part of this publication may be reproduced for any commercial purpose without the prior express permission of the copyright holders.

## **DISCLAIMER**

While every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy and reliability of the information contained in this publication, ISHR does not guarantee, and accepts no legal liability whatsoever arising from any possible mistakes in the information reported on or any use of this publication. We are however happy to correct any errors you may come across so please notify [information@ishr.ch](mailto:information@ishr.ch).