

# Zambia:

## A human rights review based on the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

### Introduction

President Frederick Chiluba and the Movement for Multi-Party Democracy (MMD) swept to power in 1991 with promises of a new era for human rights in Zambia. While there have undoubtedly been significant improvements in human rights in comparison with Zambia's record under former-president Kenneth Kaunda and his United National Independence Party (UNIP), the performance of the MMD falls short of international human rights standards in important respects.

The purpose of this report is to review Zambia's record on human rights in light of the rights guaranteed to Zambian citizens under the standards of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), which the Zambian government acceded to in 1984. Zambia is scheduled to appear before the Human Rights Committee in March to present its second periodic report to that body. Committee members will be examining how Zambia has lived up to its obligations under the ICCPR.

In March 1996, two journalists in Zambia became prisoners of conscience, imprisoned solely for the peaceful expression of their opinions in newspaper articles. They were imprisoned after a Zambian parliamentary committee improperly constituted itself as a court of law and found them guilty of contempt of parliament, "sentencing" them to indefinite detention. The government move seems designed to punish the peaceful exercise of a citizen's right to freedom of expression, in contravention of Article 19 of the ICCPR, as well as a violation of their rights to personal liberty and to a fair trial, as set out in Articles 9 and 14 of the ICCPR. Amnesty International is calling for the journalists' immediate and unconditional release.

Other examples also cited in this review illustrate the Zambian government's misuse of criminal charges in an attempt to intimidate the independent press in Zambia and suppress criticism of government officials and policies.

The death penalty has been retained in the laws of Zambia, with the right to life abridged in both the interim constitution adopted in 1991 that allowed multi-party democracy, and in the draft constitution published in 1995, which is due to be adopted this year. However, the reluctance of both the present Zambian government and the past administration to sign warrants for the execution of prisoners may indicate some move toward the abolition of capital punishment.

The use of torture in the prisons and police cells continues to be a widespread practice, according to the government's own commission of inquiry, which investigated the practice of torture in Zambia for two years since its inception in 1993. That commission also found appalling conditions in Zambia's prisons, which in Amnesty International's view appear to amount to cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment.

The right to assemble peacefully is also under threat in Zambia, where the government has enforced a broad interpretation of a law requiring all those holding public meetings to obtain police permission. Amnesty International is concerned that any person attending a meeting or demonstration for which a permit has been denied on political grounds could become a prisoner of conscience, if arrested for unlawful assembly and sentenced to a prison term.

Although the Supreme Court of Zambia ruled in January 1996 that sections of the Zambian law requiring prior permission for public meetings contravened the Zambian constitution, the government immediately proposed new legislation allowing police to cancel meetings and processions after giving organisers 48-hour notice.

### **Specific concerns in relation to Zambia's obligation under the ICCPR:**

#### **Article 6: The Right to Life**

**“Every human being has the inherent right to life. This right shall be protected by law. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his life...”**

Shortly after the MMD came to power in the elections of 1991, parliament adopted a new constitution by an overwhelming majority vote. That interim constitution retained wording that qualified the right to life in cases of a court-sentenced execution upon conviction of certain criminal offenses. The death penalty is provided for under Chapter 146 of the Zambian Penal Code for crimes such as murder and aggravated robbery.

According to a February 1996 statement by Zambian Home Affairs Minister Chitalu Sampa, there are 108 prisoners who remain under sentence of death in Zambia, with at least 20 people sentenced to death in 1994 and at least 10 people sentenced to death in 1995. The last executions of prisoners were carried out by Zambia in 1989, when 18 people were hanged for crimes of murder and aggravated robbery. Between 1985 and 1989, at least 40 prisoners were reportedly hanged at Mukobeko Maximum Security Prison in Kabwe.

The process of reviewing a condemned person's sentence through court appeals is very prolonged in Zambia, and some prisoners have been under sentence of death for more than 30 years.

While there appears to be no official impetus to abolition, a lively debate currently continues in Zambian civil society concerning abolition of the death penalty. Amnesty International is unconditionally opposed to the death penalty, because it is the ultimate cruel, inhuman and degrading punishment and constitutes the ultimate denial of human rights.

