The United States continues to offer an unrealized promise of human rights. Powerful economic interests threaten to undermine our democracy, and most of our political leaders appear unable or unwilling to stop it. In these times of economic uncertainty, we need to be especially vigilant in protecting human rights starting here at home.

There are 46 million people living in poverty in the United States and most of them are women and children. People living in poverty are particularly vulnerable to human rights violations and have the least access to power to ensure that effective policies are in place to prevent and remedy violations of their rights. The war on drugs, now three decades old, has resulted in the vastly disproportionate and unjust targeting and incarceration of poor African Americans and Latinos despite evidence that these groups engage in criminal drug activities at similar rates as their white counterparts and use drugs less. Anti-immigrant sentiment, racial discrimination, and economic stress have encouraged the vilification of undocumented immigrants and unprecedented detention and deportation of documented and undocumented immigrants alike, especially those from the global south. Workers find themselves undermined and under attack by politicians and wealthy employers throughout the country. The ongoing war on terror has led to the demonizing of Islam and an atmosphere of open bias against Muslims including sometimes by elected officials. Women, and in particular poor women of color, have seen their reproductive rights attacked with the country turning the clock back on abortion and access to contraception. Despite recent gains on same sex marriage, LGBTQ persons continue to be denied basic human rights to marriage and family, and the misuse and desecration of Native American land persists.

However, there is a vibrant and growing movement afoot and communities are fighting back to protect the human rights of all people living in the United States. They are challenging the notion that human rights violations are primarily a concern of other countries. They reject the implication that there are people who are undeserving of human rights. They are working across movements and building power from the grassroots to ensure that people are always prioritized over profit. They are demanding that the United States live up to its founding values as a nation, which holds that all people are created equal. This idea—the inherent dignity of all human beings—is the basis of the human rights movement. Some of these groups are mentioned in this report and were also highlighted in the US Human Rights Network’s 64 Day Campaign for Human Rights. Many others are not. We hope readers will familiarize themselves with the work of these groups and join the US Human Rights Network in building a people-centered human rights movement.

What are Human Rights?

Human rights are rights that we all have simply because we are human beings. They are the basic claims that we have as human beings to inherent dignity and respect irrespective of our race, nationality, gender, gender identity, sexuality, age, religion, language, immigration status, economic, or other status. Human rights include civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights. Examples of human rights are decent work, housing, health, education, food, water, freedom from discrimination, freedom from torture, freedom of expression and more.
Human rights are universal. Every human being has all human rights. Universally accepted human rights are generally expressed and guaranteed in a body of international law. The *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (UDHR) was one of the first documents to outline the full range of human rights. Human rights law has since developed to include numerous laws and agreements that aim to protect human beings around the world.

Human rights law also establishes the role of government in advancing human rights. It asserts that governments have an obligation to *respect*, *protect* and *fulfill* the rights of all people. The government has to provide all the conditions necessary for individuals and groups, the right-holders, to enjoy their rights to the fullest. The obligations to *respect* and *protect* are about refraining from certain actions and protecting rights violations by others; the obligation to *fulfill* is about taking active steps towards the realization of human rights for everyone.

**The United States and Human Rights Law**

The United States has had a paradoxical relationship with human rights law. On the one hand, it has championed human rights around the globe and was instrumental in drafting the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (UDHR), considered today the most widely accepted international customary law on human rights. On the other hand, the U.S. Government has worked fastidiously to undermine the enforceability of human rights law and to ensure that the United States is not held accountable to the same human rights standards and laws that it insists on for other countries.

Today, in addition to signing the UDHR, the United States has formally accepted and ratified only three out of the nine core human rights treaties. The treaties that the United States has ratified include the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* (ICCPR), the *International Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination* (ICERD), and the *Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment* (CAT). The United States has not ratified treaties that would advance the rights of women, children, persons with disabilities, migrant workers, or that would advance economic, social and cultural rights. The Obama Administration has stated that it is the policy of the U.S. Government not to ratify a treaty unless there are domestic laws in place to meet the requirements of those treaties. Yet, when the United States ratifies a treaty, it does so with qualifications known as Reservations, Understandings and Declarations (RUD) that typically limit the enforceability of the treaties. The rationale given for some of these RUDs
is that domestic law is sufficient to meet the standards enshrined in human rights laws. As this brief status report demonstrates, the United States does not have adequate protections in place to realize human rights for all.

**Who We Are and Why a Status Report**

The US Human Rights Network is a national network of organizations and individuals working to build and strengthen a people-centered human rights movement in the United States in order to ensure U.S. Government compliance with human rights standards and norms. We serve as an anchor to build the collective power of communities across the country and expand the base of a bold, vibrant, and broad-based human rights movement—one that is led by people most directly impacted by rights violations. We invite you to learn more about us at www.ushrnetwork.org and to join the movement.

This status report is intended to give the readers a snapshot of human rights concerns in the United States. It is derived from research conducted by partners, allies, and journalists; and original sources as found in hyperlinks. It is by no means a comprehensive report. The focus is on domestic issues with an emphasis on economic, social and cultural rights. Foreign policy and anti-terrorism measures are not addressed. We invite you to respond to us with your thoughts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decent Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter Suppression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Reproductive Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Incarceration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death Penalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration Policy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Acknowledgements**

This is a US Human Rights Network publication. We would like to thank the following students for the research they contributed to the report: Shereen Sadr-Azodi, Lauren Fannin, Nancy Murray, Cynthia McKinney, Chloe Jackson, Tiara Banks, and Grace Gipson. The report was designed by Teresa Abboud.
Decent Work

UDHR, Article 23
Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favorable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment. Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work. Everyone who works has the right to just and favorable remuneration insuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection. Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.

