

Chapter 1 : OHCHR | Human rights in the trade arena

Human Rights and International Trade Edited by Thomas Cottier, Joost Pauwelyn, and Elisabeth BÅ¼rgi International Economic Law Series. Addresses highly topical issues including institutional cooperation and lawmaking, and the interaction between trade and human rights in dispute settlement.

Indeed, globalization appears to have exacerbated this controversy. The functional specialization of different areas of international law including international trade, human rights, and environmental regulation has increased the potential for institutional and normative conflict and fragmentation. Inconsistency or incoherence in the application of international norms or the operation of institutions institutionally, the WTO is not a specialized agency of the UN in each of these functional areas is increasingly likely. Responses to these challenges have been disparate. Some international trade scholars have sought to limit recourse to international human rights standards, seeking instead to isolate international trade law from outside influences. Some human rights scholars have sought to utilize the sophisticated dispute settlement mechanisms of international trade law in the service of ensuring greater respect for human rights. Other human rights scholars have attacked international trade law and institutions as potential sources of human rights violations, focusing, in particular, on the impact of trade liberalization on the human rights of those in extreme poverty. The disparate positions assumed by scholars appear also to be reflected in the varying positions assumed by states. Historically, a significant number of developing states advocated human rights-related trade measures as a response, for example, to colonialism and apartheid. More recently, a significant number of developing states have opposed the use of unilateral coercive trade measures as responses to alleged human rights violations. Concerns have been raised about intervention in the internal affairs of states and the use of trade measures for protectionist purposes undermining the comparative advantage of developing states. Human rights concerns have also been raised. International trade restrictions on, for example, compulsory licensing regimes for pharmaceuticals have been seen as threats to effective responses by developing states to global and regional pandemics.

General Overviews The framers of the UN Charter accepted that important linkages existed between economic and social issues. Howse in Alvarez has, for example, identified the normative perspectives of important participants in the negotiations that established the post-World War 2 international regulatory system. During the Cold War and even more so today, the increasing functional specialization of institutions and instruments, economic and social, has made the identification and development of linkages between trade and human rights more complex. Functional specialization has also manifested itself in more detailed, complex regulation in the areas of trade, human rights, and the environment. The potential for conflicts and incoherence between these functional areas led scholars, at least as early as the s, to begin addressing issues of linkage. In the s, important collections of essays, such as Compa, et al. Labor rights as human rights were recognized by the international community as early as in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. More recent scholarship has expanded to consider conceptual issues raised by linkage. Alvarez ; Abbott, et al. The exploration of conceptual and practical issues rose to a new level in Cottier, et al. While human rights and environmental regulation are not based on common principles and appear to be at different stages of development, similarities in terms of linkage with international trade are nonetheless apparent. This fact is illustrated in Francioni Another important perspective in the literature has been the scholarship focusing on the alleged perverse consequences of international trade regulation. Economists have tended to focus on allocational efficiency of trade liberalization, whereas more critical scholarship has emphasized distributional issues and inequalities including in relation to gender of the reduced regulatory autonomy of states that accompanies trade liberalization. **International Trade and Human Rights: Foundations and Conceptual Issues.** University of Michigan Press, This collection brings together the writings of scholars who examine the theoretical and practical foundations of linkages between trade and human rights. **Boundaries of the WTO.** American Journal of International Law Includes Kyle Bagwell, Petros C. Mavroidis, and Robert W. University of Pennsylvania Press, **Human Rights and International Trade.** Oxford University Press, For example, important reflections on differences between legal and international relations scholarship are offered

by Laurence R. Trade, Inequality, and Justice: Toward a Liberal Theory of Just Trade. The interdisciplinary approach allows readers to comprehend the depth of complexity entailed in assessing whether human rights and trade are compatible and how to bridge the current divide that exists. Users without a subscription are not able to see the full content on this page. Please subscribe or login. [How to Subscribe Oxford Bibliographies Online](#) is available by subscription and perpetual access to institutions. For more information or to contact an Oxford Sales Representative [click here](#).

