

PREFACE

Amnesty International (AI) is a worldwide movement of people who campaign for human rights. AI's work is based on careful research and on the standards agreed by the international community. AI is independent of any government, political ideology, economic interest or religion. It does not support or oppose any government or political system, nor does it support or oppose the views of the victims whose rights it seeks to protect. It is concerned solely with the impartial protection of human rights.

AI mobilizes volunteer activists in more than 140 countries and territories in every part of the world. There are more than 1,000,000 AI members and subscribers from many different backgrounds, with widely different political and religious beliefs, united by a determination to work for a world where everyone enjoys human rights.

AI works independently and impartially to promote respect for all the human rights set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The main focus of its campaigning is to:

- free all prisoners of conscience. According to AI's Statute, these are people detained for their political, religious or other conscientiously held beliefs or because of their ethnic origin, sex, colour, language, national or social origin, economic status, birth or other status — who have not used or advocated violence;
- ensure fair and prompt trials for all political prisoners;
- abolish the death penalty, torture and other ill-treatment of prisoners;
- end political killings and "disappearances";
- ensure that governments refrain from unlawful killings in armed conflict.

AI also works to:

- oppose abuses by armed political groups such as the detention of prisoners of conscience, hostage-taking, torture and unlawful killings;
- assist asylum-seekers who are at risk of being returned to a country where they might suffer violations of their fundamental human rights;
- cooperate with other non-governmental organizations, the UN and regional inter-governmental organizations to further human rights;
- ensure control of international military, security and police relations in order to protect human rights;
- organize human rights education and awareness raising programs.

AI is a democratic, self-governing movement. Major policy decisions are taken by an International Council made up of representatives from all national sections.

AI's national sections and local volunteer groups are primarily responsible for funding the movement. No funds are sought or accepted from governments for AI's work investigating and campaigning against human rights violations.

Amnesty International Report 2001

This report documents human rights issues of concern to AI during the year 2000. It also reflects the activities AI has undertaken during the year to promote human rights and to campaign against specific human rights abuses.

The core of this report is made up of entries on individual countries and territories, listed alphabetically. Each of these entries gives a summary of the human rights situation in the country or territory and describes AI's specific human rights concerns there. The absence of an entry on a particular country or territory does not imply that no human rights abuses of concern to AI took place there during the year. Nor is the length of individual entries any basis for a comparison of the extent and depth of AI's concerns.

A world map has been included in this report to indicate the location of countries and territories, and each individual country entry begins with some basic information about the country during 2000. Neither the map nor the country information may be interpreted as AI's view on questions such as the status of disputed territory, population size or language. AI takes no position on issues other than human rights concerns which fall within its mandate.

The later sections of the report contain some information about AI and its work during the year. The final section focuses on AI's work with intergovernmental organizations and includes information about which states are bound by key international and regional human rights treaties.

Internet addresses

Reports published during the year are listed at the end of country entries. These are available on the AI website. The AI Index given in this report can be used to locate a document as follows: AI Index: ABC 63/004/2000
<http://www.web.amnesty.org/ai.nsf/index/ABC630042000>

Abbreviations for treaties

The following abbreviations have been used:

- **UN Convention against Torture** refers to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.
- **UN Women's Convention** refers to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.
- **UN Children's Convention** refers to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.
- **UN Convention against Racism** refers to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.
- **UN Refugee Convention** refers to the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees.
- **European Convention on Human Rights** refers to the (European) Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

Torture Free Zone tape

This report is published during AI's worldwide campaign to eradicate torture. Torture Free Zone tape is used as a visual link with the campaign in many country entries where torture was a significant concern in 2000. However, the absence of the tape in a country entry does not indicate that AI did not have concerns about torture or ill-treatment in that country.

AI'S APPEALS FOR ACTION

The country entries in this report include numerous examples of human rights abuses that AI is dedicated to oppose under its mandate. In response to these human rights abuses, AI urges those in authority in all countries where violations occur to take the steps recommended below. More detailed additional recommendations relevant to particular situations are included where necessary in the specific country entry.

Recommendations to governments

Prisoners of conscience

AI calls for the immediate and unconditional release of all prisoners of conscience. According to AI's Statute, prisoners of conscience are people detained anywhere for their political, religious or other conscientiously held beliefs or because of their ethnic origin, sex, colour, language, national or social origin, economic status, birth or other status — who have not used or advocated violence.

Political prisoners

AI calls for all prisoners whose cases have a political aspect to be given a prompt and fair trial on recognizably criminal charges, or released.

AI calls for trials to meet minimum international standards of fairness. These include, for example, the right to a fair hearing before a competent, independent and impartial tribunal, the right to have adequate time and facilities to prepare a defence, and the right to appeal to a higher tribunal.

Torture and ill-treatment

AI calls on governments to take steps to prevent torture and ill-treatment. Such steps include initiating impartial, prompt and effective investigations into all allegations of torture and bringing to justice those responsible for torture.

Further safeguards against torture and ill-treatment which AI promotes include:

- clear policies that torture and ill-treatment will not be tolerated;
- an end to incommunicado detention, including giving detainees access to independent medical examination and legal counsel;
- outlawing the use of confessions extracted under torture as evidence in courts of law;
- independent inspection of places of detention;
- informing detainees of their rights;
- human rights training for law enforcement personnel;
- compensation for the victims of torture;
- medical treatment and rehabilitation for the victims of torture.

Prison conditions

AI calls on governments to ensure that prison conditions do not amount to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, in line with international human rights standards for the treatment of prisoners.

Death penalty

AI calls on governments to abolish the death penalty in law and practice.

Pending abolition, AI calls on governments to commute death sentences, to introduce a moratorium on executions, to respect international standards restricting the scope of the death penalty and to ensure the most rigorous standards for fair trial in capital cases.

Political killings and 'disappearances'

AI calls on governments to end extrajudicial executions and "disappearances". It calls for prompt, independent and effective investigations into such violations and for those responsible to be brought to justice.

AI calls on governments to:

- demonstrate their total opposition to extrajudicial executions and "disappearances" and make clear to security forces that these abuses will not be tolerated in any circumstances;
- end secret or incommunicado detention and introduce measures to locate and protect prisoners;
- provide effective protection to anyone in danger of extrajudicial execution or "disappearance", including those who have received threats;
- ensure that law enforcement officials use force only when strictly required and to the minimum extent necessary — lethal force should be used only when unavoidable to protect life;
- ensure strict chain-of-command control of all security forces;
- ban "death squads", private armies and paramilitary forces acting outside the official chain of command.

Unlawful killings in armed conflict

AI calls on governments engaged in armed conflict to adhere to provisions of international humanitarian law, including the prohibition of direct attacks on civilians and of indiscriminate attacks.

Asylum-seekers

AI calls on governments to ensure that no asylum-seekers are returned to a country where they might suffer violations of their fundamental human rights.

AI calls on governments to ensure that all asylum-seekers have access to a fair and impartial individual asylum determination, and to ensure that they are not arbitrarily detained or otherwise put under undue pressure.

Promote and respect human rights

AI calls on states to ratify international and regional human rights instruments without reservations, and calls on all governments to respect and promote the provisions of these instruments.

Recommendations to armed political groups

AI calls on armed political groups to respect fundamental standards of human rights and international humanitarian law, and to halt abuses such as the detention of prisoners of conscience, hostage-taking, torture and unlawful killings.

FOREWORD

by Pierre Sané, Secretary General

This is AI's 40th anniversary year. Back in 1961 a British lawyer heard the story of two Portuguese students who had been imprisoned for drinking a toast to freedom. He launched a newspaper appeal, and from this individual initiative grew a worldwide movement in which millions of people have taken part. In its 40 years of work, AI's volunteer activists and their supporters have worked tirelessly to free the unjustly imprisoned, protect those at risk of torture and obtain justice for victims. More than a million AI members are involved in mobilizing their communities, putting pressure on governments and supporting victims and their families. Usually it is impossible to measure the impact of our endeavours, and we are generally part of a far wider effort, but we do know that we have saved lives, we have stimulated action and we have contributed to lasting improvements.

