Editorial

The articles in this issue of Nordic Journal of Human Rights all discuss timely and important human rights issues. The topics are wide-ranging and cross-disciplinary; a new protective remedy developed by the European Court of Human Rights (ECtHR), the implications of religion on human rights in Russia, prisoners' right to internet access and the balance between protecting minorities and ensuring freedom of speech.

In the first article, "Protecting human rights in cases of urgency: Interim measures and the right of individual application under Article 34 ECHR", Henrik Jorem discusses the ECtHR's power to issue interim measures of protection. He notes that with *Mamatkulov and Askarov v Turkey* (2005) such measures have developed from non-binding to binding upon states. The author welcomes this development, even if it lacks express legal basis in the Convention and diminishes state sovereignty, as it brings in an additional international remedy against impending states which is needed for an effective protection of human rights.

The second article, "Russian orthodox church: Two discourses on human rights", is written by Vebjørn Horsfjord. Horsfjord explains that within the church there are two different discourses regarding human rights; the absolutist and the pluralist. While the former sees human rights as a secular ideology, and thus indirectly opposes human rights, the latter is more positively oriented towards human rights. We should therefore seek to activate the pluralist rather than the absolutist discourse. On a more general level, the article offers valuable insights as to how religions approach human rights.

In the third article, "Imprisonment and internet access. Human rights, the principle of normalization and the question of prisoners access to digital communications technology", Peter Scharff Smith discusses a timely and pressing dilemma: To what extent should digital communication technology be made available for prisoners? The author notes that being shut off from digital communication represents an isolation which might be problematic from a human rights perspective and also make reintegration into society more difficult. He concludes *inter alia* that a complete internet ban cannot be justified, and that restrictions have to be balanced with freedom of expression as well as the right to privacy and family life.

In the fourth article, "Failing to protect minorities against racist and/or discriminatory speech? The case of Norway and § 135 (a) of the Norwegian General Penal Code", Sindre Bangstad discusses Dworkin's claim that the so-called "rac-

ism paragraph" of the Norwegian Penal Code is "unconstitutional" in light of the guarantees of freedom of expression provided by the new § 100 of the Norwegian Constitution. The author discusses the relevance of the cultural and historical difference between states and the dynamic nature of the right to freedom of speech. He also discusses possible illegitimate use of rules by states to protect minorities. Bangstad notes that the absolutist views are unsatisfactory and he emphasises the need to strike a balance between the two competing rights. He analyses various components of the Norwegian legal system, including relevant jurisprudence, and concludes that Dworkin's claim is both factually incorrect and histrionic.

The articles presented in this issue amply reflect the need to continuously search for better, preferably cross-disciplinary, arguments in order to face today's human rights challenges. We welcome further cross-disciplinary submissions dealing with such challenges.