Chapter 2 : Human Rights and International Trade - Oxford Scholarship

This book examines the theoretical framework of the interaction between the disciplines of international trade law and human rights. The interaction is explored through seven case studies, ranging from freedom of expression and anti-trust rules, to the fight against trade in conflict diamonds and the United Nations' convention on tobacco control.

The Wedding of Trade and Human Rights: Marriage of Convenience or Permanent Match? Susan Ariel Aaronson and Jean Pierre Chauffour 1 The marriage of trade and human rights sounds contemporary, but it is in fact ancient. As long as men and women have traded, they wrestled with issues involving human rights although these rights were not defined in international law until in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. For example, the ancients knew the sea could bring strangers with new goods and ideas, but these same strangers might loot their land or enslave their family. Policymakers soon recognized they would need not only rules to govern trade, but rules to ensure that trade advanced human freedoms and opportunities. Policymakers gradually developed new rules to achieve both trade and human rights objectives. For example, in the early nineteenth century, England signed treaties with the U. In the late nineteenth century, the US, England, Australia and Canada banned trade in goods made by conflict labor. These efforts stimulated international cooperation. In the signatories of the Treaty of Versailles created the International Labor Organization ILO ; its members agreed that state failure to protect labor rights could distort trade and undermine labor rights in other countries. However, Canada, Mexico, and the U. NAFTA includes labor rights in a side agreement, as well as transparency access to information and public participation obligations in both the body and side agreements. Some of these provisions are binding; others are rhetorical. Others consider that introducing human rights provisions in PTAs is simply a new form of protectionism in disguise. They stress that trade agreements are not the right place to address human rights issues. Canada and the US focus on specific human rights; put these provisions in the body of the trade agreement and often make them binding. The US and Canadian approaches have become more similar over time, but remain distinct as of Many policymakers in middle income and developing countries are reluctant to use trade instruments to change the behavior of other countries. But as they get richer and more influential, these policymakers may become more willing to accept or to demand such provisions. The human rights promoted in these agreements include privacy rights, political participation, due process, access to information provisions, cultural rights, indigenous rights, and access to affordable medicines, among others. While these agreements may prod some countries to change their laws or devote greater resources to human rights enforcement, little is known about their actual effect on human rights conditions. Human rights provisions are probably expensive for developing countries to implement just like intellectual property rights. They may have to devote scarce resources to fulfill some human rights before they have the national income or will to do so. If human rights provisions are designed carefully, they can focus on improving governance the supply side as well as empowering people to demand their rights. However, to be workable and enduring, policymakers need greater understanding of the trade and governance effects of human rights provisions in PTAs. Policymakers, scholars and activists should use new tools such as human rights impact assessments as well as widely accepted datasets to gain greater understanding of how to make the match between trade and human rights effective and enduring. In sum, policymakers use these agreements directly and indirectly to encourage good governance. Human Rights in Preferential Trade Agreements:

Chapter 3 : 3 Ways to Protect Human Rights in International Trade - wikiHow

Economic globalization and respect for human rights are both highly topical issues. In theory, more trade should increase economic welfare and protection of human rights should ensure individual dignity.