Anniversaries invite reflection not only on past achievements, but also on how the world has changed. This year, the first of a new century, is an opportune moment to look back over the recent past in order to prepare for the challenges ahead. For me personally, it is equally a time of reflection, as I leave the post of Secretary General of AI after nearly 10 years. The past decade – the years since the fall of the Berlin Wall – has seen massive political, social and economic changes. The human rights movement has grown in strength and numbers, and consciousness of human rights is undoubtedly greater than ever. Yet repression, poverty and war devastate the lives of much of humanity. The optimism we enjoyed in 1990 has been replaced by well-founded fears, and human rights activism is needed today more than ever.

1. GLOBALIZATION

The end of the Cold War was hailed by many as the start of a new world order that would bring freedom and prosperity for all. But for millions the reality has proved very different. Globalization – the spread of the free market economy, multi-party political systems and technological change – has been accompanied by growing wealth for some, but destitution and despair for many.

Globalization did not start in the 1990s but its effects have intensified and become clearer over the past 10 years. Capital has always been mobile; what has changed is that the reliance of corporations on national states has become less and less important. Parallel with the concentration of wealth in the hands of multinational corporations has been the growing power of global economic institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank and World Trade Organization (WTO).

Globalization has undoubtedly led to enormous economic expansion. The world is richer than it has ever been and technology is advancing faster and faster. There is

unprecedented potential to eradicate poverty and fulfil the aspirations of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights – freedom from fear and freedom from want. But globalization has also brought economic volatility and instability. The 1997 financial crisis in Asia led to massive unemployment and the displacement of millions of migrant workers. The effects included reduced welfare spending in apparently unconnected countries in Latin America, and a sudden rise in the cost of vital imports into Africa.

Globalization has been accompanied by debt and poverty. More than 80 countries had a lower per capita income in 2000 than they had in 1990. At least 1.3 billion people struggle to survive on less than a dollar a day. Deregulation, privatization and the dismantling of social welfare provision have led to widening inequalities in many countries. In large parts of the world, corruption has increased, and personal, social and political insecurity has spread. The predictable and almost inevitable consequence of this growth in poverty has been a parallel escalation in violations of all human rights. The Berlin Wall may have crumbled, but the walls of poverty, intolerance and hypocrisy still stand.

The new human rights challenges arising from globalization have stimulated AI to take on new areas of work, namely socio-economic rights and economic actors.

AI and socio-economic rights

In a 1997 policy decision, AI members reaffirmed their determination to promote *all* human rights. At its forthcoming International Council Meeting, AI members will debate ways of further intensifying the work of the organization in the fields of social, economic and cultural rights. AI has acknowledged the relative neglect of economic, social and cultural rights by the international human rights movement, and has taken steps to address these rights more directly in its own work.

The 50th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1998 allowed AI to reiterate the importance and the indivisibility of the human rights which are fundamental to the dignity and development of every human being. These range from economic rights, such as the right to work and to an adequate standard of living, to political rights, such as freedom of opinion, expression and association. They include civil rights, such as equality before the law, and social and cultural rights, such as the right to education and to participate in the cultural life of the community. AI's campaign to promote awareness of the Universal Declaration involved entering into a dialogue with millions of people around the world. The campaign also aimed to put pressure on states to ensure that all the rights in the Universal Declaration, including social and economic rights, moved beyond paper promises to become a reality for everyone.

AI and economic actors

The Universal Declaration not only addresses governments but also calls upon "every individual and every organ of society" to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and to secure their observance. By encouraging companies to uphold international human rights standards in their activities, AI can harness a potent influence to shape a better human rights climate. This is not a "partnership", but a recognition that, without sacrificing independence or the right to protest if necessary, non-governmental organizations and companies can build a relationship of mutual respect, working towards the protection of human rights. AI is now promoting a set of human rights principles for companies, which covers issues such as security arrangements, community consultation, freedom from discrimination, labour rights and fair working conditions.

These efforts to promote the human rights agenda within the business community have taken me over the past four years to meetings of the World Economic Forum, along with top-level business executives, heads of state, senior officials, academics, journalists and thinkers. I have argued there for companies to engage in protecting human rights and have insisted on the need to have codes of conduct verified independently and reported publicly. I believe that opportunities to speak directly to people who hold real power in the business world can be useful both in raising the profile of human rights and in pressing individual cases.

Similar considerations led me to attend the launch of the Global Sullivan Principles and of the Global Compact, an initiative of the UN Secretary-General aimed at injecting universal values into the working of global markets. These principles are those which AI expects companies to respect as a minimum, and to implement in ways that are open and transparent.

However, it would be naive not to recognize the potential conflict between the pursuit of profit and the protection of human rights. For example, the proposed Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI) would have restricted states' ability to regulate the conduct of multinational corporations. It would have limited the capacity of states to enforce certain human rights, while not imposing any binding obligations on multinational corporations to protect such rights. A broad coalition of non-governmental organizations, trade unions and political parties lobbied against the MAI, which in the event was shelved, temporarily at least.

Similarly, the World Bank, ostensibly working to alleviate poverty but heavily engaged in promoting deregulation and globalization, is in a position to exert great influence over national economic and political agendas. The World Bank disburses more funds than all the UN agencies put together. AI has called on the World Bank to raise violations of human rights with governments during consultations, to ensure that its own operating procedures are consistent with international human rights law, and to carry out human rights impact assessments of its policies and projects. AI has communicated directly with the World Bank about its

operations in several parts of the world, including Indonesia, Sierra Leone and Chechnya. World Bank officials have had discussions with AI staff on other projects and initiatives, and AI will continue to press for real change, so that human rights are given proper consideration in all the Bank's work.

AI has also not shied away from openly criticizing companies. When Nigerian writer Ken Saro-Wiwa and eight other Ogoni activists were threatened with execution after grossly unfair trials, AI pleaded with the Anglo-Dutch Shell oil company to intervene. Shell insisted then that it played no role in Nigerian politics. The nine men were hanged. I made it clear that I simply do not believe that the Nigerian government perceived the silence of one of its most powerful investors as neutral. AI publicized its concern about the role of BP in Colombia, when we learned that the company used to protect BP's oil installations was reportedly passing intelligence information about the local population to the Colombian military. The Colombian armed forces and their paramilitary allies are responsible for most of the 30,000 political killings in Colombia over the past 10 years. Both Shell and BP have since declared their commitment to supporting human rights.

The development of AI's work on socio-economic rights and on economic actors is informed by a sense of urgency. Poverty, hunger and homelessness are not inevitable – the world has the resources to overcome them if we can generate the political will. Utopia may not be within our reach, but positive change is.

AI and the UN

Economic insecurity has stoked internal conflicts that nation states have proved unable to resolve or contain. Far from becoming a more effective force for peace and justice once freed from the paralysis of Cold War super-power rivalry, the UN has been drawn into crises that are beyond the resources it has been given and which test its credibility. Because so many hopes rest with the UN, it is hard to confront its failures. But no objective observer could describe the results of UN interventions such as those in Somalia, Angola, Haiti or Iraq as successful examples of the values on which the UN was founded.

The UN is trapped between the principles it was established to uphold and the self-interest of the governments of which it is composed. Even within the UN's human rights machinery, this tension can lead to paralysis. The UN Commission on Human Rights, the leading UN human rights body, has sacrificed human rights integrity in the interests of political compromise. In March 2000, AI called on the Commission to speak out on the human rights situation in, among others, China and Saudi Arabia, countries which have appalling human rights records but where in the interests of *realpolitik* the international community has remained silent. China has seen in the past two years the most serious and wide-ranging crackdown on peaceful dissent for a decade. Yet the Commission's response has been minimal. Some Commission delegates have argued that dialogue alone would produce

positive results, but dialogue is a means to an end. It cannot be meaningful if it has no impact on the human rights situation.