Article 6 of the ICCPR generally refers to abolition in terms which strongly suggest abolition is desirable, while the Zambian government has not shown any progress made towards abolishing the death penalty. The Zambian government has not yet acceded to the Second Optional Protocol to the ICCPR aiming at the abolition of the death penalty.

Since 1989, both former president Kenneth Kaunda and now President Frederick Chiluba have been reluctant to sign death warrants which are preliminary to the carrying out of the sentences of the court. This reluctance indicates the hour has come for the Zambian government to consider abolishing the death penalty in law – rather than simply letting the practice lapse into disuse. Amnesty International is urging the Zambian government to seriously consider abolition of the death penalty and thereby join a worldwide trend in doing away with this form of punishment.

### **Articles 7 and 10 - Protection from torture and Protection from inhuman treatment**

**“No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment...”**

**“All persons deprived of their liberty shall be treated with humanity and with respect for the inherent dignity of the human person.”**

Amnesty International has continued to receive reports that Zambia is not upholding the right to protect its citizens from torture, in contravention of Article 7 of the ICCPR.

In March 1993, at least 27 government opponents were detained without charge or trial under a state of emergency declared by President Frederick Chiluba on the grounds that a plot by the UNIP to overthrow the government had been uncovered. UNIP party leaders said that a crucial document, entitled *The Zero Option*, was not party policy but a discussion paper about options that had been rejected. Three of the detainees, all of them UNIP party members, alleged that they had been tortured during interrogation.

Prompted by these torture allegations, as well as other long-standing reports of widespread torture, the Zambian government launched an ad hoc commission in 1993 to investigate such allegations of police torture and ill-treatment of detainees. Headed by lawyer Bruce Munyama, the Commission heard many witnesses describe being stripped naked, chained, suspended upside down from a pole, starved of food and beaten with hosepipe, in cases dating from the 1970s to the present.

In September 1995, in submitting its report to the government, the Commission reported that it had established that torture, abuses and human rights violations were not only perpetrated by the Zambian police in the past, but continue to be practised currently. Commission Chairman Munyama said torturers carry out their business in secret places across the country. The Commission's report has not yet been made public. It will only be released after a government review has been conducted and possibly published as part of a "white paper" dealing with the problem of torture by police officers.

Amnesty International is also concerned that prison conditions in the country are contrary to those that Zambia agreed to uphold under the ICCPR's Article 10.

According to official statistics, more than 12,500 prisoners are inhabiting facilities designed for only 10 percent of that number. Reports received by Amnesty International indicate that, for example, about 1,000 inmates inhabit Lusaka Central Prison, which was intended to house only 200 prisoners. In Mukobeko maximum security prison, 108 prisoners sentenced to death await execution in facilities designed to accommodate only 30 persons.

Conditions in the prisons of Zambia amount to a violation of Article 7, which prohibits cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, as well as contravening international standards for prison conditions, such as the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners. Since Amnesty International raised its concerns about the appalling conditions under which prisoners were kept in a 1989 report on administrative detention and torture in Zambia (AI Index AFR 63/03/89), continuing reports received by the organization suggest there has been no improvement.

The Munyama Commission began investigating conditions in prisons and in cells in police stations. The government's instruction to the commission to investigate this issue

came after the authorities had refused a petition from the Law Association of Zambia for access to prison and police cells.

In October 1993, the Commission visited Kamwala and Dhimkokaila prisons in Lusaka. It found prisoners suffering from malnutrition, tuberculosis, scabies and dysentery. Some were said to be suffering from AIDS-related diseases. The Commission documented further evidence of terrible conditions in these and other locations of detention, finding prisoners being denied basic necessities such as soap and clothing, being fed food unfit for human consumption and denial of medical treatment.

Amnesty International recognises that difficulties brought about by an arduous economic situation have resulted in the Zambian prison system being underfunded and overcrowded. Nevertheless, the Zambian government bears responsibility for allowing prison conditions to degenerate to an appalling level in what amounts to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Amnesty International recommends that prison conditions in Zambia should be brought into line with both national law (The Prisons Rules), which stipulates standards for prisoners' meals, medical treatment and other aspects of prison conditions, and with international human rights standards.