The international vision post-World War II envisaged creation of the UN to take care of two of the pillars of the New World Order, namely peace and human rights, whereas the other two pillars of trade and finance were entrusted to the Breton Woods Institutions namely the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, as well as to the regime under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade – the predecessor of the WTO. All member states of the WTO have signed at least one core human rights treaty under the auspices of the UN. As such, it is imperative that while operating at the WTO, states must adopt policies that would at the very least, not infringe upon their human rights commitments under the UN, and would in fact further them. However, various WTO agreements and policies have resulted in undermining human rights around the world in very complex ways. This has resulted in a fragmented nature of international law governing human rights on the one hand and international trade on the other. States also find themselves in a rather ambivalent position where, in furtherance of trade obligations under the WTO, they end up breaching their own human rights commitments under the UN. Even institutionally, the WTO, including its judges and officials, have long preferred that human rights issues should not gravitate towards the WTO which is a trade institution, and should be handled solely by the UN. This e-learning course introduces students to the various linkages between international trade and human rights, how the two regimes interact with one another, and the current debates on how to resolve the tensions between the two. The doctrinal and policy debates underlying these linkages will be highlighted to give participants an insight into why states, while operating at the WTO, adopt policies that tend to disregard their own human rights commitments under the UN. The next two weeks of the course are devoted to analysing how human rights are affected by specific WTO Agreements and policies. Concrete issues of trade and human rights linkages will be examined, including labour rights, biosafety regulations, the intellectual property rights regime under the WTO, trade in natural resources during conflicts etc. In the fifth week of the course, the focus is on the human rights implications of Regional and Bilateral Trade and Investment Agreements and how they interact with the broader tensions between multilateral trade under the WTO and human rights. In the last week, participants will examine the various responses and solutions proposed to resolve the tensions and to build convergence between the two regimes of international trade and human rights. The course is based on a participatory, active learning approach, with an emphasis on critical reflection and peer-to-peer learning. The maximum number of course participants is 20. Students who successfully complete the course will receive a certificate of completion. Course outline Week 1: Human rights approach vs. Legal and doctrinal aspects of international trade and human rights linkages Week 3: Labour rights and international trade, human rights exception Clauses in WTO Agreements, international trade, natural resources and armed conflict Week 5: Human rights implications of regional and bilateral trade and investment agreements Week 6: Exploring solutions and suggesting convergence; human rights impact assessments, development approach, judicial approach, pragmatic approach About the instructor: Prior to the present position, Mr. He holds a LL. He has served extensively as a legal advisor to many human rights organizations, including those involved with refugee protection, and has represented them before different courts and tribunals in criminal, constitutional, asylum, human rights and labour cases. His current primary area of academic research and study is Human Rights, Development and International Trade linkages. Who should apply The course is intended for staff members of development and trade organisations, including development NGOs, government agencies, inter-governmental organisations. Candidates should have a good written command of English and have high competence and comfort with computer and Internet use. Costs Tuition fee for participants: Bulk rates are available. Payments are due upon registration.

Chapter 4 : International Trade and Human Rights - International Law - Oxford Bibliographies

International Trade and Human Rights addresses the relationship between human rights and international trade from a unique and important interdisciplinary perspective. The missing link between the international trade regime and human rights has become one of the key concerns of critics of the WTO.