While critical of the UN when necessary, AI works to improve the UN's human rights machinery. In the mid-1990s, lobbying by human rights organizations including AI culminated in the creation of the post of High Commissioner for Human Rights. In 2000 the UN Commission on Human Rights created a Special Representative on human rights defenders to intervene on behalf of those in the forefront of the struggle for human rights.

Over the past decade, as the UN has become more involved in peace-keeping operations, AI has developed a series of recommendations on building human rights promotion and protection into peace-keeping activities. In 1997, I briefed the UN Security Council on human rights in armed conflict, suggesting how human rights initiatives can play a role in better preventing and managing conflict, and in post-conflict peace-building.

In AI's experience, long-term reconciliation after armed conflict is not possible unless justice is central to the search for peace. Sweeping aside the question of responsibility for atrocities during an armed conflict only leads to renewed cycles of violence and impunity. AI has been fully engaged in the campaign to establish a just, fair and effective International Criminal Court. This court would have jurisdiction over the worst crimes in the world—genocide, other crimes against humanity and war crimes—and AI members continue to lobby their own governments to make the court a reality.

AI members reaffirmed in 1997 the fundamental role of work with the UN in ending and preventing human rights abuses. In the coming years, we will strengthen our "insider" advocacy work, backed by sustained public campaigning from the "outside".

Globalization – the challenge for AI

In a world where globalization is undermining many nation states and bringing poverty to the forefront of the human rights agenda, the challenge for AI is to remain relevant. In my opinion, this means broadening our aim from the protection of civil and political rights to embrace all human rights. The indivisibility of human rights is not an abstraction: the context which gives rise to human rights violations is invariably complex and cannot be divorced from issues of wealth and status, injustice and impunity. We have to maintain our focus on the individual victim to articulate what indivisibility means in real life. And in real life, accountability extends beyond the police officer wielding a baton, not only to his or her political masters but also to those who profit from inequality. In the minds of the drafters of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, freedom from fear and freedom from want have always been inseparable.

And the indivisible links between socio-economic and political rights have been mirrored in the emergence of a new network of protest movements. Globalization has brought together activists on issues such as child labour, the environment, anti-capitalism, Third World debt and human

rights, creating an international, grassroots movement. Many of the groups that have come together to halt the proceedings of international financial institutions overcame long-standing divisions and diverging agendas using one of the much-vaunted advances of globalization—the Internet. A global solidarity movement to address the negative consequences of globalization is in the making. AI will bring its unique contribution to this endeavour.

2. FRAGMENTATION

Divisions within many societies have deepened in recent years, and in some have degenerated into open conflict. Far from the fall of the Berlin Wall marking "the end of history", we have witnessed a resurgence of bitter wars in which countless lives have been ruined and lost. In the past decade there have been tragic conflicts in Bosnia-Herzegovina and other parts of former Yugoslavia, in Chechnya, East Timor, Algeria, Somalia, Central Africa, Liberia and Sierra Leone.

Faced with the mass violations of human rights committed during such conflicts, and especially the 1994 genocide in Rwanda, AI was forced to re-evaluate some of its working methods and its policies. Many of AI's campaigning and research techniques were developed in the Cold War era of individual prisoners of conscience faced with a monolithic state apparatus. But the scale, the ferocity and the speed of these disasters demanded new approaches. AI developed new internal mechanisms to respond to human rights crises more rapidly and forcefully, and grappled with difficult issues such as "humanitarian" military intervention and sanctions. Our members expanded AI's mandate in the light of the increasing number of conflicts with complex internal and international dimensions. Central to our approach has been the belief, borne out in each succeeding crisis, that impunity is the poison that allows human rights violations to spread, to recur or to re-emerge.

Fragmentation is not solely about conflict. It is true that democratic institutions have spread in the past decade—especially in Latin America, Eastern Europe and Africa. All too often, however, this has not meant genuine popular participation, but merely a power struggle within a tiny ruling elite, or an army general donning a suit. Whole sections of society have remained disenfranchised and vulnerable to the divide and rule tactics employed by weak governments. Even in long-established democracies, such as those in Western Europe, lip-service to social inclusion has all too often been used to hide the spread of intolerance, racism and discrimination.

Discrimination

People feel powerless and alienated in the face of global trends, and in reaction they turn to their group for identity. Religion, race, ethnicity, nation—even football—all take on a new importance. This desire to belong has been manipulated both to reinforce the hold of tradition and to feed intolerance of outsiders. This can be seen in mounting xenophobia against asylum-seekers and refugees, whipped up by politicians more concerned with popularity than international human rights

obligations. It can be seen in violence against women, at the hands of police and soldiers, but also at the hands of their own husbands, fathers or employers. It can be seen in racist attacks on Roma in Europe and on members of racial or ethnic minorities in countries all over the world. It can be seen in homophobic attacks on gays and lesbians, and in the frequent failure of the police to provide protection against such attacks or to pursue those responsible.

In the past decade AI has run major campaigns taking up these themes. In 1992, the 500th anniversary of the arrival of Europeans in the Americas, we campaigned against the widespread human rights violations suffered by indigenous peoples in the Americas. In the run-up to the Beijing World Conference on Women's Rights we launched worldwide action around the slogan *Women's Rights are Human Rights*. Faced with growing efforts by governments to avoid their obligations to refugees, and rising intolerance towards asylum-seekers, we organized a worldwide campaign for refugee rights. We took a dual approach: to show that every refugee is a human being with a story of persecution, not a statistic; and to press governments to fulfil their commitments to refugee protection. Above all, we stressed that states should work to end the human rights crises that force people to leave home in search of safety.

Discrimination can take many different forms. In the Israeli-occupied West Bank, for example, thousands of Palestinians live in fear that their homes may be demolished without warning by the Israeli authorities. Palestinians living in the West Bank have no chance of getting a building permit from the authorities, which means their home is effectively illegal even if built on land that has belonged to their family for generations. In 1999 AI published a report which clearly revealed how planning laws are interpreted according to two policies: one for the Palestinians and one for the Israelis.

Our campaign against human rights abuses in the USA – *Rights for All* – highlighted racism in the criminal justice system. Pointing to the disproportionate number of black people in prison and on death row, and systematic police brutality against blacks and Latinos, we called on the USA to deliver rights for all its people. This work fed into our efforts to contribute to the 2001 World Conference against Racism.

Discrimination is also one of the three main messages of the current campaign against torture, which is built around the need to prevent torture, to combat discrimination and to end impunity. Discrimination paves the way for torture by allowing the victim to be seen not as human but as an object, who can, therefore, be treated inhumanely. Institutionalized discrimination also means that the victims are less likely to receive protection and support from the authorities. The campaign has focused special attention on racism and torture, on torture of women, on torture of children, and on torture and sexual identity.

One of the debates among anti-torture activists is the extent to which states are responsible for acts of violence committed not by police officers or soldiers, but by private individuals – “non-state actors”. Domestic violence, racist attacks by

skinhead gangs and “cleansing campaigns” against street children are examples where AI holds that the state can be held accountable if it does not take the basic steps necessary to prevent the abuses and bring those responsible to justice.

AI and human rights defenders

One of the most dramatic changes in the 40 years since AI was created has been the growth and development of human rights groups at the local and national level. Their constant vigilance and dedication are often the only defence against injustice and the abuse of power.

Human rights defenders work to protect the weak and hold the powerful to account. For this they are often victimized. Some have “disappeared” after making inquiries about the “disappeared”. Some have been assassinated for protesting against state violence. Some have been put behind bars for demanding prisoners’ rights. For AI, supporting and protecting human rights defenders at risk, making sure that their voices can be heard, is a vital part of its strategy.