In a country with the resources of the United States, every adult who is willing and able should have an opportunity to earn an adequate living through work. Under human rights law, it is the government’s obligation to create conditions so that everyone has the opportunity to find decent work. Though we have seen slight improvements recently, the financial crisis created a significant jobs shortage. The burden of unemployment is borne disproportionately by African Americans, Native Americans, Hispanics, persons with disability and youth of color. In December 2012, there were 12 million people (7.7%) unemployed but the unemployment rate for African Americans was 13.2%, Hispanics 10%, Black youth 39.8%, Hispanic youth 30.1%, white youth 19.4%, and persons with disabilities 12.7%. For Native Americans, the rate was 14.6 % in 2011. These groups tend to face greater barriers to employment including discrimination. For example, research has shown employers are reluctant to hire qualified Black job applicants. A Princeton University study revealed that even in a diverse city like New York, employers were more willing to hire a white applicant just out of prison than they were a Black applicant with no criminal record.

Blacks and Latinos are also disproportionately barred from employment as a result of conviction records given their over-representation in the prison system. Job applicants with a criminal record are 50% less likely to get a callback. And while it is illegal for employers to employ blanket no-hire policies for applicants with criminal records, they still persist. The Equal Employment Opportunities Commission took a positive step in trying to address this issue and updated its guidelines in May to clarify that employers may not deny employment based on a conviction except when the offense is job-related.
Despite the passage of the Lily Ledbetter Act in 2009, which was designed to make it easier for victims of wage discrimination to use legal recourse, women’s wages continue to lag behind those of men. **Even when women have the same level of education and work in the same occupation as their male counterparts, they still only earn 77 cents on a man’s dollar.** This gap persists even in fields in which women dominate. For example, female secretaries earn 83% as much as male ones. For women of color, the earning potential gap is much more severe. **African-American women earn 61 cents for every dollar a white non-Hispanic man earns, and Latinas earn a mere 52 cents.** The wage gap exists along racial lines as well. Black men and women earn less money than their white counterparts, and Hispanic men and women earn less money than whites, Asians, and African Americans.

**A significant number of workers—10.5 million in 2010—live in poverty because they do not earn enough from their wages.** Blacks and Hispanics are much more likely to be among the working poor, and women who maintain families are more likely than their male counterparts to be working and poor. The future does not look promising in this regard. While we are slowly seeing jobs added to the U.S. economy, most of them pay low wages and offer no benefits. **About seven out of 10 growth occupations over the next decade will be low-wage.** The minimum wage is not sufficient to lift most fulltime workers with families above the poverty line and is not enough to **afford a market rate two-bedroom apartment in any state of the Union.** Furthermore, most low-income workers lack basic benefits such as paid sick time. A **disturbing 81% of low-wage workers** in industries such as retail, childcare and food services have no access to paid sick days.

**Undocumented and informal workers** including farm workers, restaurant workers, domestic workers, construction workers, and sex workers are **among the most vulnerable workers** in the country. Their rights to receive promised wages, to overtime for work performed, to healthy and safe conditions at work, and to workers compensation are often denied. Furthermore, domestic and farm workers are explicitly excluded from many labor law protections. Workers in the informal sector are generally immigrants and people of color. Human rights law requires the United States extend workplace protections to all workers regardless of immigration status.

Collective bargaining has historically enabled workers to negotiate better wages and benefits but union membership in the United States has dwindled. **Private-sector union membership is just over 7%, the lowest percentage since 1900.** For government workers, union membership is about 37%. Some states—North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Texas and Virginia—do not allow collective bargaining in the public sector. Wisconsin joined the ranks of states cutting collective bargaining rights for most public workers despite organized and loud protests. However, the constitutionality of that bill is currently being litigated. A **bill to curtail collective bargaining in Ohio was passed and then overturned by referendum in 2011.** **Michigan recently passed a bill to effectively end collective bargaining for all workers.** In addition, **Indiana passed a law prohibiting employment contracts that require workers who aren’t union members to pay representative fees.** Interestingly, **some corporations like Walmart that actively oppose unions in the United States have been willing to work and negotiate with unions in other countries where the governments have insisted on collective bargaining rights.**
Specific Human Rights Commitments made by the U.S. Government in 2011
The Obama Administration made specific commitments to promote decent work in its official response to the United Nations Human Rights Council's first ever comprehensive review of the United States' human rights record in 2010. In response to the review, called the Universal Periodic Review, the U.S. Government agreed to take steps to address disparities in socio-economic opportunities, to provide equal access to decent work, and to recognize the right to association as established by the International Labour Organization (ILO), for migrant, agricultural workers and domestic workers.

Human Rights groups advancing the Human Right to Decent Work
Coalition of Immokalee Workers ■ Black Workers for Justice ■ Mississippi Workers Center for Human Rights ■ United Workers Congress ■ Our Walmart ■ Warehouse Workers United ■ American Civil Liberties Union ■ National Domestic Workers Alliance ■ National Partnership for Women and Families ■ 9to5 National Association for Working Women ■ New York Communities for Change ■ United NY ■ The Black Institute ■ Center for Global Women's Leadership ■ Project South ■ Michigan Welfare Rights Organization ■ Poverty Initiative ■ Georgia Citizens Coalition on Hunger ■ Southwest Georgia Project for Community Education Inc ■ Sex Workers Project ■ National Economic and Social Rights Initiative ■ Human Rights Project at the Urban Justice Center ■ Vermont Workers Center
Voter Suppression

UDHR, Article 21
Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives. Everyone has the right of equal access to public service in his country. The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

The victories of women’s suffrage and civil rights movements were thought to have enshrined the right to vote as a human right in U.S. law, practice and culture. However, the last two years have ushered in a new wave of threats to this right.

Since the beginning of 2011, 41 states have introduced 180 laws that would restrict voting rights: 34 states tried to pass photo identification laws; 17 states tried to require proof of citizenship; 16 states tried to restrict voter registration; and 9 tried to reduce early voting hours. Many of these restrictive laws have been pushed with support from wealthy conservative backers including the Koch brothers, as well as ALEC (the American Legislative Exchange Council), a body made up of banks and corporations working with Republican legislators to craft laws that would undermine a number of human rights including voting rights, and environmental and labor protections.