Since the mid-90s, the EU has developed a sophisticated array of instruments to promote human rights in its external trade policy such as human rights clauses in bilateral trade agreements and a set of human rights criteria in the Generalised System of Preferences GSP. In this context the EU appears to be more concerned with the goals of an economic and political integration community rather than with the objectives of a human rights organisation. In the new EU trade strategy, 7 this shift in focus has been further expanded in order to include a parallel concern for the environment and human rights, including social rights. In addition, there is explicit reference to using trade agreements and trade preference programmes as levers to promote around the world values such as sustainable development, human rights, fair and ethical trade and the fight against corruption as well as improving the responsibility of supply chains. Indeed, it is now widely recognised that business operations affect the public interest and can impact on a range of human rights. In the first place, there are problems concerning vertical and horizontal consistency requiring all the Member States within the EU to speak with one voice in their external relations and, linked to this, the persistence of inter-institutional conflict at EU level. While internal cohesiveness is not a sufficient condition for the effectiveness of EU external action to occur and other factors need to be taken into account, such as bargaining configuration between the parties, 16 achieving and maintaining a common position at the EU inter-institutional level is a necessary condition for ensuring consistency in policy implementation. The analysis starts with an examination of the fragmented human rights protection legal regime of the EU with a particular focus on the impact of the ToL. This analysis is important because it shows that despite the foundational and pervasive character of human rights in EU law – which has been made even more visible by the introduction of certain constitutional changes of the ToL – the legal framework for the respect of human rights remains fragmented and does not provide for a coherent legal system of human rights protection in both the internal and external sphere of EU action. The paper then looks at the way the EU integrates human rights in its unilateral trade arrangements and regional and bilateral trade agreements. After having identified the main shortcomings concerning the practice of EU human rights conditionality it considers whether ex ante human rights-informed impact assessments combined with ex post evaluations can help improve the methodology for measuring the trade sustainability and human rights impact of trade agreements. The paper thus considers whether these improved impact assessments may be one of the ways to effectively tackle the extant limitations of EU human rights conditionality together with trade agreements, which are tailored to the specificities of the third country concerned. The added value of these changes is that they would not require any further Treaty reform to ensure better promotion and respect for human rights. Together Articles 2 and 6 TEU: They permeate the EU legal order in multiple forms: This omission was not accidental but the result of a deliberate choice. It shows how the Court resisted attempts by litigants to invoke fundamental rights and was unwilling to treat them as part of the Community legal order. Yet, this has not impeded the EU to develop narratives on fundamental rights at a later stage, which claim retrospectively that fundamental rights are and have always been inherent in the EU. However, this may prove to be difficult in practice. The Charter rights and the standing rules for judicial review seem to be at variance with each another. The ruling also seems to ease the above tension between rights and NPAs legal standing in a number of respects. First, Frente Polisario, a national liberation movement for the independence and autonomy of the Sahrawi people in Western Sahara territory that is under the control of Morocco, has been found to have legal standing. Second, the EU is under an obligation to ensure respect for the fundamental rights of non-EU nationals in non-EU territory. Another limitation of the Charter is that not all of its provisions can have direct effect as illustrated by those provisions concerning social rights. A careful reading of the Charter shows that the legally binding status it has acquired has not had the desired impact in relation to the qualification and place given to social rights. Only individual social rights are fully

justiciable. Chapter IV on Solidarity includes individual rights, guiding principles and objectives. For example, Article 34 EUCFR on social security and social assistance is considered a mere objective, 35 while Article 28 EUCFR on the right of collective bargaining is a guiding principle since its practical specification is left to national legislation. The first reason for such interpretation is that they are formulated in fairly concrete terms and seem capable of conferring a subjective right on individuals given their specific wording. The place of this provision within the EU acquis is further reinforced through secondary legislation based on Article 46 TFEU and its precursors. Since the emergence of the internal fundamental rights regime, human rights have also become an important component of EU external relations. Taken together these provisions seem to require that the EU respects human rights in its external action and also in its internal policies with an external dimension. Firstly, the EU lacks a serious and coherent human rights policy and mechanism, which applies also to its Member States. Secondly, and linked to the former, the EU maintains double standards between its internal and its external policies. In spite of the broad set of objectives laid down by Articles 3 5 and 21 TEU these two provisions do not confer new competences on the EU. Hence, some observations are warranted. In part, the EU seeks to exert some degree of political and economic domination over third countries because the failure to export its standards developed within its Internal Market to others outside the EU would put European firms at a competitive disadvantage. Moreover, by acting as a global regulator, the EU can defend its social preferences without compromising the competitiveness of its industries. The ToL has given the EU Parliament a stronger role in relation to the conclusion of international agreements, which is of great significance given that it constitutes a formally independent voice for EU citizens 55 and that it is a strong human rights advocate. This flows from its ongoing commitment to the protection of human rights generally as well as its democratic legitimation function that may be said to be independent and separate from that of the Member States. The EU Parliament has been given a right to be informed at all stages of the procedure for adopting international agreements. As posited by Martines: More generally, human rights concerns feature prominently in EU external trade. It was first set up in 85 and since then subject to periodical revision. Through this scheme the EU provides preferential access to the EU market to a certain number of developing countries and territories, in the form of reduced tariffs for their goods when entering the EU market. To this end, it accords tariff preferences to countries, which fulfil certain economic criteria in terms of poverty and non-diversification of exports. Secondly, it also aims at improving their political and social situation. The EU, via these unilateral trade preference schemes, pursues a two-fold objective: The EU has used its power to withdraw access from beneficiary countries very rarely, and only in response to grave violations of ILO labour standards rather than human rights more generally. In the Council withdrew GSP status from Myanmar for forced labour practices, 88 which were then reinstated in June Infringements of CLS have often been reported and the EU Parliament has continuously called upon the Commission to monitor more strictly the compliance with ILO labour standards and asking for the suspension of preferences in respect of countries that breach fundamental social rights. Consequently, the Commission stopped its investigation in March Even though Articles 3 5 and 21 3 1 TEU require the EU to respect human rights in relation to its external policies and internal policies with external effects, it is unclear whether these provisions require the EU also to protect human rights extraterritorially or to fulfil human rights other than in general terms. The foregoing provides a mixed picture of the GSP scheme. Together with the European External Action Service, the Commission has set up a structured monitoring process: According to the Commission sanctions under the clause should be reserved only for the most extreme and flagrant violations of human rights. The sustainable development chapter of the agreement contains obligations on the effective implementation of, and non-derogation from, domestic labour laws, recognition of the ILO decent work principles and their relevance for trade and labour. They are also the first post-Lisbon agreements in the region. This is important insofar as the inclusion of human rights conditionality in the three AAs is now mandated by EU primary law. All three agreements include two different forms of conditionality. In all three agreements an extensive list of international instruments constitutes the basis for the essential elements that the parties must respect in their domestic and foreign policies. All three AAs include separate dispute settlement clauses for trade and trade-related matters. With regard to labour provisions, the Cotonou Partnership Agreement CPA is particularly worthy of mention