From its inception, AI has worked to protect human rights defenders through campaigning, government lobbying, urgent actions and so on. AI has also worked with other human rights organizations pressing for the adoption of a UN declaration on human rights defenders and the creation of the UN Special Representative on human rights defenders, both of which have become a reality after years of hard work.

The late 1990s saw a real increase in AI’s work on behalf of, and with, human rights defenders. It began in 1996 with the International Conference on the Protection of Human Rights Defenders in Latin America and the Caribbean (the Bogotá Conference), held in Colombia. This was followed in November 1998 with the All-Africa Conference on Human Rights Defenders held in Johannesburg, South Africa, and ended with the Paris Summit in December 1998 which brought together more than 300 defenders from all over the world.

Human rights defenders are playing an ever more crucial role in the defence of the rights of groups who have been marginalized and silenced. Without their tireless work, those who face discrimination and human rights abuses would have little or no protection.

Fragmentation – the challenge for AI

AI was born at a time of widespread global radicalization and drew its strength from people determined to express solidarity with the victims of government repression. In the 1960s the peoples of Africa were struggling to free themselves from colonial domination, and people living under authoritarian regimes in Spain, Portugal or the USSR were fighting to assert their right to dissent. AI said, “let opinions flow freely”, and we organized to unlock the cells of the dissenters.

When, in the 1970s and 1980s, military juntas used torture to break the opposition in Latin America, we campaigned to secure an international convention against torture and to close down the torture chambers. When political repression moved out of the prisons to the streets in the form of “disappearances” and extrajudicial executions, we took on

these new violations. AI responded to the proliferation of armed conflicts in the 1990s by adjusting its mandate to address all the combatants, not just governments.

The challenge facing AI now is to enlarge its focus beyond freedom of opinion to encompass identity-based abuses. We have to work not only for people who are targeted because of what they think, but for those who are at risk because of who they are. This is not a turn away from our roots: the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was a product of revulsion against the Holocaust – and genocide is the ultimate identity-based human rights violation.

This is no easy process. We need new methods of research. We need new campaigning techniques. Above all we need to find new ways of building international solidarity. It has proved in many ways harder to mobilize the public around identity-based abuses. For example, while the torture of anti-apartheid leaders was the subject of worldwide condemnation and popular protest, the torture of criminal suspects in South Africa's police stations today barely registers. While many of the political dissidents around the world that AI campaigned for in the early days were well-connected, middle class intellectuals, the victims of identity-based abuses are often poor and uneducated. Many are unpopular within their own countries. Some people have turned against human rights organizations, regarding their work as little more than the protection of criminals. They have accepted the killing of young suspects, provided it was not their own sons killed by mistake. AI must find new ways to generate compassion, solidarity and action.

3. ASSAULT ON THE NATION STATE

States are being squeezed between the twin pressures of globalization and fragmentation. The nation state can neither control global trends, nor easily accommodate the demands of different groups living within its borders. Some states have collapsed completely under the pressure of competing demands. In others, state control over parts of the national territory is minimal or non-existent. Many states have been weakened, and some have lost legitimacy in the eyes of those they are supposed to represent.

Virtually all governments have adopted the rhetoric of liberal democracy and of human rights. Few have delivered this as a reality. Many states claim they have been forced to adopt economic policies which undermine social, economic and cultural rights. While it is true that no national economy can survive in isolation from globalized markets, it is not true that national governments are totally lacking in powers to defend their people against the arbitrary actions of multinational corporations or the pressures of intergovernmental financial institutions. There is much that governments can and should do.

They can ensure that workers are protected from the worst forms of exploitation. They can tackle official corruption. They can stop attacking human rights defenders. They can, and must, live up to their human rights obligations, national and international.

How to hold states accountable for their conduct? That is the central question that AI tackles on a daily basis. The answer is as varied as the situations we face. The traditional techniques of generating publicity and appealing directly to the responsible authorities through letters, faxes and e-mails are still important. However, AI has moved towards a more strategic approach by identifying in each instance who can influence those with the power to stop abuses, how to mobilize them to take action, and what steps need to be taken to prevent further human rights violations. Companies and other governments can use their economic and diplomatic links to press for improvements. Non-governmental organizations, AI members and local human rights defenders all have a role to play and all have particular strengths to bring to the defence of human rights.

Sometimes an international campaign mobilizing as many people as possible all around the world is the best way to achieve change. In the past 10 years AI members have organized worldwide campaigns against human rights violations in countries including China, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Turkey and the USA. These campaigns motivated and inspired thousands of people and achieved measurable improvements, from raising the profile of human rights issues to the introduction of legislative safeguards. Looking back over these campaigns, one of the most striking developments is the way in which AI has joined forces with other human rights organizations, operating as part of the wider human rights network. The strategy for the USA campaign, for example, was discussed openly with coalitions of US human rights and civil liberties groups.

Increasingly, work to support and strengthen local human rights organizations is an integral part of AI's international campaign strategies. One element is the use of high-profile delegations visiting the country, engaging in discussions with local non-governmental organizations, confronting government officials directly and generating publicity in the local news media. I myself have led more than 50 such high-level missions and they have provided valuable opportunities to speak directly to new audiences and to present AI's message in our own words. Often we have helped give new confidence to the local human rights community and, by making clear what kind of organization we are, what our demands are and how we work, we have given a real boost to our own members. Sometimes the tangible results have exceeded our expectations.

To give just one example, in February 2000 I led an AI delegation which visited Nepal at a time of escalating violence in the "people's war" between the government and the Communist Party of Nepal (Maoist). Our packed schedule included talks with a large number of government officials; meetings with human rights defenders, refugees and victims; a human rights defenders' workshop; a human rights training workshop for police officers; and media work. For most of that week, we were front page news. We raised our concerns about political killings, torture, arbitrary detention and an emerging pattern of "disappearances". The highlight of the visit was the release of two "disappeared" prisoners – Suresh Ale Magar and

Pawan Shrestha – whose cases the AI delegation had brought to the attention of the authorities throughout the week.

AI holds states accountable not only for their actions, but for their inaction. When states pay lip-service to women's and children's rights but fail to train their police in how to deal with domestic violence and child abuse, they have not lived up to their responsibilities and therefore share the blame. Similarly AI holds states accountable not only for their actions at home, but also for the harm they do in other parts of the world. The failure to regulate international transfers of arms, security equipment and expertise used to abuse human rights has equipped torturers, propped up repressive regimes and fuelled conflicts.

The horror of crimes committed in these conflicts has finally prompted the international community to take serious steps towards ending impunity. The attempt to bring former Chilean leader Augusto Pinochet to justice in Europe showed just how far the world's understanding of international justice had come. Although Augusto Pinochet was eventually allowed to return to Chile, his arrest in London transformed the human rights landscape. The principle of universal jurisdiction – that there can be no hiding place for those who commit torture and other terrible crimes – is at the heart of international efforts to establish the International Criminal Court. Pinochet may have escaped justice in Europe, but he now faces trial in Chile. At long last.

Regionalization

Regional groupings of states – such as the European Union, Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Asia-Pacific Economic Co-operation (APEC) – are playing an increasingly prominent role on the world stage. Some of these bodies, for example the Council of Europe and the Organization of American States (OAS), have provided valuable human rights machinery. However, too often states have hidden behind regional bodies to deflect criticism from their own actions. In addition, the perception that decision-making is moving further and further away from ordinary people has in some instances reinforced a reactionary and nationalistic response to human rights initiatives by these bodies. For example, politicians in English-speaking Caribbean countries have stoked support for the death penalty by arguing, among other things, that the OAS was interfering in internal affairs.

