

1. What similarities and differences exist between these different modalities of courts referring to each other's judgments? --It seems that they first go to their local court and if they feel it is not being judged fairly they all go to the International Human Rights Court to appeal the decision made locally--what is similar. What is different is how the local courts in each situation operates.
2. What are the advantages and the dangers associated with an increased use of judgments or materials from other jurisdictions in human rights litigation? Are certain uses of comparative jurisprudence legitimate, while others are not? --The advantage is that there are choices to go elsewhere when a decision seems unfair locally. The danger are the complexities of the differences in cultures and how to apply the rules to all in a general manner. If people in a country have agreed to an international human rights treaty, then the comparative jurisprudence is legitimate in similar situations in different countries, but given some situations might be different in some places, I'm sure there are always examples of an exception to the general rule.
3. What are the key factors that favor the development of this approach, based on a dialogue across jurisdictions? Why did it gain in importance in recent years? --The key factors is to help each other and collaborate based on one courts' experiences and knowledge in a specific human rights decision over another in a different jurisdiction. It is important since the different courts share their knowledge and experiences in making complex human rights decisions. In recent years, it is easier to collaborate than in earlier times in our world's history.