

***Maria da Penha v. Brazil* in the Inter-
American Commission on Human Rights:
An Analysis of the Impacts of the
Convention of Belém do Pará in the
Federal Legislation**

Aléxia Duarte Torrest†

INTRODUCTION

In 1995, Brazil ratified the Inter-American Convention on the Prevention, Punishment, and Eradication of Violence Against Women, also known as the Convention of *Belém do Pará*, an international treaty focused on violence against women.¹

In 1992, Brazil also signed the American Convention on Human Rights, which made possible the processing of reports of human rights violations initiated by NGOs and victims. In the second half of the 1990s, a relevant case was sent to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights: the case *Maria da Penha*.

This article analyzes the impacts of the case in the federal legislation, particularly the implementation of Law nº 11.340/2006, known as “*Maria da Penha Law*,” drafted for feminist organizations and submitted by the National Congress in 2004. This article also presents the additional effects of the law as the redefinition of the family institution, and the inclusion of the gender ideology.

I. FACTS OF THE *MARIA DA PENHA* CASE

On August 20, 1998, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR), under the Organization of American States (OAS) received a petition filed by Mrs. Maria da Penha Maia Fernandes, the Center for Justice and International Law (CEJIL), and the Latin American

*This paper was submitted in fulfillment of the writing requirement for the Edmund Burke Fellowship program held by the Center for Family & Human Rights (C-Fam). Special thanks to Susan Yoshihara and Stefano Gennarini for selecting the best submissions. † Aléxia Duarte Torres received her J.D. in 2016 from Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Minas Gerais in Brazil.

¹ Organization of American States, Inter-American Convention on the Prevention, Punishment and Eradication of the Violence Women (Convention Belém do Pará), June 9, 1994, 27 U.S.T. 3301, 33 I.L.M. 1534.

and Caribbean Committee for the Defense of Women's Rights (CLADEM),² as provided for in Articles 44 and 46 of the American Convention on Human Rights and Article 12 of the Inter-American Convention on the Prevention, Punishment, and Eradication of Violence against Women (Convention of *Belém do Pará* or CMV).

The petition stated that on May 29, 1983, Maria da Penha a pharmacist, was the victim of attempted murder by her then husband, Marco Antônio Heredia Viveiros, originally from Colombia-naturalized Brazilian economist, at her home in Fortaleza, Ceará State. He shot her while she was asleep, bringing to a climax a series of acts of aggression carried out over the course of their married life. Because of this aggression of her spouse, Maria da Penha sustained serious injuries, had to undergo numerous operations, and suffered irreversible paraplegia and other physical and psychological trauma.³

In 2001, the IACHR published a report of merit on this case, concluding that the Brazilian State had "violated the rights of Mrs. Maria da Penha Maia Fernandes to a fair trial and judicial protection."⁴ The IACHR recommended "the State conduct a serious, impartial, and exhaustive investigation in order to establish the criminal liability of the perpetrator for the attempted murder of Maria da Penha and to determine whether there are any other events or actions of State agents that have prevented the rapid and effective prosecution of the perpetrator."⁵

The IACHR also recommended "prompt and effective compensation for the victim and the adoption of measures at the national level to eliminate tolerance by the State of domestic violence against women."⁶ The Commission also recommended that the State adopt public policy measures, put an end to state tolerance of domestic violence against women in Brazil, and establish mechanisms that serve as alternative to judicial mechanisms and simplify criminal judicial proceedings.

In addition to the recommendations by the IACHR pertaining to reparation of the victim's individual rights, this was the first case in which

² *Maria da Penha Maia Fernandes v. Brazil*, Case 12.051, Inter-Am. Comm'n H.R., Report No. 54/01, OEA/Ser.L/V/II.111, doc. 20 rev. (2000).

³ Alda Maria Sousa Gant, *Domestic Violence against Women as a Human Right Violation*, 3 REVISTA DO INSTITUTO BRASILEIRO DE DIREITOS HUMANOS 9, 9-21 (2002).

⁴ Lee Hasselbacher, *State Obligations Regarding Domestic Violence: The European Court of Human Rights, Due Diligence, And International Legal Minimums of Protection*, 8 NW. J. INT'L. HUM. RTS. 190 (2010).

⁵ *Maria da Penha* at 704.