AI has worked to further its human rights concerns on the agendas of these regional bodies. AI's office in Brussels seeks to influence the evolution of the European Union's human rights mandate and to monitor its actions. Most recently AI has focused on issues surrounding foreign policy, refugees and asylum, the death penalty, torture and the arms trade. ECOWAS, the West African regional grouping, has deployed peace-keeping troops in several countries. AI has lobbied ECOWAS, seeking to ensure that its peace-keeping troops respect human rights. In the aftermath of the Asian economic crisis, AI highlighted its impact on freedom of association and expression in APEC member states, and urged APEC to

guarantee basic human rights and labour standards. In 1999 NATO launched a bombing campaign against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, with the declared aim of ending human rights violations against ethnic Albanians in Kosovo. NATO claimed that its air campaign was the "most precise and lowest-collateral damage air campaign in history". However, after careful analysis of a number of incidents in which civilians were bombed, AI publicly stated its belief that NATO forces had committed serious violations of the laws of war, leading in a number of cases to the unlawful killings of civilians. AI called for redress for the victims, and reforms to the command structure and decision-making processes of NATO.

The nation state: the challenge for AI

The pressures of globalization and fragmentation are indisputable. However, despite the growing powers of multinational corporations and international institutions, the challenge for AI remains above all to hold states accountable. Recentring the debate to focus on the powers and obligations of governments does not mean ignoring the responsibilities of others. It does mean insisting that states are bound by international human rights law and have no alternative but to uphold it. It does mean confronting their cowardice, their cover-ups and their efforts to shirk their responsibilities. It does mean stressing that they have the power, despite external constraints, to deliver on human rights if they have the political will to do so. In short, we need to bring the state back in.

When AI calls on states to be strong in defence of human rights, it is not calling for the use of repression or strong-arm tactics. States often claim that they have to use force to control the irretrievable slide into division. But the use of violence in the face of internal dissent and fragmentation is not a sign of strong governance. Strong governance depends on transparency, inclusion and respect. Governance does not mean mere government. It means the framework of rules, institutions and established practices that set limits and give incentives for the conduct of individuals, organizations and companies. National and global governance have to be reinvented with human rights at their core.

In the name of the victim

AI never loses sight of the fact that these principles are important because of their impact on the real lives and personal tragedies of the victims of human rights violations. The victim is always at the heart of the battles we fight. The first battle is the battle to preserve the individual identity of the victim. A victim is not a statistic or a sociological category. A victim is a human being. And every human being has the right to the elemental human dignity of being named. The second battle is the battle against forgetting. The suffering of victims must be acknowledged and given its due importance. There can be no justice while the perpetrators are allowed to ignore or deny what they have done. The third battle is the battle for compassion for all victims of human rights violations. Human rights are the birthright of all, not just the popular, the articulate and the well-connected. But to build international

solidarity on behalf of the socially excluded requires new ways of organizing and reaching people. It requires a new inclusiveness.

I am confident that new audiences will find a home in a multifaceted mass human rights movement, and that together we will rise to these challenges. The forces ranged against us may be formidable. However, the outrage at injustice that led to the founding of AI 40 years ago continues to inspire and motivate millions of people determined to build a better world.

Happy anniversary to all AI members, supporters and staff.

INTRODUCTION

"When I got out I was amazed to hear that Amnesty International had somehow heard about me and had been campaigning for me. For me, Amnesty International means a lot. It is because of the people who care enough about other people to contribute to the work of Amnesty International that people like me all over the world are still alive and are what they are now."

Sylvestre Gahungu, a survivor of human rights violations in Burundi, now an AI member living in New Zealand.

For the past 40 years AI has fought to defend victims of human rights violations. During that time, AI members have steadfastly refused to be daunted by the scale of the task. Whether faced with apparently impregnable totalitarian regimes or the chaos and devastation of war, AI members have found ways to campaign on behalf of prisoners of conscience and victims of other human rights violations, including torture, "disappearances", political killings and executions. Since AI's creation in 1961, AI members have worked on more than 45,000 cases. Some of these cases were on behalf of individuals, others involved whole families or groups. Since the first urgent action appeal was issued in 1973, AI has initiated some 16,600 urgent appeals on behalf of men, women and children in immediate danger. In about one third of new urgent action appeal cases, AI learns of some improvement in the situation of the person or people named in the appeal.

During 2000, in addition to its continuing work monitoring and exposing human rights violations wherever they occur, AI launched a concerted new effort to eradicate torture around the world.

This Amnesty International Report summarizes human rights issues of concern to the organization during 2000. The individual entries which make up the

bulk of the report look at these concerns within individual countries and territories. This introductory chapter aims to highlight major campaigning initiatives undertaken by AI members during the year and to reflect some of the major human rights developments worldwide.

Campaign against torture

Few people today would defend the use of torture, yet every year thousands of people beat, rape and electrocute other human beings. AI's renewed campaign to eradicate torture, launched in October 2000, affirms that torture is always indefensible, and that it can be stopped. The message is not new. However, what is new is that more people, in more countries, are taking part in a greater variety of activities to promote this message than ever before.

In Nepal, for example, members organized a motorbike rally involving more than 80 riders. They set out from Kathmandu in two groups – heading for the eastern and western extremes of the country. On their way the riders went into every police station trying to persuade police officers to declare their police stations torture free zones and to show their commitment by displaying "Torture Free Zone tape". The day after the launch of the anti-torture campaign, 14 of the country's 15 newspapers carried reports about the campaign, many on the front page. As well as imaginative and effective public events, members organized a workshop for lawyers on the shortcomings of Nepal's Torture Compensation Act and participated in human rights training for more than 700 police personnel.

In countries around the world AI members are seeking to reach out beyond AI's traditional partner organizations and forge links not only with local human rights groups, but also with other organizations willing to become involved, such as women's groups and trade unions. These new networks are able to draw on complementary capacities and expertise to develop a

A Peruvian theatre group taking part in a "Marathon for Life, Against Torture", part of AI Peru's activities for the launch of AI's worldwide campaign against torture. More than 2,000 people took part, old and young, including TV personalities and members of Congress.



collective strategy for action, appropriate to their specific country or locality.

The campaign has local roots, but global reach. On 18 October the campaign was launched by human rights activists not only in London, but also in Beirut, Buenos Aires, Nairobi and Tokyo. "Torture Free Zone tape" was wrapped around embassies, police stations and courts of justice. In Argentina, speakers at AI's heavily attended press conference included Isabel Allende, a Chilean Deputy, and Argentinian Deputy Dr Alfredo Bravo, a survivor of torture adopted by AI as a prisoner of conscience in the 1970s. In Lebanon, Marcel Khalife, a renowned Lebanese singer and poet, and over 100 AI members held a press conference at the Press Syndicate where solidarity messages from other celebrities were read out. In Japan the launch press conference was attended by torture victims from Tibet, Myanmar, South Korea and Indonesia. Yenny Rosa Damayanati, an Indonesian human rights activist and torture victim, paid tribute in front of the Indonesian embassy to those who died as a result of torture. In Kenya speakers at the launch included Joseph Etima, Uganda's Commissioner for Prisons; Elvis Thodi, Malawi's Assistant Commissioner of Police; and Anisia Achieng, Coordinator of Sudanese Women's Voice for Peace and Human Rights.

The painstaking planning and tireless efforts of those involved set a new benchmark for the level of media coverage and attention that a human rights campaign can and should achieve.

Campaigning against torture online

Working to prevent or stop the torture of individuals at risk has always been at the heart of AI's work. The methods of the torturers have changed over the decades, and so have the methods of the anti-torture

campaigners. This campaign is using the Internet to try to extend the protection of international scrutiny to an ever greater number of potential victims. The www.stoptorture.org website has led to individuals in 188 countries registering to get involved and add their voice to the clamour for justice and freedom from torture.