The exciting story this year is that human rights and voting rights advocates pushed back, and as a result, significantly fewer people saw their voting rights curtailed. In two states—Maine and Ohio—voters fought back and repealed restrictive laws at the polls. Courts weakened or blocked restrictive laws, the Department of Justice blocked some measures, and in some states, governors vetoed restrictive laws. Today, there are 16 new laws and two executive actions that restrict voting: a total of 27 laws and executive actions since 2011.

Most of the restrictive voting laws introduced since 2011 were those that require voters to present identification to vote. Because advocates fought back, only six states were able to pass new voter identification laws, and two states—Kansas and Tennessee—were able institute new requirements for photo identification to vote in the 2012 elections. Laws requiring voters to present identification to vote have a disproportionate impact on people of color, the elderly, and people with low-incomes, who are all less likely to have government issued identification. About 1 in 4 African Americans and over 1 in 6 Latino citizens of voting age do not have a government-issued photo ID, compared to 8% of their white counterparts. In addition, 18% of Americans over the age of 65 (or 6 million senior citizens) do not have a government-issued photo. Failure to get photo identification is often associated with cost.

The United States remains one of the most restrictive countries in the world in denying the right to vote to people who have been convicted of a felony. About 1 in 40 adults is not able to exercise the right to vote due to a current or previous felony conviction and this disproportionately impacts African Americans and Latinos. African Americans are the most negatively impacted voters in this regard and are disenfranchised at a rate four times more than non African Americans for both men and women. Two states—Florida and Iowa—passed
new laws to further restrict voting rights for people convicted of felonies. The result in both states now permanently disenfranchises most citizens with past felony convictions. South Dakota also passed a law imposing more restrictions on citizens with felony convictions by denying voting rights to people on probation.

Specific Human Rights Commitments made by the U.S. Government in 2011
During a recent review of the United States on its human rights record, a recommendation was made to the U.S. Government that it ensures the enjoyment of the right to vote both by persons deprived of their liberty and of persons who have completed their prison sentences. The government responded that it supported the recommendation only to the extent that some state laws conform to it. Given that only two states—Vermont and Maine—allow people convicted of felonies to vote, and that most people with a felony conviction do not have the right to vote, we find this response inadequate.

Human Rights groups advancing the Human Right to Vote
NAACP ■ Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law ■ Los Angeles Community Action Network (LA CAN) ■ Brennan Center for Justice ■ American Civil Liberties Union
Housing

UDHR, Article 25
Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including housing

The human right to adequate housing should be something that people in the wealthy economies like the United States take for granted. Nevertheless, in the United States, about 1 in 194 people will experience homelessness in the course of a year, and this number likely undercounts the actual problem. As the report goes to press, countless families are facing homelessness in the wake of Hurricane Sandy. Homelessness has been exacerbated by the economic crisis. One estimate indicates that in 2010 alone, family homelessness rose at an average of 9% in cities.

Some groups are at a much higher risk for homelessness. Compared to the general population, 1 in 13 people recently released from prison is homeless; 1 in 12 people living with family or friends out of economic necessity is homeless; and 1 in 11 of young adults who have aged out of foster care is homeless. African Americans and Native Americans are disproportionately homeless, as are veterans.

As homelessness has increased, so have measures instituted to punish the homeless, including laws that criminalize sleeping or sitting in public spaces.

Domestic violence is a leading cause of homelessness for women. In an effort to address this issue, the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) provides new housing rights for women and protects individuals applying for or living in public and subsidized housing from discrimination based on their status as survivors of domestic violence. Thanks to the valiant efforts of human rights and women’s rights advocates, VAWA was reauthorized in early 2012 with key provisions intact despite efforts to weaken the bill.

One of the reasons for increased homelessness is the foreclosure crisis. Since 2007, over 2.5 million homes have been foreclosed. Many of these foreclosures stem from predatory lending practices that target communities of color and poor borrowers. Almost all foreclosed homes are at least temporarily vacant, and many are vacant for years. It is estimated that there are five vacant homes for every homeless person (18.5 million vacant homes to 3.5 million homeless) in the United States. It is simply immoral to have houses lying vacant as families are living on the streets. To address this issue, some human rights activists have started taking over foreclosed property to provide temporary housing to homeless families, a disproportionate number of whom are women of color with children.

In addition to people losing their homes, the affordable housing stock has shrunk over the past few years. It is estimated that there are only 37 affordable housing units for every 100 households. One in 4 renters spends more than half their income in rent; and almost 3 in 4 extremely low-income renters pay more than half their income in rent. Public housing has also has seen its stock decrease over the years as cities have destroyed the units including in New Orleans, Atlanta, and several others. It is important to note that public housing provides
affordable housing to people with fixed or very low incomes and is home to approximately 2.2 million seniors, low-income families and people with disabilities.

Specific Human Rights Commitments made by the U.S. Government in 2011
The Obama Administration has agreed to continue to take steps to ensure “adequate housing at an affordable price for all segments of the American society.” It also committed to ensure that people are protected from discrimination based on race in accessing housing.

Human Rights groups advancing the Human Right to Housing
National Law Center for Homelessness and Poverty ■ Just Cause/Causa Justa ■ Take Back the Land ■ Chicago Anti-Eviction Campaign ■ Picture the Homeless ■ Poverty and Race Research Action Council ■ National Economic and Social Rights Initiative ■ Witness
Education

UDHR, Article 26
Everyone has the right to education...Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. 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. Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.

The United States should be a frontrunner in providing a quality education for all. Instead, we currently rank 17th of countries surveyed in a global report on the best education systems. We continue to see sharp educational disparities disproportionately impacting children living in poverty and children of color.

Unfortunately, the circumstance into which a child is born in the United States has a significant impact on their academic achievement. The social and economic situation of a child's parents in the United States is one of the greatest predictors of the child’s academic and educational attainment.