as both the EU and the African, Caribbean and Pacific ACP countries have equally committed themselves to respect CLS and to enhance cooperation in this area, for example, through the adoption and enforcement of legislation and, at the same time, rejecting the use of labour standards for protectionist purposes, as provided in Article 50, the key labour clause of the agreement. It also contains a commitment by the signatory parties that they will not lower their domestic labour standards to attract foreign direct investment and has a separate chapter on social aspects of trade. The practice of linking economic benefits to human rights conditionality is clearly the standard *modus operandi* of the EU. However, the analysis carried out in this section showed that its effectiveness is far from being uniform. Human rights conditionality seems to have some clear results with third countries over which the EU holds substantial economic leverage, which might also suggest that the latter is more important than legalisation for promoting compliance. There are other significant limitations of EU human rights conditionality. Moreover, the failure of the European Commission and Council to publish a clear catalogue of human rights, rule of law and democracy benchmarks in order to help understand the type of situations and actions that may trigger the application of a human rights clause has also been criticised. The foregoing shows how EU human rights conditionality presents some significant limitations, which need to be tackled. It remains to be seen whether future agreements will incorporate some of the suggested changes discussed above. Another way to address these limitations is by way of improving the methodology for measuring the social and human rights impact of trade agreements, which is the focus of analysis of the next section. One way of ensuring this could be through improved impact assessments of EU trade agreements. Consultants are tasked to choose a specific methodology, deliver economic analysis, carry out a preliminary assessment and provide detailed sector studies and a final synthesis report. These trade SIAs have been increasingly subject to criticism as they have failed to provide a proper assessment of how a given trade agreement will impact on human rights. In particular, it is argued that they do not adequately consider the real problems that developing countries particularly LDCs have. This is mainly because not all sectors are assessed as illustrated by the SIAs carried out in relation to the EU-ACP EPAs, which have not fully taken into account the impact that market integration has on small-scale farmers. Many NGOs have paid particular attention to the vulnerability of small-scale farmers due to their inability to deal with external shocks combined with a lack of infrastructure as well as abuses of human rights by both State and non-State actors. It has to be added that trade SIAs involve highly complex studies concerning a wide spectrum of sectors, stakeholders and economic, social and political variables that, as some IAs recognise, are very difficult to disaggregate and measure. To some extent, therefore, trade SIAs have inherent limitations which explains why they can only provide a limited perspective on a given trade agreement and its potential impact. As posited by Harrison, HRIAs must be based on a clear evaluation of the impact of trade law obligations on relevant, codified human rights obligations that apply to a given country avoiding that the inclusion of human rights in the assessment becomes a mere window dressing exercises. Again, this is explained by the difficulty of developing appropriate human rights indicators that have the required contextual specificity, which is tailored to the problems of the country concerned. Despite these shortcomings, HRIAs constitute an invaluable process to systematically identify, predict and respond to the potential human rights impact of trade agreements. This is particularly in consideration of the fact that the EU is increasingly establishing trade relationships with countries that are either notorious human rights violators or that are unable to prevent or stop human rights abuses from taking place in their own territory because they do not have the adequate governance and capacity-building to do so. For these EU trade SIAs of new generation which in part derive their legitimacy from human rights obligations to be credible they must be employed to draft international agreements with third countries or regions. However, studies show that this is not always the case. As pointed out by Bonanomi: In contrast to trade HRIAs, which focus on risks, trade SIAs concentrate on opportunities and seek ways to optimally capture the opportunities provided by a new trade agreement. Firstly, there is a problem of lack of consistency. Hence, more consistency is required in the EU SIA practice ensuring the assessment of human rights impacts is made in the EU and in the partner country concerned. The former, therefore, should always be combined with *ex post* assessments after implementation, which should also include human rights considerations. With the new generation of trade SIAs *ex post* evaluations are conducted to analyse the