In addition, Amnesty International calls upon the Zambian government to publish without delay both the Munyama Commission's report and its white paper on responding to the finding of the Commission. The Zambian authorities should then implement the Commission's recommended reforms to end the widespread, ongoing practice of torture by police. In addition, the government should urgently undertake both the prosecution of those responsible for such torture and the compensation of victims of torture.

Amnesty International also believes that if the Zambian government ratified the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, it would be demonstrating its commitment to ending torture extends to a willingness to be held accountable both to the international community and Zambian citizens.

### **Articles 9 and 14 - Protection of Personal Liberty and Equality before the law**

**“Everyone has the right to liberty and security of person. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest or detention.”**

**“All persons shall be equal before the courts and tribunals. In the determination of any criminal charge against him, or of his rights and obligations in a suit at**

---

**law, everyone shall be entitled to a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent and impartial tribunal established by law... In the determination of any criminal charge against him, everyone shall be entitled to... be tried in his presence, and to defend himself in person or through legal assistance of his own choosing..."**

On 20 February 1996, the Speaker of the National Assembly Robinson Nabulyato announced that he had found the managing director of The Post newspaper, Fred M'membe guilty of libel and "publishing inflammatory and contemptuous remarks which lowered the authority and dignity of the house". Speaker Nabulyato made similar findings against Managing Editor Bright Mwape and the newspaper's columnist, Lucy Sichone. The accusations allegedly stemmed from articles the journalists had published on 20 February 1996, castigating Zambian Vice-President Godfrey Miyanda for an earlier speech in parliament in which he criticised a 10 January 1996 decision by the Supreme Court striking down sections of Zambia's Public Order Act requiring police permits to hold public meetings.

Following Speaker Nabulyato's announcement, the Standing Orders Committee of the Zambian National Assembly met on 22 February 1996 to consider the cases and declared that it found all three guilty of contempt of parliament and that it had sentenced them to indefinite detention "until they present petitions expressing proper contrition for their offences and praying for their release, or until, upon motion made in the house, it is resolved that they be discharged." The journalists were also fined Kwacha 1,000 each.

An order for their arrest signed by Speaker Nabulyato was issued on 26 February 1996 after the three journalists failed to appear before the National Assembly to be informed of their sentence. Zambian police encircled the Lusaka homes of M'membe and Mwape in their hunt to apprehend the two. On 4 March 1996, Fred M'membe and Bright Mwape reported to parliament, where police took them into custody. Reports indicate M'membe is being held in Lusaka Central Prison, while Mwape has been taken to Mukobeko maximum security prison, where an outbreak of cholera had been reported only a few days before his internment. At the time of publication of this review Lucy Sichone was not arrested, but remained in hiding.

Serious concerns about their detention can be raised in the context of Article 9 of the ICCPR, which prohibits arbitrary arrest or detention and the deprivation of liberty "except on such grounds and in accordance with such procedure as are established by law". The conviction, sentence and imprisonment also denied them their right to a fair trial before a competent, independent and impartial tribunal, as guaranteed by Article 14 of the ICCPR and Articles 7 and 26 of the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (ACHPR).

Amnesty International is concerned that the parliamentary committee has assumed powers to prosecute and issue orders for detention without trial, without any reference to established, normal judicial procedures. The proceedings clearly were of an extra-judicial nature. Notwithstanding that the Standing Orders Committee is not a duly constituted court of law, the journalists singled out for attack were not afforded legal representation before that body, nor given notification to appear before the Committee to answer the charges.

The procedure for instituting a prosecution for contempt of parliament is laid out by Section 27 of the Parliamentary (Powers and Privileges) Act, which requires that no prosecution of an offense under the Act shall be instituted except by the Director of Public Prosecution, acting on written information supplied to him by the speaker of parliament. The prescribed involvement of the present Director of Public Prosecution, Gregory Stephen Phiri, strongly suggests that such prosecution should take place in a court of law. These statutory requirements do not appear to have been followed, making the process illegal.