No Child Left Behind, the education policy instituted in 2001 to help address the achievement gap has largely failed to bridge the achievement gap. The Obama Administration’s signature education initiative, Race to the Top, is designed to catalyze reforms and encourage innovation in education but has been largely criticized as not ensuring equal opportunities for all students particularly in communities of color and has not focused enough on investing in quality teachers. A recent study on improving education attainment concluded that there were no substitutes for good teachers and that all successful school systems find ways to attract the best people to the teaching profession including investing in ongoing, relevant trainings, and treating teachers with respect as valuable professionals.

The Race to the Top initiative also steers funding to charter schools. Charter schools may provide some answers for some students, but on average, students in charter schools have
performed worse than students in nearby public schools. In addition, charter schools divert important resources from public education to schools that have generally served a limited pool of students, including privileged students with parents who can and know how to navigate the system. Similarly, school vouchers, the private school choice option that provides funding generally through lotteries to pay for low-income children to attend private schools, have produced varying results and diverted funding from regular public schools. They reflect a problematic trend towards the privatization of education. Education is a human right and a public good. Privatization raises real concerns that profit will be prioritized over providing a quality universal education.

In addition to receiving a poor education, many students of color are also being pushed out of school and steered towards the criminal system. This happens because students of color are disproportionately punished for infractions in school that puts them on a path towards the criminal justice system. This pattern, known as the School-to-Prison pipeline, disproportionately affects students of color and grossly violates the human right to education.

Students in the United States are being suspended at unprecedented rates and often for minor mischief like “disruptive behavior,” “insubordination” or school fights. Increasingly, law enforcement officers are in schools handling discipline issues. As a result, school arrests are increasing with students’ educations being disrupted. In some schools, low-scoring students are pushed out to help increase the overall test scores of the school.

The impact of increased suspensions, expulsions and arrests is felt most by students of color, students with disabilities, students in foster care and LGBTQ students. Black students are 3.5 times more likely to be expelled than white students for the same infractions. Latino students are 2 times and Native American students 1.5 times more likely to be expelled students. Students who are suspended, expelled or arrested in school are more likely to drop out or graduate late, and young people who do not finish high school are more than eight times more likely to go to prison than students who graduate. In effect, the increased pushing out of children from school not only violates their human right to an education but other human rights as well.

Specific Human Rights Commitments made by the U.S. Government in 2011
The Obama Administration has committed to take steps to promote educational opportunities for all, both in law and in fact, and to address racial discrimination and inequalities in education. It also committed to increase access to education to prisoners and to incorporate human rights training and education strategies into public policies.

Human Rights groups advancing the Human Right to Education
Dignity in Schools Campaign ■ Advancement Project ■ Independent Commission on Public Education (ICOPE) ■ NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund (LDF) ■ Latino Justice ■ MALDEF ■ CADRE ■ American Civil Liberties Union ■ Poverty and Race Research Action Council ■ National Economic and Social Rights Initiative
Health and Reproductive Justice

UDHR, Article 25
Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of...sickness...Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection.

Every human being irrespective of income, race, gender, immigration status, sexuality or other status has the right to attain the highest attainable standard of health. Yet, in the United States, socioeconomic status and race are two strong predictors of whether one enjoys good health. People with higher incomes, more years of education, and more prestigious jobs have a higher chance of enjoying good health than people who don’t. African Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and Pacific Islanders experience adverse health outcomes at higher rates than white Americans. They are more likely to suffer from illnesses such as hypertension, cancer, diabetes, stroke, HIV/AIDS, and obesity and are more likely to die from them.

One of the most important indicators of a nation's health is its infant mortality rate. Despite spending more of its wealth than any other country in the world on healthcare, the United States ranks 30th in infant mortality. Compared to all other groups, African Americans are three times as likely to die in infancy.

Health disparities and poor health outcomes are driven by the lack of access to quality health insurance. People who are uninsured are less likely to have regular medical care or to see a doctor, and more likely to delay care due to its cost. When they get care, it is generally lower quality care than people with insurance get. Living without insurance endangers not only the human right to health but also the human right to life. People who are uninsured are 40% more likely to die from illness than people with private insurance. The majority of people who do not have insurance are poor or low-income. Medicaid does not cover all poor people. Young adults
are the least likely to have insurance. And Hispanics and blacks are disproportionately uninsured. About 10% of children in the United States do not have health coverage, though this number marks an improvement over the years as a result of the Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP). Immigrants are disproportionately likely to be uninsured, and one in three of immigrants (documented and undocumented) are uninsured.

Economic status should not be the determining factor in whether a woman enjoys her right to reproductive justice, but in the United States it is. This is particularly apparent when it comes to access to safe abortions especially with the restrictions of the Hyde Amendment. The Hyde Amendment is a provision in the federal budget barring use of Medicaid funding for abortions except in cases of incest, rape, or when a woman’s life is endangered. Because Medicaid is a public health insurance option for people who have low-incomes, the impact is disproportionately felt by poor women and women of color who are more likely to be on public insurance. Access to safe abortion is necessary for women to fully enjoy their human right to reproductive health. Although abortions are legal in the United States, there have been efforts in a number of states, with over 50 measures, to restrict abortion and undermine preventive care and family planning. This climate could aggravate attacks on abortion clinics by private individuals and groups as attacks continue to present an issue.

Women’s reproductive health is further jeopardized in prison. Pregnant women who are detained in prisons, jails, and immigration facilities in the United States continue to be shackled during transportation to medical appointments and while giving birth. Shackling pregnant women is a violation of human rights and has a disproportionate impact on poor women and women of color given that they comprise the majority of women prisoners. Human rights advocates have fought and won important victories banning shackling of pregnant women in 15 states. However, it is still legal to shackle pregnant women in prison in the other 35 states.

A combination of factors: lack of coverage, discriminatory policies, anti-immigrant sentiment, and environmental racism (discussed in the next section), result in millions of women being denied access to reproductive health care.