observed economic, social, environmental and human rights impacts. These evaluations are prepared by Commission services. This would allow for modifications to be made in case their implementation is found by independent assessments to be causing human rights violations. Conclusion Is the EU human rights conditionality in external trade instruments effective? Is the EU a credible global human rights actor? Answering these questions is particularly important in consideration of the fact that human rights feature prominently in EU law and policy. The analysis carried out in the preceding sections explained how the foundational character of human rights is a legal construction to legitimise the European polity and EU action. In addition, the examination of the various types of instruments used by the EU to promote human rights in its external trade policy found that there is a lack of transparency, the use of selective conditionality and the application of double standards.

Chapter 5 : The Promotion and Integration of Human Rights in EU External Trade Relations

The essays thus range over a host of topical questions including: trade in GMOs, biosafety in intellectual property rights, technology transfer and environmental protection, trade and labour rights, child labour standards, the EU and WTO, MERCOSUR, and many other topics.

Drafted by representatives with different legal and cultural backgrounds from all regions of the world, the Declaration was proclaimed by the United Nations General Assembly in Paris on 10 December General Assembly resolution A as a common standard of achievements for all peoples and all nations. It sets out, for the first time, fundamental human rights to be universally protected and it has been translated into over languages. All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood. Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status. Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty. Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person. No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms. No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law. All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination. Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the constitution or by law. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile. Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time the penal offence was committed. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honour and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution. Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance. Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers. Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality. Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace. Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration can be fully realized. Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein.

Chapter 6 : International Trade and Human Rights

This book examines the theoretical framework of the interaction between the disciplines of international trade law and human rights. The interaction is explored through seven case studies, ranging from freedom of expression and anti-trust rules, to the fight against trade in conflict diamonds and the UN's new convention on tobacco control.

Chapter 7 : International Trade and Human Rights: Balancing the Act | HREA

Other human rights scholars have attacked international trade law and institutions as potential sources of human rights violations, focusing, in particular, on the impact of trade liberalization on the human rights of those in extreme poverty.

Chapter 8 : Environment, Human Rights and International Trade - Google Books

The lack of any explicit linkages of human rights and trade rules in WTO law contrasts with the integrated regulation of the common market and human rights in many national constitutions as well as in the EU Treaty Constitution.

Chapter 9 : Universal Declaration of Human Rights | United Nations

The book seeks reasons for what is a growing understanding that international trading regimes are not meeting objectives found in many international agreements, including both the international trade agreements themselves (WTO, GATT, TRIPS etc.) and human rights instruments.