⁶ *Id.*

an international human rights organization applied the Convention *Belém do Pará*, issuing an unpublished decision in which a country that signed the convention was also, for the first time, responsible for domestic violence practiced by an individual.⁷

In October 2002, the government, through the Secretaria de Estado dos Direitos da Mulher (State Secretary of Women's Rights or SEDIM), created at the very end of Fernando Henrique Cardoso's second term, began to pay attention to the case of Maria da Penha. The head of SEDIM, Solange Bentes, then pressured the Superior Tribunal de Justiça (Superior Tribunal of Justice) to conclude the appeal against the aggressor.⁸

The case was concluded soon after, confirming the decision of the local jury that had condemned Mr. Viveros to ten years and six months in prison.⁹ The delivery of such a decision, just a few months before the deadline for the prescription of the crime, was one among other IACHR recommendations on this case.

II. LAW Nº 11.340/2011 - MARIA DA PENHA LAW

Between 2002 and 2004, the non-governmental feminist advocacy organizations Schedule, Themis,¹⁰ CLADEM, CEPIA,¹¹ and CFEMEA¹² gathered in the form of a consortium to draft a law to combat domestic violence against women.

The 2002 Conference of Brazilian Women created a feminist platform salient in the election leading to the presidential accession of Luiz Inácio Lula da Silva that same year.¹³ Two years later, the National Conference of Public Policies for Women and a newly designated Secretariat for Women developed and promoted the "Maria da Penha Law," which passed with President Lula's support on August 7th, 2006.¹⁴

⁷ Cecília MacDowell Santos, *Human Rights for Women and Violence Against Women: Advances and Limits of the Maria da Penha Law*, in HUMAN RIGHTS IN BRAZIL 2007 167-176 (Evanize Sydow & Maria Luisa Mendonça eds., 2007).

⁸ Cecilia MacDowell Santos, *Transnational Legal Activism and the State: Reflections on Cases against Brazil in the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights*, 4 SUR INT'L J. HUM. RTS. 29 (English ed. 2007).

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ Themis: Assessoria Jurídica e Estudos de Gênero, <http://www.themis.org.br> (last visited Jan. 22, 2017) (Themis is located in Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil).

¹¹ CEPIA, <http://www.cepia.org.br> (last visited Jan. 22, 2017) (Cepia is located in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil).

¹² Marta Rodriguez de Assis Machado, *Punishing Gender Violence: Brazil's 'Maria da Penha Law'*, YOUTUBE, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eq8nU2Cp67E>.

¹³ *Id.*

¹⁴ Mimi Kim, *Brazil and the Paradox of Gender Justice*, UNIVERSITY CALIFORNIA, BERKLEY: CENTER FOR

The informal title of Law nº 11.340 as the “Maria da Penha Law”¹⁵ is a tribute to Maria da Penha Maia Fernandes.

The purpose of the law, according to Article 1 is:

This Law creates mechanisms to restrain and prevent domestic and family violence against women, in compliance with paragraph 8 of article 226 of the Federal Constitution, the Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, the Inter-American Convention to Prevent, Punish and Eradicate Violence against Women and other international treaties ratified by the Federative Republic of Brazil; it provides for the creation of the Courts of Domestic and Family Violence against Women; and establishes measures for assistance and protection of women in a situation of domestic and family violence.¹⁶

Among its more significant procedural reforms are changes to the Penal Code, the Law of Criminal Sentences (Lei de Execução Penal), and the Code of Criminal Procedure.¹⁷

III. THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE LAW AND INTERNATIONAL CITATIONS ON SUPREME COURT DOCUMENTS

In March 2011, the Brazilian Supreme Federal Court (*Supremo Tribunal Federal*, STF) ruled for the constitutionality of the Maria da Penha Law.¹⁸

When judging the constitutionality of some articles of the Maria da Penha Law, the Supreme Court Judge Luiz Fux based his vote on the Brazil’s commitment before the international scenario, as written:

Latin American Studies, <http://clas.berkeley.edu/event/punishing-gender-violence-brazil-s-maria-da-penha-law>.

¹⁵Brazil. Lei 11.340 de 2011, Maria da Penha's Law, Brasília: Secretaria Especial de Políticas para as Mulheres, <http://www.compromissoeatitude.org.br/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/SPMLawmariapenha2006.pdf>.