In 2010, President Barack Obama took a significant step in advancing the human right to health and extended healthcare coverage for up to 30 million previously uninsured people by pushing for and signing the Affordable Care Act. Under the new law, millions of Americans will no longer be denied coverage because of preexisting conditions, and women will benefit from guaranteed coverage of preventive services including contraception without co-payments among other benefits. This will be of particular benefit to women of color who are less likely to be insured. In addition, millions of young adults are now able to stay covered under their parents’ insurance until the age of 26. Affordable and expansive health care coverage is an essential part of ending health disparities and fulfilling the human right to health. However, the Affordable Care Act has some glaring problems: it failed to achieve universal coverage. There are still over 20 million who will not be covered by the Act. Specifically, the Affordable Care Act does not extend coverage to undocumented immigrants even when they can afford to buy insurance for themselves denying them the human right to healthcare and health. Universal coverage is possible in the United States and some groups are leading the way. Groups in Vermont were able to pass universal coverage, and human rights advocates continue to work towards achieving universal coverage.
Specific Human Rights Commitments made by the U.S. Government in 2011

The Obama Administration has committed to ensure the realization of the human right to health for all people who live in the United States and its territories, as well as for prisoners. However, it qualified the commitment by stating that it expects to realize this right progressively. The Administration also agreed to ensure access to healthcare without discrimination based on race, but declined to reconsider its decision to restrict access to publicly supported healthcare to undocumented immigrants claiming that they have access through “an extensive network of Migrant Health Centers.”

Human Rights groups advancing the Human Right to Health and Reproductive Justice

SPARK Reproductive Justice Now ■ Center for Reproductive Rights ■ Woodhull Sexual Freedom Alliance ■ SisterSong ■ National Economic and Social Rights Initiative ■ Vermont Workers Center ■ National Advocates for Pregnant Women ■ American Civil Liberties Union
Environmental Justice

United Nations Human Rights Commission; in Resolution 2005/57
A democratic and equitable international order requires, inter alia, the realization of the right of every person and all peoples to a healthy environment.

The environment—surrounding conditions in which people are born, grow, live, work, and play—is an important determinant of the human right to health and well-being. Environmental hazards are borne disproportionately by communities of color, indigenous peoples, and those living in economically disadvantaged areas. Furthermore, climate change, as evidenced by Hurricane Katrina and recently Hurricane Sandy, is having a disproportionate negative impact on poor communities and communities of color. Environmental justice seeks to reduce these inequitable environmental burdens.

Almost 3 out of 4 African Americans live in counties that violate federal air pollution standards, as do 58% of the white population. Air pollution is a trigger for asthma, the leading chronic disease for children. African Americans and Native American children are most likely to have asthma and bear some of the biggest risks. African Americans and Puerto Ricans are three times more likely to die from asthma-related causes than whites. Black children are four times more likely to die from asthma related problems than whites.

Living near a hazardous waste facility exposes people to additional toxins. People of color are also more likely to live near hazardous waste facilities. Nearly half of all people of color in the United States live within three kilometers of a hazardous waste facility. Additionally, about six million Americans live within three miles of a coal power plant. These plants tend to be disproportionately located in low-income communities and communities of color. Hazardous waste facilities and coal-fired power plants tend to result in inequitable health outcomes for low income communities and communities of color.

In one example, residents of Mossville, Louisiana, a historic African American community, are exposed to an average level of dioxins—toxic chemicals linked to cancer, reproductive damage,
and significant harm to fetal and child development—that is three times higher than the exposure in the general U.S. population. Not surprisingly, Mossville residents are surrounded by 14 toxic industrial facilities that regularly release dioxins into the air, water, and land. Despite residents’ complaints about health problems, governmental agencies continue to issue permits which allow the industrial facilities to increase the amount of toxic pollution, including dioxins that they release into the Mossville community. Human rights advocates are fighting back and have filed a petition with the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights that received a favorable decision setting an important precedent.

Inadequate and unsafe housing and work settings also expose vulnerable groups to pollutants and toxins that impact their health. Unhealthy housing contributes to infectious and chronic diseases, adverse childhood developmental problems, and other injuries. African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans are at least twice as likely to live in inadequate housing as non-Hispanic whites. Because women and people of color are more likely to be low-wage workers, they are disproportionately exposed to many hazardous chemicals, including agricultural pesticides, home cleaning products, industrial cleaning products, and chemicals used in workplaces such as hair and nail salons. Exposure to chemicals has been linked to infertility, reproductive cancers, and birth related problems.

Native Americans have also been prime targets of environmental violence in the United States. In addition to losing millions of acres of lands, they have witnessed nuclear weapons testing and uranium mining on their lands, including in but not limited to, New Mexico (Eastern Navajo reservation), California (Mohave reservation), Idaho (Skull Valley Goshutes reservation), and Nevada (Western Shoshone reservation). The presence of pollution from mines and similar activities have been linked to contamination of water and lung, heart, and kidney disease, and cancer. In a small step towards addressing this, the Administration recently reached a settlement agreement to cleanup a former open pit uranium mine on the Spokane Indian Reservation in Washington.

There are a number of other proposed projects that could cause environmental harm to indigenous habitats, including the Keystone XL pipeline, which if constructed, would transport tar-sands oil 1,700 miles across six states and hundreds of waterways, posing an unacceptable risk of spill, threaten sacred burial grounds, and potentially contaminate the only source of water in the plains. If the project moves forward, it would pose a threat to indigenous and non-indigenous people alike. An existing pipeline called Keystone 1 has leaked 14 times since it began operating in June 2010. Human rights and environmental advocates have mobilized to halt construction of the pipeline, and the Obama Administration has put a tenuous hold on the construction for part of the pipeline saying it needs time to study environmental impact. Another project, the Pebble Mine in Alaska’s Bristol Bay watershed, would be one of the largest mines in the world if constructed, and by accounts given to the UN, would seriously threaten the sockeye salmon fisheries, a source of livelihood for many indigenous people in the area, if developed according to current plans.