Notwithstanding this remarkable violation of the Articles 9 and 14 of the ICCPR, the Zambian judicial system has displayed a tendency to attempt to preserve its independence. For example, in a significant ruling on 1 February 1996, Lusaka High Court Judge Kabazo Chanda granted a writ of Habeas Corpus and Subjiciendum (a writ requiring a person to be brought before a judge to investigate the lawfulness of his or her detention) to seven Rwandese refugees wrongfully detained by the Zambian government. In his judgement, the judge said the state had acted in bad faith because it granted the Rwandese men refugee status, then later withdrew that status without proper reasons. In another landmark ruling in mid-January, the Supreme Court ruled unconstitutional certain sections of a law requiring citizens to obtain police permits before holding public assemblies.

Amnesty International believes the journalists' detention to be unconstitutional under Zambia's own laws. Zambia's present constitution specifies that: "No one shall be deprived of his personal liberty save as may be authorised by law..." That constitutional protection to the right of personal liberty has some qualifications, which are elaborated upon in references to deprivations by "an order of the court" and "in execution of the order of a court of record". The National Assembly of Zambia does not qualify as a court of law.

In Zambia's constitution, the right to secure protection of the law is also guaranteed, with an implication of a constitutionally mandated strict separation of the powers between the judicial, the legislative and the executive arms of the government. Yet that separation became less apparent in the February 1996 "sentencing" of The Post journalists in the contempt of parliament proceedings undertaken by the Standing Orders Committee of the Zambian National Assembly.

Amnesty International insists that Fred M'membe and Bright Mwape, as prisoners of conscience, should be set free at once and without conditions on their liberty. Under both Zambian law and international law -- including the ICCPR's Articles 9 and 14 -- the government has not provided them with a fair trial in a court of law and therefore has no right to deprive them of their liberty. Amnesty International further recommends that orders for the arrest of Lucy Sichone, who remains in hiding at the time of this report's publication, should also be dropped.

### **Article 19 - Protection of the freedom of expression**

**“Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print...”**

There appears to be a long-standing policy by the Zambian government to misuse criminal charges against journalists with the aim of harassing and intimidating the independent press into docility. Amnesty International views these charges in the broader context of the state suppressing legitimate political debate by interpreting vaguely worded legislation to penalize the free expression of views, in contravention of Article 19 of the ICCPR.

Certain types of legal charges -- including sedition, contempt of court, subversion, defamation, possession of classified documents, and holding meetings or demonstrations without an official permit -- are used by Zambian authorities against non-violent opponents and critics of the government. Often the wording of the laws, as well as their misapplication, are in conflict with international standards. One example is the charge of sedition, which tends to be based on laws dating back to colonial rule. Non-violent dissent has been defined by Zambian prosecutors as sedition in levelling charges against journalists, when the consensus of international judicial opinion agrees that “sedition” should apply to direct incitement to violence.

During the past few years, the government has been angered in particular by criticism and negative articles published in The Post newspaper, formerly a weekly publication, but now publishing daily. The government's threats of criminal charges, detentions for questioning and arrests in 1994 and 1995 against its critics have escalated in 1996 into the banning of newspapers and hunts conducted by Zambian police for journalists.

Amnesty International is concerned about the mounting number of criminal charges against The Post and other journalists of the independent press in Zambia, which

appear to confirm a pattern of intimidation by the government to silence critics from non-violently expressing critical opinions about government and its policies. Some of the cases noted by the human rights organisation in the past two years include:

- April 1994 - Managing Director of The Post Fred M'membe and Managing Editor Bright Mwape charged with criminally defaming President Frederick Chiluba , in violation of Section 69 of the Penal Code, although the overwhelming international legal consensus is that defamation should be a civil and not a criminal offence. They had published an article that quoted a former minister describing the President as a "cretin";
- August 1994 - M'membe and Mwape of The Post, along with seven other journalists at the newspaper detained for defaming the president and other offences, including five counts of defaming the Press Attache of the President, Richard Sakala, two counts of having been in possession and having printed classified documents, and one count of having "published false information likely to cause harm". They had published an article reporting that the United Nations had accused Zambia and Zaire of violating sanctions against the Angolan rebel movement, the *União Nacional para a Libertação Total de Angola* (UNITA);
- December 1994 - M'membe of The Post and staff journalist Mulenga Chomba charged with various offences, including treason, sedition, possessing of and printing classified documents, and inciting the army to revolt. They had published an article quoting unnamed sources inside the Zambian army describing dissatisfaction among soldiers that bordered on mutiny, which could be legitimately described as a matter of public interest to be discussed in a free and public manner;
- April 1995 - Managing Editor Reverend Steward Mwila and Deputy Editor George Malunga of the weekly Crime News interrogated after publishing an article on pornography and nudity that was illustrated by pictures of a Zimbabwean sculpture and a Kenyan political cartoon. Both images were taken from the February/March 1995 edition of Free Press, the media magazine published by the Media Institute of Southern Africa, and were used to illustrate a serious story designed to encourage debate on an issue of public interest. No charges were ever filed against the journalists;
- June 1995 - M'membe and Editor-in-chief Masautso Phiri of The Post arrested and charged with defaming the President in an article quoting a woman who claimed to have been the lover of the President since 1983. The two journalists were charged under Section 69 of the Zambian Penal Code, which makes it a crime to defame or

---

insult the president, although international legal opinion has come to a consensus that defamation should be a civil and not criminal offence;

- September 1995 - Mwape and two other journalists of The Post detained after bail is revoked in connection with earlier charges of defaming the President's press secretary.

On 5 February 1996, the government declared that the 5 February edition of The Post was a prohibited publication. Any member of the Zambian public who possesses a copy of the banned newspaper edition -- with the knowledge that it is a prohibited publication -- could face up to two years in prison if convicted.

M'membe, Mwape and Masautso Phiri, who is a special projects editor of The Post, were arrested by police that same day. The three newspapermen were charged with violating the State Security Act for possessing and printing classified documents, and with possessing a prohibited publication -- that day's edition of the newspaper. The arrests were in connection with an article published in The Post alleging plans by the Zambian government to hold both a referendum to adopt a proposed constitution and national elections simultaneously in March.

If convicted of violating the State Security Act, the three defendants could face a maximum of 25 years in prison. The government later dropped the second charge of possessing a banned publication, but the 5 February 1996 edition remains banned. No court date has been set in this case.

Laws such as Zambia's State Security Act use vague terms that allow for a broad interpretation of what can be defined as a "classified document", according to Amnesty International. This vagueness opens the door for the misuse of such legislation to criminalise and punish legitimate journalistic activity and suppress peaceful public political debate. In this specific case, the restrictions imposed by the use of the State Security Act appear to go beyond the restrictions allowed by Article 19 of the ICCPR and by the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights. to suppress journalists' peaceful freedom of expression,

As discussed in this report, the 22 February 1996 "sentencing" of three journalists to indefinite detention for contempt of parliament appears to be an abuse of a law governing parliamentary powers and privileges. Amnesty International believes the government used an overly broad interpretation of Chapter 17 of the country's national law -- the National Assembly Powers and Privileges Act -- which describes as an offense any person who:

“Commits any other act of intentional disrespect to or with reference to the proceedings of the Assembly or of a committee of the Assembly or to any person presiding at such proceedings” (Chap. 17, Section 19e)

“Publishes any false or scandalous libel on the Assembly or any report which wilfully misrepresents in any way any proceedings of the Assembly or committee...”  
(Chap. 17, Section 25b)

Both Article 19 of the ICCPR and Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights recognize a wide latitude for robust criticism of government officials, including parliamentarians. The European Court of Human Rights has made clear that “[t]he limits of permissible criticism are wider with regard to the Government than in relations to a private citizen” and that “the dominant position which the Government occupies makes it necessary for it to display restraint in resorting to criminal proceedings, particularly where there are other means available for reply to the unjustified attacks and criticisms of its adversaries in the media.” *Castells v. Spain*, Vol. 236, Series A Judgement (1992), para.46.

In its January 1995 report, Amnesty International called on the Zambian government to initiate a thorough review of its national laws and procedures regulating state secrets, sedition, contempt of court, defamation, possession of classified documents, subversion and holding meetings without a permit, so they can be brought fully into line with international human rights standards. (See AFR 01/01/95.)

Amnesty International is strongly urging the Zambian government to immediately release Fred M'membe and Bright Mwape, who are being held as prisoners of conscience, and to immediately drop charges against Lucy Sichone, who is still being sought by police on similar charges of contempt of parliament.