¹⁶*Id.*

¹⁷Jodie G. Roure, *Domestic Violence in Brazil: Examining Obstacles and Approaches to Promote Legislative Reform*, 41 COLUMBIA HUM. RTS. L. REV 67 (Fall 2009).

¹⁸Supremo julga procedente ação da PGR sobre Lei Maria da Penha, Supremo Tribunal Federal (Feb. 9, 2012), <http://www.stf.jus.br/portal/cms/verNoticiaDetalhe.asp?idConteudo=199853>.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is not possible to sustain, in the present case, that the legislator chose wrong or did not adopt the best policy to combat the endemic situation of domestic abuse against women. It is important to remember that the Maria da Penha Law is the result of the Convention Belém do Pará, through which Brazil has pledged to adopt instruments to punish and eradicate violence against women. Numerous other international commitments were made by the Brazilian State in this sense, namely, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), the IV World Conference on Women (1995), the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, among others.¹⁹

Also, Judge Celso de Mello said in his vote:

It was with that purpose that the World Conference on Human Rights urged, particularly expressively, that "women have full and equal access to human rights and that this be a priority for Governments and the United Nations," emphasizing also "the importance of integration and full participation of women as both agents and beneficiaries of development process ..., all with the purpose of stressing the importance of "working towards the elimination of violence against women in public and private life, the elimination of all forms of sexual harassment, exploitation and trafficking in women, of eliminating gender bias in the administration of justice and the eradication of any conflicts which may arise between the rights of women and the harmful effects of certain traditional or customary practices, cultural prejudices. and religious extremism."²⁰

¹⁹Decisions STF ADC 19 and ADI 4424 (constitutionality of the Maria da Penha Law and exemption from representation of the victim), COMPROMISSOEAITUDE (Mar. 1, 2017), <http://www.compromissoeatitude.org.br/decisao-stf-adc-19-e-adi-4424-09022012/>.

²⁰Supremo julga precedente ação da PGR sobre Lei Maria da Penha, *supra* note 19.

IV. DISTORTIONS

A. Refinition of the Concept of Family

The Maria da Penha Law is not limited to being an instrument to combat domestic violence, but also is an instrument to redefine family, bringing a broader definition. Article 5 states:

For the effect of this Law, domestic and family violence against women is defined as any action or omission based on gender that causes the woman's death, injury, physical, sexual or psychological suffering and moral or patrimonial damage ..., in the scope of the **family, understood as the community formed by individuals that are or consider themselves related, joined by natural ties, by affinity, or by express will.**²¹

In this article, the law includes an unprecedented and liberalizing definition of family as a "community formed by individuals who are or consider themselves to be related,"²² ignoring the Civil Code and the Constitution that recognize the natural family.

The Brazilian Constitution expressly rules in art. 226 that the family is the foundation of society and the stable union is comprehended as a union between a man and a woman.²³ The express concept of marriage in the Constitution and the Civil Code clearly indicates the will of the legislator to put in evidence the biological concept of the family.

The same happens in other States, like Latvia, Hungary, Croatia, Slovakia, FYR of Macedonia, when in order to prevent the introduction of same sex marriage in constitutional amendments, jurisprudence, and legislation, they define marriage as a "unique union between a man and a woman" instead of simply guaranteeing "to men and women" the right to marry and found a family.²⁴

However, it seems Brazil is going against its Constitution, as are other States. Out of 13 national high courts to consider whether individuals

²¹Brazil. Lei 11.340 de 2011, Maria da Penha's Law, *supra* note 16 (emphasis added).

²²*Id.*

²³CONSTITUICAO FEDERAL [C.F.] [CONSTITUTION] art. 226 (Braz.).

²⁴Grégor Puppinc, *Same Sex Unions and the European Court of Human Rights*, PUBLIC DISCOURSE (May 4, 2015), <http://www.thepublicdiscourse.com/2015/05/14848/>.

who identify as LGBT have a right to marry another individual of their same-sex, only Brazil's and the United States' found such a right, and both only did so on the basis of a reading of the Constitutions that is widely seen as illegitimate.²⁵

What impresses in Law nº 11.340 is the audaciousness of an infra-constitutional law to redefine the concept of family and to place emphasis on volition and emotional attachment in defining the family. Actually, not so impressive, if one takes into account that the bill was created by strong feminist groups. This perspective brings the idea of family based on an emotional ground (*affection familiae*), embracing each group of people that permeates the affection element,²⁶ disregarding the biological sphere.