With the loss of their land, indigenous peoples have also lost control over lands of cultural and religious significance impacting their cultural rights. The ability of indigenous peoples to use and access their sacred places is often restricted by mining, logging, and other development projects. Often, the mere presence of these activities signifies a desecration.
Specific Human Rights Commitments made by the U.S. Government in 2011
The Obama Administration has committed to ensure the participation of indigenous peoples in the decisions affecting their natural environment, measures of subsistence, culture and spiritual practices. This commitment should naturally extend to other communities.

Human Rights groups advancing the Human Right to Environmental Justice
Advocates for Environmental Human Rights ■ Coastal Women for Change ■ International Indian Treaty Council ■ New Mexico Environmental Law Center ■ Environment and Human Rights Advisory ■ Survivors Village ■ Moving Forward Gulf Coast Inc. ■ Mvskoke Food Sovereignty Initiative ■ Tonatierra ■ WE ACT for Environmental Justice
Mass Incarceration

UDHR, Article 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10

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.... 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.

The United States incarcerates more people than any other country in the world. The U.S. incarceration rate has risen exponentially moving beyond the imprisonment of individual offenders to the systemic imprisonment of specific groups, in particular, African Americans. There are more African Americans under correctional control today than there were during slavery in 1850, and more are disenfranchised today than in 1870. This phenomenon amounts to the “creation of an under caste—a lower caste of individuals who are permanently barred by law and custom from mainstream society.”

Two-thirds of the two million prisoners in the United States are African American or Hispanic. Black men have an imprisonment rate that is nearly seven times higher than white males. Assuming that current incarceration rates remain unchanged, approximately 1 in 17 white men is expected to serve time in prison during his lifetime; 1 in 6 Hispanic men is expected to do so, and 1 in 3 African American men is expected to be incarcerated in his lifetime. Indigenous peoples also face disproportionate rates of incarceration.

Women are the fastest growing population in incarceration, and this is particularly evident with women of color. Black women represent 30% of all incarcerated women in the United
States even though they represent 13% of the female population. Black women are imprisoned at a rate nearly three times that of white women. Hispanic women represent 16% of incarcerated women, though they make up only 11% of all U.S. women.

Many might think the drastic rise in incarceration rates is linked to increased crime, but in reality, crime rates have fluctuated over the last few decades. While crime rates are at historical lows, imprisonment rates have consistently soared. In fact when the drug war was officially declared, drug crime had already been in decline. The drug laws have increased the incarceration rate ten-fold over the past few decades. More than half of America’s federal inmates today are in prison on drug convictions and most of them—4 out of 5—are arrested for simple possession.

African Americans and Latinos are disproportionately targeted by drug laws. In at least 15 states, Blacks are admitted to prison on drug charges at a rate from 20 to 57 times greater than that of white men. And in some states, African Americans make up 80%-90% of all drug offenders sent to prison. Contrary to popular belief, these numbers are not driven by higher drug activity in the black community. Some studies indicate that white youth are significantly more likely to engage in illegal drug dealing than black youth. Drug use among African Americans is not necessarily more severe or dangerous, and white youth have about three times the number of drug-related visits to the emergency room as their African American counterparts.

Serving time in prison is only one aspect of the criminal justice system. People of color caught up in the system are subjected to surveillance, prosecutorial discretion, mandatory minimum sentences, and have limited access to work, public housing, and public assistance. Furthermore, the conditions of imprisonment including solitary confinement and physical, mental and sexual abuse all constitute human rights violations.

The mass incarceration of people of color in prisons often located away from their communities not only strips communities of color of human and social capital but also political capital. People of color are often incarcerated far from their communities in rural, demographically white communities where prisons are located. The problem is that the Census counts prisoners as residents of the prison location district despite the fact that they cannot vote, and they are not county residents. For example, almost all of New York state prison cells are located in state senate districts that are disproportionately white, and in Connecticut, 75% of the state's prison cells are in state house districts that are disproportionately white.

The treatment of youth in the criminal system is perhaps the most troubling statement on our society. Human rights law prohibits life without the possibility of parole for children who commit crimes before the age of 18. Yet, the United States is the only country in the world that engages in this practice. There are currently an estimated 2,570 children sentenced to die in prison in the United States. Human rights law also mandates that children be treated differently than adults in the criminal system, but each year about 250,000 children under 18 end up in the adult system. New York and North Carolina considers all 16 and 17-year-olds as adults in criminal proceedings.

As with the adult system, children of color bear the disproportionate burden of human rights violations inflicted through the criminal system. Black children are nine times more likely than
white children to receive an adult prison sentence. Hispanic children are 40% more likely to be admitted to adult prison than white children. Children in adult systems have a very high chance of being victimized and have constituted between 13-21% of inmate-on-inmate sexual violence victims when they constitute only 1% of all inmates in jail. As a result, for their protection, they are often put in isolation for up to 23 ½ hours a day. Solitary confinement of children is a serious human rights violation and can constitute cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment under human rights law.

The tireless work of domestic human rights advocates has resulted in some recent victories for children in the criminal system. In June 2012, the Supreme Court ruled that the automatic sentencing of children to life in prison without the possibility of parole even for homicides is unconstitutional and constitutes cruel and unusual punishment. Nevertheless, judges still have the discretion to impose life-without-parole sentences if they determine it is appropriate. The recent Supreme Court decision comes on the heels of other progressive court decisions including the prohibition of the death penalty for children and restricting life without the possibility of parole to homicide only.

Specific Human Rights Commitments made by the U.S. Government in 2011
The Obama Administration has committed to take appropriate measures to prevent racial bias in the criminal justice system. It also agreed to review minimum mandatory sentences in order to assess their disproportionate impact on the racial and ethnic minorities and examine alternative avenues for handling petty crime. In addition, the Administration committed to take steps to improve the situation of inmates in prison. Disappointingly, the Administration refused to renounce or take steps to end the application of life in prison without parole sentences for children. It also rejected a recommendation to ensure that imprisonment is only used as a last resort when sentencing children who have committed offenses.