One of the first urgent actions posted on this website was on behalf of Trabun Ibrahim Laku, a Sudanese asylum-seeker detained in Lebanon. There were fears that he and other asylum-seekers were being tortured to force them to drop their asylum claims. Twelve hours into the campaign, 1,300 people had sent expressions of concern for Trabun Ibrahim Laku from the website. The Lebanese government asked AI "to please stop the e-mail messages which are still arriving at a rate of 2 every minute".

Take a step to stamp out torture

At the start of the campaign AI published *Take a step to stamp out torture*, drawing on recent reports of torture and ill-treatment from more than 150 countries. Torture continues to be used as an instrument of political repression. In many parts of the world, those who challenge the prevailing order, whether non-violently or by taking up arms, are still likely targets of torture and ill-treatment.

However, AI's global survey into patterns of torture revealed that the most common victims of torture and ill-treatment are convicted criminals and criminal suspects. In some countries, beatings of criminal suspects are so routine that they are not recognized as torture, even by the victims themselves. Criminal suspects often come from the poorest or most marginalized sectors of society. Discrimination against

© Gilles Peress/Magnum Photos

We do not have copyright for these photographs for the web.

Please contact your nearest section
to purchase a copy of the report.

Cambodia: a woman looks at pictures of people tortured by the Khmer Rouge in the late 1970s. This photograph appears in a book produced by AI Italy to promote the anti-torture campaign.

© AI

Imen Derouiche, a former prisoner of conscience from Tunisia, speaks of her experience of torture and why she is backing AI's campaign, Take a step to stamp out torture. She was one of a group of students at the University of Tunis who were held in incommunicado detention, beaten, threatened and denied essential medical treatment in 1998 and 1999.



such groups often contributes to the lack of action against their torture or ill-treatment.

AI's increased emphasis on working against abuses based on identity – especially women and children – is at the heart of the torture campaign. For many people torture is what happens to political prisoners under brutal dictatorships. This is true. But it is also what happens in liberal democracies, especially to members of groups which have been silenced or marginalized by wider social discrimination. The link between discrimination against women, children, members of ethnic minorities and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered people is key to the campaign.

Children and torture

"He had a pair of pliers in his hand. He kept asking where the mobile [phone] was. I told him I had not seen it... He got hold of my thumb and placed it between the pliers. He pressed it hard and crushed my thumb. I do not remember what happened next."

This description would be shocking no matter who the victim was. What makes it particularly abhorrent is that these are the words of a nine-year-old boy tortured by police in Bangladesh.

As part of the anti-torture campaign, AI published a report which highlighted the horrific violence and abuse to which children are subjected throughout the world. Every day children are tortured in police stations, by rival armies and in their homes. Most children suffer in silence, their stories never told, their tormentors never called to account. AI's campaign seeks to expose the hidden scandal of the torture of children and to end it. (*Hidden scandal,*

secret shame – Torture and ill-treatment of children, AI Index: ACT 40/038/2000)

Women and torture

"She was crying when she came back. She told us she had been raped by three or four soldiers. She cried for a long time. She asked why we were lying about it because she said she knew it had happened to us too."

A woman from Suva Reka, Kosovo, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, 1999

The kind of torture that women are subjected to is decisively influenced by their gender. Rape and other sexual violence have been inflicted on women in all the armed conflicts investigated by AI in recent years.

Women in custody have been subjected to many forms of torture. Prominent among them is sexual violence, including rape, by police and prison guards. Yet in most countries women's greatest risk of violence comes not from police officers or soldiers, but from people they know. Whatever the setting, whoever the perpetrator, most women victims of violence have to contend not only with the abuse itself, but also with official silence or indifference.

Although governments have a duty to prevent, investigate and punish abuses against women, in reality women often face inadequate preventive measures, police indifference, a failure to define abuses as criminal offences and gender bias in the court system. In Italy, in February 1999, the Supreme Court overturned an appeal court verdict which had found a male driving instructor guilty of raping his 18-year-old student, commenting: "It is common knowledge... that jeans cannot even be partly removed without the active cooperation of the person wearing them... and it is impossible if the victim is struggling with all her force". The court concluded that rape was not proved and referred the case back for retrial.

As part of the anti-torture campaign, AI is seeking to hold states accountable for all acts of torture, including those committed by private individuals.

Sexual identity and torture

The torture of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered people around the world is concealed behind a veil of secrecy and taboo. It is a worldwide problem – AI has documented numerous cases from every continent – but one that is greatly under-reported. The stigma surrounding homosexuality in many cultures means that those speaking out are often ignored, further marginalized or abused. While some governments seek to deny that such torture takes place – or even that homosexuals exist in their countries – others openly justify it in the name of morality, religion or ideology. Either way, the effect is that torture goes unchallenged.

Laws criminalizing homosexuality not only deprive a sector of the population of basic human rights, they may also act as a licence to torture or ill-treat. However, torture is not limited to countries where homosexuality is illegal. Institutionalized prejudice means that lesbians, bisexuals, gay men and

transgendered people who come into contact with the law for other reasons may be targeted for abuse, in particular rape and other sexual violence. AI campaigns against laws that criminalize homosexuality. As part of this campaign AI is highlighting the links between discriminatory laws and practices and torture.

Racism and torture

The recent resurgence in racist ill-treatment and torture is nourished by increasingly xenophobic responses to immigration, discrimination in the criminal justice system, and the proliferation of armed conflicts with an ethnic dimension.

According to AI's research, many if not most of the victims of police brutality in Europe and the USA are black or members of other ethnic minorities. In the Americas, torture and ill-treatment of indigenous people, especially in the context of land rights disputes, is a continuing legacy of centuries of subjugation. Rape, mutilation and other torture have been used as weapons of war in recent conflicts with an ethnic dimension in Africa, Asia and Eastern Europe.

The link between racism and torture is a key theme of the anti-torture campaign, and the 2001 UN World Conference on Racism provides a welcome opportunity to cast the spotlight on patterns of racist abuse.

Take a step to stamp out torture

- Join AI's campaign against torture
- Join AI and other local and international human rights organizations which fight torture
- Make a donation to support AI's work
- Tell friends and family about the campaign and ask them to join too
- Register to take action against torture at www.stoptorture.org and campaign online. Visitors to the website will be able to appeal on behalf of individuals at risk of torture

Campaign against the death penalty

"The death penalty is disgusting, particularly if it condemns an innocent. But it remains an injustice even when it falls on someone who is guilty of a crime."

Giuliano Amato, Prime Minister of Italy, 14 September 2000, commenting on a scheduled execution in Virginia, USA

A permanent end to all executions in the year 2000 – that was the challenge to governments that went out from AI and other abolitionist organizations. It was a challenge that was directed to all governments, but above all to the handful of states responsible for the vast majority of executions – China, Iran, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and the USA. At the end of 2000 more than half the countries in the world had abolished the death penalty in law or practice.

We do not have copyright for these photographs for the web.

Please contact your nearest section to purchase a copy of the report.

© Adrees Latif/Reuters

An 11-year-old boy holds up a sign protesting against the scheduled execution of Bettie Lou Beets in Texas, USA, February 2000. The 62-year-old woman was later put to death by lethal injection for a murder committed in 1983.

More than three countries a year on average have abolished the death penalty for all crimes in the past decade. Once abolished, the death penalty is seldom reintroduced. Since 1985, more than 40 countries have abolished the death penalty in law or, having previously abolished it for ordinary crimes, have gone on to abolish it for all crimes. During the same period only four abolitionist countries reintroduced the death penalty.

In March Malta became the first country to abolish the death penalty for all crimes in the new century. Côte d'Ivoire followed in July when a new Constitution which stipulates that "all penalties resulting in the deprivation of human life are prohibited" was adopted by referendum.