As Professor Gregor Puppink contends, it reflects the decline of the institutional and stable nature of marriage to a contractual and easily revocable mode of union: the expression of a society in which it is not so much the family that is the natural and fundamental unit of society²⁷ but the individual.²⁸

B. Application For Same-sex Unions

The Maria da Penha Law's application is going further than it was supposed to go, being applied in different cases from what is its main object. Despite the objective of the law to combat the violence against women, the Maria da Penha Law is the first to reference sexual orientation, in the sole paragraph of article 5.

The sole paragraph of article 5 provides for the following: "The personal relationships expressed in this article are independent of sexual orientation." This paragraph has been interpreted as the juridical recognition that "homo-affective unions constitute a family entity."²⁹

With the innovated concept of family, including the "socio-affective family," it allows judges to use the analogy and apply the law for same-sex

²⁵CENTER FOR FAMILY AND HUMAN RIGHTS, C-FAM FACTSHEET ON SEXUAL ORIENTATION AND GENDER IDENTITY (2015).

²⁶LEONARDO BARRETO MOREIRA ALVES. NOTAS SOBRE O RECONHECIMENTO DO CONCEITO MODERNO DE FAMÍLIA NA LEI MARIA DA PENHA 42-46 (2006).

²⁷G.A. Res. 217 (III) A, U. N. Doc. A/RES/3/217 A at art. 16 § 3, Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Dec. 10, 1948).

²⁸Puppink, *supra* note 25.

²⁹S.T.F.-102.002, ADI 4.277 DF, Min. Ayres Britto, 05.05.2011, Vol. 02607-03 PP-0034, Coordenadoria de Análise de Jurisprudência Dje 198, 14.10.2011, 611, 611-880, (Braz.), <http://redir.stf.jus.br/paginadorpub/paginador.jsp?docTP=AC&docID=628635>.

couple situations, ruling that sexual orientation is of no relevance in determining how the law applies.³⁰

Luiz Flávio Gomes contends:

The Maria da Penha Law can (and should) be applied in favor of any person (once proven that violence had occurred within a domestic context, family, or intimate relationship). No matter if the victim is transsexual, a man, a grandparent, etc. Such measures were first thought to promote women (in a subordinate position, of subjugation). Now, every time these conditions happen (domestically, family, or intimate relationship, submission, violence to impose an act of will, etc.) nothing prevents the judiciary, making good use of the Maria da Penha Law, to come to the aid of those threatened or injured in their rights. Where there are the same circumstances there should be the same rights.³¹

The problem with this affirmation is that the law has a view towards achieving the elimination of prejudices, customary and all other practices that are based on the idea of the inferiority or the superiority of the sexes, or on stereotyped roles for men and women; it is not a gender policy.

The application of law should not be based on a personal identification, but in reality. An adult who committed a crime should not receive the protections that are given to a child who committed an act against the law only because he or she identifies as a child, neither should a man who identifies himself as a woman should be treated as if a woman he were.

Moreover, the term “discrimination” should grant legal protection when related to a personal characteristic that is inborn, involuntary, immutable (like race and color) and innocuous (because it does no harm to the employer, to the individual, or to society as a whole),³² which is not the case of sexual orientation.

³⁰ Flávia Piovesan, *Violence against Women in Brazil: International Litigation and Local Advances*, in *FEMINIST AGENDAS AND DEMOCRACY IN LATIN AM.* 113-129 (Jane S. Jaquette, ed., 2009).

³¹ Luiz Flávio Gomes, *Lei Maria da Penha: aplicação para situações análogas*, JUSBRASIL (Jun. 26, 2009, 3:39 PM), <http://lfg.jusbrasil.com.br/noticias/1460220/lei-maria-da-penha-aplicacao-para-situacoes-analogas>.

³² PETER SPRIGG, *HOMOSEXUALITY IS NOT A CIVIL RIGHT* (Fam. Research Council, 2007).

The contradictory logic is that when the victim is a man in a homosexual relationship, judges in general understand that the law applies. However, this law would not protect a man who is a victim in a heterosexual relationship, as explained below.