Human Rights groups advancing the Human Right to Equal Treatment
Sentencing Project ■ Center for Constitutional Rights ■ Campaign for the Fair Sentencing of Youth ■ Malcolm X Grassroots Movement ■ All of US or None ■ Southern Center for Human Rights ■ Malcolm X Center for Self-Determination ■ Youth Justice Coalition ■ Families and Friends of Louisiana's Incarcerated Children ■ American Civil Liberties Union ■ Rights Working Group ■ Midwest Coalition for Human Rights ■ Georgia Latino Alliance for Human Rights
**Death Penalty**

*UDHR, Article 3, 5*
*Everyone has the right to life, liberty and the security of person. No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.*

Putting convicted persons to death remains a longstanding and deplorable human rights abuse in the United States. As forensic science has advanced we are learning of a growing number of innocent people that have been put to death or who have spent years on death row – lives and years lost due to a faulty and racially biased criminal justice system, one which applies the ultimate, irreversible punishment. Application of the death penalty violates the right to life and the right not to be subjected to torture and other inhumane treatment. The United States remains one of the few countries to apply the death penalty with 141 countries having abolished it. Only three countries execute more people than the U.S. each year: China, Iran and Saudi Arabia.

**Methods of execution** include lethal injection, electrocution, gas chamber, hanging, and firing squad. **Botched executions** are possible with any method used, occurring because of the victims’ reaction to the drugs used, equipment failure and/or human error. It took medics 30 minutes to find the vein to administer the lethal injection to Brandon Joseph Rhodes (executed in Georgia in September 2010) and then 14 minutes for the lethal drugs to kill him. The methods utilized to put inmates to death and botched executions are tantamount to torture and cruel and inhumane punishment.

**Since the re-instatement of the death penalty in 1976, 1,317 people have been put to death in the U.S.** Although trends show a decrease in the number of death sentences and executions in the last decade, **thirty three states continue to administer the death penalty.** A 2010 Death Penalty Information Center poll of 1,500 registered voters found public opinion shifting with a majority (61%) choosing a punishment other than the death penalty for murder. While California’s Proposition 34, which sought to abolish the death penalty in the state, did not pass in the recent election, it was voted down in a close vote with 53% of voters opposing it.
While some trends would suggest that attitudes may be shifting on the issue here in the U.S., the Georgia execution of Troy Davis in September 2011 underscores the continuing injustices associated with capital punishment. Davis, an African American man convicted of killing a white police officer, was put to death despite serious doubts about his presumed guilt. Questions surrounded evidence used to convict him with seven of the nine witnesses contradicting their testimony or admitting it was false. There was a global outcry in response to this travesty of justice.

Proponents of the death penalty argue that it deters crime and costs less than life imprisonment. Multiple studies have shown that capital punishment does neither. The southern United States, which accounts for 80% of all executions, also has the highest crime rate. A 2009 study found that 88% of the heads of the country’s top academic crime associations reject the position that the death penalty acts as a deterrent to murder. It costs far more to execute a person than to keep him or her in prison for life as studies in New Jersey, California and Maryland have demonstrated.

The single most reliable predictor of whether someone will be sentenced to death is the race of the victim. A 2005 study found that African American defendants convicted of killing a white person are three times more likely to receive the death penalty in California, with Latinos four times more likely. Application of the death penalty also disproportionately impacts people who are poor with most defendants unable to afford an attorney and court-appointed attorneys often inexperienced.

In the past decade some advances have been made with the Supreme Court ruling to limit application of the death penalty in cases involving juvenile offenders and persons with mental disabilities. In 2005, the Supreme Court ruled against the death penalty as a sentence for persons convicted of a crime committed as a juvenile. In 2002, the Supreme Court ruled that it is unconstitutional to execute persons with “mental retardation.”

Too often politicians avoid discussing the real issues behind criminality, instead advocating the use of the death penalty as a catch-all solution to making the public safer. The death penalty does not deter crime, it is applied in a racially biased manner, and the exorbitant costs spent on each case could be redirected to address more effectively inherent problems in the criminal justice system. To meet its human rights obligation, the United States should move immediately to abolish the death penalty. Several states have discontinued the practice of applying the death penalty, with former Illinois Governor George Ryan commuting all death sentences in the state to life imprisonment, calling the death penalty system “arbitrary and capricious – and therefore immoral.” The review of the death penalty in New Jersey points to the many reasons to abolish it.

Specific Human Rights Commitments made by the U.S. Government in 2011
During the UN Human Rights Council Universal Periodic Review of the United States, several countries called on the U.S. Government to abolish the death penalty and to implement a federal level moratorium in the intervening period until abolition is achieved. The U.S. Government declined to accept these recommendations but noted a decrease in the number of cases for which the death penalty was applied, and noted that the Supreme Court has ruled to exclude from a possible death penalty sentence persons who committed a crime before age of
18 and with intellectual disabilities. Nevertheless, the Obama Administration committed to undertake studies to determine reasons for the race disparities in the application of the death penalty and to identify strategies for addressing these disparities.

**Human Rights groups organizing to end the Death Penalty**
National Coalition to Abolish the Death Penalty  ■  Amnesty International USA  ■  Georgians for Alternatives to the Death Penalty  ■  Southern Center for Human Rights  ■  American Civil Liberties Union  ■  NAACP
Immigration Policy

UDHR, Article 1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 23, 25

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. No one shall be held in slavery or servitude; slavery and the slave trade shall be prohibited in all their forms. 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. 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 has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favorable conditions of work and to protection against unemployment. Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. Immigration laws in the United States put undocumented immigrants at heightened risk for human rights violations. Furthermore, an insistence by many on using the term “illegal” applied to human beings who do not have proper immigration documentation renders them more susceptible to human rights violations. No human being’s existence should be deemed illegal.

The total number of undocumented immigrants is unknown, although recent government numbers estimate that about 11.1 million people are living in the United States without a commonsense roadmap to citizenship. Undocumented immigrants face a myriad of human rights challenges including detention, deportation, family separation, violence, lack of counsel, denial of healthcare coverage, racial profiling, denial of labor protections, and slave-like work conditions. Unfortunately, we do not have a comprehensive immigration law that provides a
path to citizenship, so most undocumented immigrants have no practical avenues to regularize their status.