In the USA a recent survey has shown a majority in favour of a moratorium on executions until a study is carried out on the fairness of how the death penalty is used. In January, the Governor of Illinois declared a moratorium on executions in his state owing to its "shameful" record of wrongful convictions in capital cases. His decision fuelled calls for executions to be

By the end of 2000, 75 countries and territories had abolished the death penalty for all crimes. A further 13 countries had abolished it for all but exceptional crimes such as wartime crimes. At least 20 countries were abolitionist in practice: they had not carried out any executions for the past 10 years or more and were believed to have an established practice of not carrying out executions.

In 2000 at least 1,457 people were executed in 28 countries. At least 3,058 people were sentenced to death in 65 countries. These figures include only cases known to AI; the true figures were certainly higher.

The vast majority of executions worldwide are carried out in a tiny handful of countries. In 2000, 88 per cent of all known executions took place in China, Iran, Saudi Arabia and the USA.

- In China, preliminary figures indicated that at least 1,000 people were executed, although the true number was believed to be much higher.
- At least 75 executions were carried out in Iran.
- Eighty-five people were executed in the USA.
- In Saudi Arabia, 123 executions were reported, but the total may have been much higher.
- In Iraq, hundreds of executions were reported, but many of them may have been extrajudicial.

halted elsewhere in the country. Despite this, the death penalty continued to be widely used. Four juvenile offenders were executed; the highest number since 1993. In Texas alone, 40 people were executed, a record in any one year; in December, the 150th prisoner was executed under the five-year governorship of George W. Bush. The USA continued to violate international standards by using the death penalty against the mentally impaired, individuals who were under 18 at the time of the crime, and defendants who received inadequate legal representation. Studies continued to show that the death penalty is applied in the USA in an arbitrary and unfair manner, prone to bias on grounds of race and class.

Although the worldwide abolition of the death penalty has come closer over the past four decades, much still remains to be done, especially in the handful of countries where judicial killing by the state is most entrenched.

Worldwide actions

AI members around the world took special action during 2000 in response to situations in a number of specific countries where the scale or long-term nature of human rights abuses were the cause of acute concern. This was in addition to their continuing work on behalf of individuals, and their efforts to persuade governments to improve their human rights policies and practices.

Sierra Leone

The internal armed conflict in Sierra Leone has been marked by terrible atrocities against unarmed civilians, including mutilations and sexual violence, ever since its outbreak in 1991. In early May 2000 there was a serious deterioration in the political and security situation, precipitated by the capture of some 500 UN peace-keeping troops by rebel forces of the Revolutionary United Front. This crisis showed clearly the link between impunity and continued human rights abuses – the Lomé peace agreement of 1999 included a blanket amnesty for crimes committed in

the conflict, which provided no deterrent to a resurgence in the violence.

Although the captured UN forces were released by mid-July 2000, through the mediation of President Charles Taylor of Liberia, the situation remained volatile, with shifting alliances and continuing hostilities between a number of armed forces. Large parts of the north and east of the country, including the key diamond-producing areas, remained under the control of rebel forces, and the illicit trade in diamonds continued to finance the provision of arms and ammunition to rebel forces. Both rebel forces and government-allied forces committed abuses.

AI responded to this crisis by mobilizing its members worldwide to protest at gross human rights abuses against civilians – including killings, mutilation and rape – and to call for the protection of refugees and internally displaced people. AI members highlighted the widespread use of child soldiers in the conflict and the need to prevent the illicit trade in diamonds from Sierra Leone being used to finance arms purchases by rebel forces. AI members around the world called on their governments to enforce effectively an embargo on arms sales to rebel forces, and to ensure that transfers of arms and services to government forces did not facilitate human rights violations.

AI's strategy on Sierra Leone sought to maintain human rights concerns high on the agenda of influential actors, in particular the UN Security Council,

© Yannis Behnakis/Reuters

We do not have copyright for these photographs for the web.

Please contact your nearest section to purchase a copy of the report.

Internally displaced people in Sierra Leone. Thousands of people fled to Freetown in May 2000 to escape rebel attacks.

the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and key governments. AI pressed the UN Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) to fulfil its mandate to protect civilians, while urging the international community to ensure that the UNAMSIL human rights section received adequate resources and political support.

AI called for an effective international mechanism for investigating human rights abuses and bringing perpetrators to justice. In August 2000 the UN Security Council agreed to establish an independent Special Court for Sierra Leone to try crimes against humanity, war crimes and other serious violations of international humanitarian law. AI called for the Special Court to have the power to prosecute those most responsible for atrocities throughout the conflict and anyone who recruited children under the age of 15 into armed forces or groups, whether such recruitment was forced or voluntary. It also called for the Special Court to receive adequate and sustained funding and for priority to be given to the speediest possible reconstruction of the national judicial system so that it can eventually assume responsibility for bringing to justice perpetrators of human rights abuses not tried by the Special Court.

AI also lobbied the international diamond trading community, as well as major diamond trading centres, to implement UN restrictions on diamonds from Sierra Leone. AI addressed meetings of the International Diamond Manufacturers Association and the World Federation of Diamond Bourses in Antwerp. As a result of ground-breaking work on diamonds and arms, AI was able to involve its grassroots members in taking action on issues concerning economic relations to a greater extent than ever before and to develop expertise in sustaining such activities in countries around the world. Working together with other non-governmental organizations, AI had an impact in that the industry acknowledged the need for regulation and worked towards a tamper-proof certification scheme for diamonds from Sierra Leone.

AI sees its work with the Sierra Leone human rights movement as crucial. Although Sierra Leonean non-governmental human rights organizations have consolidated their work by forming a National Forum for Human Rights and cooperating with the UNAMSIL human rights section and international human rights and humanitarian organizations, they still require training and logistical support. The partnership between AI and the Sierra Leone human rights movement was greatly strengthened during 2000.

Israel and the Occupied Territories

On 29 September, Israeli soldiers shot and killed five Palestinians and injured more than 200 others in East Jerusalem. The shooting took place after stones were thrown over the Western Wall following Friday prayers at the al-Aqsa Mosque. Demonstrations which followed were in protest at these killings, and became even more widespread after television viewers saw the prolonged agony ending in the death of a 12-year-old boy, Muhammad al-Dura, shot at Netzarim Junction on

We do not have copyright for these photographs for the web.

Please contact your nearest section to purchase a copy of the report.

30 September in the Gaza Strip by Israeli security forces, while his father tried to protect him. In the following days, demonstrations, which often developed into violent clashes between Palestinians and Israeli security forces, took place – sometimes daily – in cities and villages in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. Demonstrations also took place in Palestinian towns and villages within Israel. In the four days that followed more than 50 Palestinians were killed – 13 in Israel and at least 40 in the West Bank and Gaza – by soldiers using rubber-coated metal bullets and live ammunition, including high-velocity bullets.

By the end of 2000, Israeli security forces had killed at least 300 and wounded more than 10,000 Palestinians, many of whom were children under 18. The Israel Airforce and the navy used heavy weaponry, including helicopter gunships, tanks and naval vessels, to shell randomly Palestinian areas from where armed Palestinians had opened fire. Armed Palestinians, including paramilitary groups linked to the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and opposition groups such as Islamic *Jihad*, carried out attacks, killing 16 Israeli civilians.

AI's overriding concern was the excessive use of lethal force by the Israeli security forces. AI members

A Palestinian schoolboy face to face with an Israeli soldier. In the last three months of 2000, Israeli security services killed at least 300 Palestinians, many of whom were children. AI used this photograph on a poster with the slogan "Stop the Killing".

around the world called for the killings to stop. They demanded that killings, on both sides, be investigated. By the end of the year, not a single killing had been properly investigated and few autopsies had been conducted by either side to determine how individuals had been killed.

AI publicly called for the immediate suspension of all transfers of attack helicopters from the USA to Israel, including a pending upgrade of Apache helicopter gunships.