C. The Non-application for Men in a Situation of Domestic Violence

The majority of the legal scholars and jurisprudence hold that the law cannot be applied to protect the male victim of domestic violence committed by a woman. This is also the position of the Conselho Nacional de Justiça (National Council of Justice).³³

The formal Minister Iriny Lopes, Brazil's Special Secretariat for Women's Policies, holds that the law is about gender and should not be applied to female-on-male violence cases. For men, she said, there is the common legislation: "Man is not injured because he is a man, but the woman is injured because she is a woman."³⁴ So, what is the justification for the application for men who identify themselves as women, since they are not injured for being women, as they are not in fact women?

It gets more confusing with some scholars who argue that "the law protects the sex of the woman, regardless of the sexual orientation, including in this case lesbians. It also protects females, i.e., transvestites and transsexuals."³⁵ The subsequent question is: if the law protects the woman who identifies herself as a man in a relationship and the man who identifies himself as woman, why should the law not protect the real man?

Many legal scholars defend a clear violation of the principle of equality consecrated expressly as formal equality in art. 5, caput, of the

³³ Represented by the Coordinator of the Movimento Permanente de Combate à Violência Doméstica e Familiar (Permanent Movement to Combat Domestic and Familiar Violence), Ana Maria Amarante. See Regina Bandeira, *A Lei Maria da Penha pode ser aplicada em casos de violência doméstica contra homens?*, CNJ (May 13, 2014, 9:51 AM), <http://www.cnj.jus.br/noticias/cnj/61647-a-lei-maria-da-penha-pode-ser-aplicada-em-casos-de-violencia-domestica-contra-homens>.

³⁴ Mariana Oliveira, *Aplicar Maria da Penha para proteger homem 'não é adequado', diz ministra*, GLOBO (Aug. 3, 2011, 7 AM), <http://g1.globo.com/brasil/noticia/2011/03/aplicar-maria-da-penha-para-proteger-homem-nao-e-adequado-diz-ministra.html>.

³⁵ Dayane de Oliveira Ramos Silva, *Aplicabilidade da Lei Maria da Penha: Um olhar na vertente do gênero feminino*, AMBITO JURIDICO, http://www.ambito-juridico.com.br/site/index.php?n_link=revista_artigos_leitura&artigo_id=8892 (last visited Mar. 7, 2017).

Constitution, which guarantee equality of all before the law, without distinction of any nature.³⁶

Article 6 of the Law categorizes domestic violence against women as a type of human rights violation, ending the formal treatment for violence against women as a criminal infraction of minor offensive potential. However, it should not be a violation only because it is against women, but because it is violence against a human being and consequently against the dignity of the person inherent to the human condition.

In this way, Souza³⁷ states that the law that seeks to avoid discrimination, is for itself discriminatory, because it does not apply when the victim of the domestic violence is a male person, which defies the provisions of Article 5, I of the Constitution, which establishes the principle of isonomy between men and women.³⁸

One recent example of the perpetration of this logic was the approval on March 9th of 2015 by Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff (the same party of formal President Luis Inácio Lula da Silva) of a new law that criminalizes femicide,³⁹ the gender-motivated killing of women.

The new legislation amends Brazil's Penal Code to redefine "femicide" as any crime that involves domestic violence, discrimination, or contempt for women, which results in their death.⁴⁰ Imposing harsher sentences of between twelve to thirty years imprisonment, the bill also includes longer jail terms for crimes committed against pregnant women, girls under the age of fourteen, women over the age of sixty, and women and girls with disabilities.⁴¹

Nevertheless, this is the inconsistency of the UN Women agency: to create special protections for women and a new sphere of rights. They fail

³⁶C.F., *supra* note 25 (English version available here: <http://english.tse.jus.br/arquivos/federal-constitution>).

³⁷Cláudio Calo Souza, *Violência Doméstica e Familiar, Brevíssimas Reflexões, Algumas Perplexidades e Aspectos Inconstitucionais* (citing Lei No. 11.340, 2006, *Journal Jurid* 182 "[Q]ue a própria lei, que procura evitar a discriminação, é, por si, discriminatória, por que afasta a sua incidência protetiva quando a violência doméstica e familiar tiver como vítima uma pessoa do sexo masculino, o que, por si só, faz crer que é possível que se questione a sua constitucionalidade, pois pode afrontar o disposto no artigo 5º, inciso I, da Constituição Republicana, que estabelece o princípio da isonomia entre homens e mulheres.").