There are currently more than 400,000 immigrants detained every year. The increased trend towards immigration detention is a relatively recent. Detained immigrants are not locked up for any crime they have committed but rather to ensure that they show up for their hearings and comply with the court’s decision. Immigration laws are also used to target, detain, and deport Muslims. While in detention, immigrants are routinely denied the right to a lawyer and to a speedy trial. The result is that people can sometimes spend years in detention separated from their families while they work to prove that they have the right to stay in the country.

Deportations of all immigrants—documented and undocumented—have increased over the last few decades. The 1996 immigration laws expanded the list of crimes that documented immigrants could be deported for including minor, nonviolent crimes. Additional changes to immigration and anti-terrorism laws after the September 11, 2001 attacks targeted male immigrants from 25 countries as well as selected individuals from other states to submit biometric data, conduct in-person interviews with immigration officers, and re-register on an annual basis through the National Security Entry-Exit Registration System (NSEERS) program. It also expanded enforcement powers. The Obama Administration has also aggressively pursued deportations, doubling the number over the last four years.

Immigrant workers, and especially undocumented and temporary guest workers, are exposed to frequent and cruel human rights violations with few protections. The lack of work authorization allows unscrupulous employers to take advantage of undocumented workers sometimes denying them fair treatment, wages, and sometimes subjected to beatings. Many farmworkers have found themselves held captive by employers using threats and actual violence. Undocumented workers are far more likely to experience violations of wage-and-hour laws, particularly if they are women. Low-wage temporary guest workers too often find themselves housed in isolated labor camps, sometimes without electricity or heat, and completely dependent on their employers for transportation to work, to purchase groceries, or go to the bank.

In the absence of commonsense federal immigration reform, states—including Arizona, Alabama and Georgia—have enacted immigration laws that constitute serious human rights violations. The Supreme Court blocked several problematic provisions of the laws including attempts to deny to undocumented immigrants the right to an education, and criminalizing a failure to appropriate immigration documents, attempts by undocumented immigrants to find work, and providing undocumented immigrants with housing or transport. Nevertheless, the Supreme Court upheld provisions that effectively allow law enforcement officers to attempt to verify a person’s immigration status during a stop, detention, or arrest if they have reasonable suspicion that the person may not have proper immigration documentation. This means that people of color—Latinos, African Americans, Native Americans, Asians and Arabs, people of mixed racial backgrounds, or anyone perceived to be a member of these groups—will be targeted and expected to show documentation to clarify their residency status. This practice is racial profiling and violates human rights law.

There are some positive but modest steps on the immigration reform front. The Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), enacted this year by President Obama is a good first step
to ensuring the human rights of many immigrants. It will temporarily allow some immigrants brought to the United States as children to remain in the country for an additional two years without the threat of deportation and to obtain work permits. At the state level, Maryland voters passed a ballot measure that allows Maryland students to pay in-state tuition at Maryland universities regardless of immigration status as long as they have graduated from a Maryland high school and fulfilled other requirements.

**Specific Human Rights Commitments made by the U.S. Government in 2011**
The Obama Administration has committed to prevent cruel or lethal force in immigration control but emphasized that immigration officers sometimes have to use force including for self-defense. The Administration agreed to eliminate discrimination and abuse of authority by police officers against migrants, and to prohibit and punish the use of racial profiling in immigration law enforcement. It also agreed to prevent the enslavement of farm workers.

**Human Rights groups organizing to advance the Human Rights of Immigrants**
This report provides a brief overview of human rights concerns in the United States today, and an introduction to the work that groups and communities in the domestic human rights movement are engaged in. We invite you to join the domestic human rights movement.

Organizations featured for the 64 Day Campaign for Human Rights (Full list)
9 to 5 National Association of Working Women; ACLU Human Rights Program; Advocates for Environmental Human Rights; Advocates for Human Rights; All of US or None; Amigos Multicultural Services Center; Asian Law Caucus; Atlanta Public Sector Alliance; Black Alliance for Just Immigration; Black Workers for Justice; Border Action Network; Breakthrough; Center for Constitutional Rights; Center for Global Women's Leadership; Center for Reproductive Rights; Center for the Human Rights of Users and Survivors of Psychiatry; Chicago Anti-Eviction Campaign/Chicago Independent Human Rights Council; Coalition of Immokalee Workers; Coastal Women for Change; Environment and Human Rights Advisory; Families and Friends of Louisiana’s Incarcerated Children; Four Freedoms Forum; Georgia Citizens Coalition on Hunger; Georgians for Alternatives to The Death Penalty; Hawai’i Institute for Human Rights; Indigenous Alliance Without Borders/Alianza Indigena Sin Fronteras; International Indian Treaty Council; Just Cause/Causa Justa; Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; Los Angeles Community Action Network; Malcolm X Center for Self-Determination; Malcolm X Grassroots Movement; Meiklejohn Civil Liberties Institute; Michigan Welfare Rights Organization; Midwest Coalition for Human Rights; Mississippi Workers Center for Human Rights; Moving Forward Gulf Coast Inc.; Mvskoke Food Sovereignty Initiative; NAACP; National Economic Social Rights Initiative; National Gay and Lesbian Task Force; National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty; National Network for Immigrant and Refugee Rights; New Mexico Environmental Law Center; Poverty and Race Research Action Council; Poverty Initiative; Project South; Rights Working Group; Self Advocates Becoming Empowered; Sister Song; Southern Center for Human Rights; Southerners on New Ground (SONG); Southwest Georgia Project for Community Education Inc.; SPARK Reproductive Justice Now!; Survivors Village; Tonatierra; United Worker's Congress; Urban Justice Center-Human Rights Project; Vermont Workers’ Center; Voices of the Heart Inc.; Witness; Woodhull Sexual Freedom Alliance; Youth Justice Coalition.