Other Zambian citizens' freedom of expression has been curtailed by the government's abuse of a legal requirement to obtain permits for public meetings from the Zambian police. Authorities have used their discretion in certain cases in a manner that appears designed to suppress peaceful, non-violent political gatherings. This would violate not just Article 19, but also Article 21, of the ICCPR. Amnesty International is concerned that a person who attends a meeting or demonstration, for which a permit has been denied on political grounds, could become a prisoner of conscience if arrested and convicted of unlawful assembly and sentenced to a prison term.

In October 1995, for example, police revoked an earlier permit obtained by organizers of a peaceful public demonstration on an important issue of public concern

---

-- the method of adoption of a new constitution. Organizers of other peaceful public meetings, involving for example human rights discussions and political speeches, were also denied permits by police in an apparent attempt to silence those critical of government policy.

On 11 January 1996, the Supreme Court struck down Sections 5 (4) and Section 7 (a) of the Public Order Act, finding that the provisions requiring people to get police permits to hold meetings or assemblies was a contravention of the Zambian peoples' constitutional rights.

In upholding an appeal against such a requirement by the UNIP opposition party, Chief Justice Matthew Nglube said:

**“...the requirement for a permit to gather and speak has been used since 1953 to muzzle critics and opponents as well as alleged trouble makers... It has also been used to deny permission on grounds that had nothing to do with securing public order and safety. For example, there was much litigation in our courts during the recent transition to plural politics engendered by denials of permits on spurious grounds.”**

Seven weeks after the court's ruling, on 27 February 1996, the Zambian government presented parliament with an amendment to the Public Order Act, which was designed to re-instate government control over public assemblies. The bill would require any person intending to assemble a public meeting, or procession, to notify law enforcement authorities in writing of such intent by a 14-day minimum before the meeting. If the police decide that they cannot adequately police any particular meeting or procession, and that such an assembly might result in a riot or a threat to public safety, the new law would allow the police to cancel the assembly, after giving organisers 48 hours notice.

In vesting police with the power to cancel public assemblies, the government should require a test of reasonableness regarding the true extent that a meeting or march would threaten national security, public safety, public order, public health or the rights and freedoms of others. Further, such provisions under law should provide for an open process by which authorities reach this conclusion, as well as the possibility of appealing this decision.

In proposing to grant police such power, the Zambian government appears to be creating the same conditions that have previously resulted in the abuse of such regulations to suppress the freedom of peaceful assembly, allowing further violations of that freedom as protected by Article 21 of the ICCPR.

The government's immediate response to reintroduce potentially greater restrictions on public assembly indicates the Zambian government's reluctance to allow the unfettered exercise of the right to free expression in marches, demonstrations, gathering or meetings. A Zambian citizen could become a prisoner of conscience under this law if detained or imprisoned for participating in a meeting or demonstration that was cancelled by police not because of a genuine concern for public safety but because it would be hosted by those expressing criticism of the government or its policies.

### **Summary of recommendations**

Amnesty International is making the following recommendations in this report:

1. Journalists Fred M'membe and Bright Mwape, as prisoners of conscience, should be set free at once and without conditions on their liberty. The order for the arrest of Lucy Sichone, who remains in hiding at the time of this report's publication, should also be dropped. If arrested she, too, would be considered a prisoner of conscience.
2. The government should seriously consider abolition of the death penalty.
3. The government should immediately act to improve prison conditions, which amount to cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment, bringing them up to the level required by international standards as well as by national law.
4. The government should publish without delay both the Munyama Commission's report on prison conditions and torture in Zambia, as well as its white paper on responding to the findings of the Commission.
5. The government should act to end the widespread, ongoing practice of torture by police and urgently undertake both the prosecution of those responsible for such torture and the compensation of victims of torture.
6. The government should ratify the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.
7. The government should initiate a thorough review of its national laws and procedures regulating state secrets, sedition, contempt of court, defamation, possession of classified documents, subversion and holding meetings without a permit, which

could lead to the imprisonment of prisoners of conscience, and bring such national laws and procedures fully into line with international human rights standards.