³⁸C.F., *supra* note 25 art. 5.

³⁹DECRETO NO. 11.340, de 7 de August 2006, DIARIO OFFICIAL DA UNIAO [D.O.U.] de 8 Aug. 2006 (Braz.).

⁴⁰*Id.*

⁴¹UN Women, *In Brazil, new law of femicide to offer greater protection* (Mar. 16, 2015), <http://www2.unwomen.org/en/news/stories/2015/3/in-brazil-new-law-on-femicide-to-offer-greater-protection#sthash.cAScL3vB.dpuf>.

to consider the Preamble and Article 1 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which recognizes that all human beings possess the same fundamental rights by virtue of their inherent dignity and worth.⁴² This logic also fails to consider that human rights by definition belong to all people because of their humanity. There are no special additional human rights beyond those of other citizens by virtue of sex.⁴³

CONCLUSION

The *Maria da Penha v. Brazil* case is an important example of how International Law can affect a society and create diverse changes in the internal system.

It also demonstrates the power feminists gained to push for a national agenda on violence against women in Brazil, especially after the wave of international feminist movements that began with the 1975 Conference for Women in Mexico City and the subsequent signing of the CEDAW in 1982, and the Convention of *Belém do Pará* in 1994.

The mobilization of these groups at the national level led to the formation of the first institutions, and their demands echoed in the 2006 federal legislation, making them strong enough to submit a bill by the National Congress and get its approval with very few alterations.⁴⁴

Despite the creation of a mechanism to curtail domestic violence, the *Maria da Penha* Law is an attempt to impose the feminist agenda and positively include its goals through legal documents over the federal legislation, redefining the concept of family and creating space for gender ideology. Against the Constitution of Brazil and the Civil Code, the Law is an example on how organized civil groups can modify the purpose of the Law to insert their own political agendas and redefine institutions.

Human rights norms can not be overburdened with a political and ideological weight, being a refuge for the imposition of the worldview of certain specific groups and disengaging from its essential role.

In order to avoid this distortion, a very important measure is to establish local groups to remain vigilant to these feminist groups, mapping the cases they submit to the International Courts and avoid local effects of

⁴²G.A. Res 217 (III) A, U.N. Doc. A/RES/3/217 A, Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Dec. 10, 1948).

⁴³See *supra* note 16 at 2.

⁴⁴ See Rodriguez de Assis Machado, *supra* note 13.

these decisions. These local groups of advocacy and litigation can actively act in national discussions, participate in the legislative process of passing a bill, and manifestly expose their views during the public audiences the National Congress promotes before the votes.

The majority of pro-life and pro-family organizations in Brazil, for example, count on volunteers who can donate a little part of their time to the cause, having to manage their full time jobs besides the volunteer work, which makes the work of these organizations slow and inefficient sometimes. The support to get paid, full-time professionals in these groups, like policy makers, academics, activists, would be essential to the local development of these institutions and surely the achievement of good results, such as avoiding bad policies.

One other efficient measure is the promotion of training with local partners to aware them about the dangers of these feminist strategies. In the *Maria da Penha* case, the government and feminist groups sell the idea of the law as the most important victory in the last years to combat violence against women. Unfortunately, even the pro-family groups cannot see the Trojan horse the law brings, as the infra-constitutional article redefining family discussed previously.

In its thirty-ninth session, in 2007, the CEDAW Committee ⁴⁵ recognizes that “international treaties, such as the American Convention on Human Rights, (the Pact of San Jose, Costa Rica), can effectively have a direct influence on the procedures adopted by the courts,” ⁴⁶ and consequently have a “direct impact on the federal legislation of the State Parties.”⁴⁷

These measures and practices should help to strengthen the groups working at national levels and avoid feminist strategies to create a safe space to implement their goals. International Law is such a powerful instrument to help improve conditions not only for women, but also for every human being, and should not be used to serve certain groups and their agendas.

⁴⁵ UNITED NATIONS HUMAN RIGHTS OFFICE OF THE HIGH COMMISSIONER, *Comm. on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women*, (2016), <http://www.ohchr.org/en/hrbodies/cedaw/pages/cedawindex.aspx>.

⁴⁶ Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women, *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women*, <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/committee.htm>.

⁴⁷ *Id.*