AI reiterated its urgent call for an independent international investigation by the UN into serious human rights abuses in Israel and the Occupied Territories, including the areas under the jurisdiction of the Palestinian Authority. In October, a special session of the UN Commission on Human Rights set up a Commission of Inquiry into the violations of human rights in Israel and the Occupied Territories. AI asked that it cooperate with all other ongoing investigations, that it be given access to all persons, documents and places and that it report publicly.

A key focus of the action was to generate the maximum impact through public events, as well as more traditional lobbying and letter-writing activities aimed at those with the power to influence the situation. AI members faced particular challenges in addressing the human rights crisis in Israel and the Occupied Territories. In a situation where inaccurate information and disinformation were common currency, AI's sustained presence and accurate reporting from the field were crucial to the effectiveness of our campaigning, as was our work together with Israeli and Palestinian non-governmental organizations.

Saudi Arabia

AI's campaign on human rights violations in Saudi Arabia was launched in March with the slogan "End Secrecy, End Suffering". The launch report, *A Secret State of Suffering* (AI Index: MDE 23/001/2000), highlighted the secrecy and fear permeating every aspect of the criminal justice system in Saudi Arabia. This secrecy facilitates human rights violations including arbitrary arrest and indefinite detention, the imprisonment of prisoners of conscience, torture, secret and summary trials, cruel judicial punishments and executions. AI's campaign also drew attention to the fact that responsibility for human rights violations in Saudi Arabia lies not just with the government but also with the international community, which has largely been reluctant to speak out against human rights violations in the country.

The campaign provoked unprecedented debate within Saudi Arabia about fundamental human rights. A number of Saudi Arabian newspapers reported AI's arguments and the reaction of the authorities. Newspapers carried articles about the criminal justice system and other human rights issues. Live debates and interviews on human rights in Saudi Arabia were broadcast by TV and radio stations to viewers and listeners throughout the Middle East.

In an unprecedented move, the Saudi Arabian government publicly stated its belief in the universality and indivisibility of human rights and announced measures to promote and protect such rights. During the March/April 2000 session of the UN Commission on Human Rights, Saudi Arabia's Deputy Foreign Minister stated that "...human rights are a non-negotiable objective for the achievement of which we must all strive together", and that Saudi Arabia was committed to "...the protection and promotion of human rights through carefully studied measures within the context of a comprehensive human rights strategy." In September, days before AI launched its report *Saudi Arabia: Gross human rights abuses against women* (AI Index: MDE 23/057/2000), Saudi Arabia acceded to the UN Women's Convention.

AI's campaign has been successful in drawing attention to the grave human rights violations which have persisted for so long in the country. It has broken through the wall of secrecy; the challenge now is to end the suffering.

Impunity

Impunity – the failure to bring to justice those responsible for human rights violations – feeds the cycle of violence, encourages further abuses and denies the victims justice. Tackling impunity is a vital step in building a vigilant society where human rights are respected and protected, where routine abusive practices cannot persist and where isolated cases, should they occur, are dealt with promptly and effectively.

AI, therefore, opposes any measures which grant amnesties to perpetrators of human rights crimes before the truth has been established. The failure to acknowledge the truth prolongs the original harm by

AI members in Washington DC, USA, protest against human rights abuses in Saudi Arabia, September 2000. Human rights activists all over the world took part in AI's campaign, End Secrecy, End Suffering in Saudi Arabia.



seeking to deny that it ever took place – a further affront to the dignity and humanity of the victim.

States have a duty to investigate human rights violations, to identify those responsible, to impose the appropriate penalties and to ensure the victim receives adequate reparation. Yet in countries all around the world, evidence is concealed, investigations are inept or corrupt, and the system conspires to protect the perpetrators rather than the victims.

States also have responsibilities that extend beyond their borders. According to the principle of universal jurisdiction, states should bring to justice those presumed responsible for crimes against humanity, war crimes and genocide, regardless of where the crimes were committed, the nationality of the person responsible, or the nationality of the victim. All states are obliged to cooperate in this process.

Augusto Pinochet

The case of the former Chilean military leader, Augusto Pinochet, continued to attract immense international interest, both because it broke new ground in the practical application of the principle of universal jurisdiction and because the scale and ferocity of the repression in Chile after the 1973 military coup reverberated throughout the world. This case continued to have an unprecedented impact in terms of spreading awareness of universal jurisdiction and sending a clear message of warning

to perpetrators of gross human rights abuses in all parts of the world.

Developments in the case in 2000 highlighted some of the limitations and the possibilities of universal jurisdiction in the struggle against impunity.

Despite criminal investigations or proceedings against him in Spain, the United Kingdom, Belgium, France, Switzerland and the USA, Augusto Pinochet was allowed to return home in March on grounds of ill health. By then, however, the publicity surrounding his arrest had punctured his apparent invincibility and given renewed impetus to the calls for justice within Chile itself.

In June, the Santiago Appeals Court ruled that Augusto Pinochet's parliamentary immunity should be lifted. In December, Judge Juan Guzmán ordered that Augusto Pinochet be placed under house arrest as author of the kidnapping and/or murder of 75 people during an October 1973 military operation known as the "Caravan of Death" ("*Caravana de la Muerte*"). Subsequently, the Supreme Court overturned the order, ruling that the judge had failed to interrogate Augusto Pinochet before issuing the order, and that mental and physical tests should be carried out to determine his fitness to stand trial before the interrogation could take place. At the end of 2000 Augusto Pinochet's name appeared in 202 lawsuits which were pending before Chilean courts in connection with human rights violations committed under his military government.

Hissein Habré

The case of Hissein Habré, former president of Chad, demonstrates that at both the national and international levels, overcoming impunity requires political will on the part of the authorities. Although Senegal had ratified the UN Convention against Torture, it had failed to incorporate all of its provisions into national legislation. In particular, the authorities failed to incorporate the provision which would explicitly allow Senegalese courts to try a foreign national for acts of torture committed abroad. In July, the Senegalese court investigating charges of complicity in acts of torture against Hissein Habré dismissed the charges on the grounds that it could not prosecute crimes committed in Chad. An appeal against this verdict was pending at the end of the year.

Hissein Habré had been indicted following a criminal complaint filed in January by Chadian victims and a coalition of non-governmental organizations. The legal action accused Hissein Habré of crimes against humanity and acts of torture. The lesser charge of complicity in acts of torture was retained by the investigating judge and Hissein Habré was placed under house arrest while investigations into the charges against him began. However, the defence lodged a motion to dismiss the case on the grounds that Senegal has no jurisdiction over crimes committed in Chad and that the prosecution is barred by the 10-year statute of limitations.

No one has been brought to justice in Chad for their part in the abuses committed under the former government of Hissein Habré.

© Andrew Wong/Reuters

We do not have copyright for these photographs for the web.

Please contact your nearest section to purchase a copy of the report.

A Chinese police officer about to arrest a follower of the spiritual group *Falun Gong* in Tiananmen Square, Beijing, April 2000. Many thousands of *Falun Gong* adherents were held in detention during 2000.

A student in Aceh, Indonesia, tries to push back riot police during clashes between protesters and the security forces in March 1999. Police and military operations against separatist rebels continued throughout 2000. Hundreds of people were extrajudicially executed. Some were tortured before being killed. Many of the victims were ordinary civilians, including aid workers, human rights defenders and political activists.

© Reuters

We do not have copyright for these photographs for the web.

Please contact your nearest section to purchase a copy of the report.

No justice, no peace

In Algeria, more than 100,000 people have been killed by the security forces, state armed militias and armed groups since the current conflict began in 1992. Thousands "disappeared" after being seized by the security forces. Despite the scale of this long-drawn-out tragedy, there have been no independent, impartial investigations. The authorities have stated that they want to close this sad chapter in Algeria's history, but are seeking to do so by granting immunity to those who may have committed gross human rights crimes. The immunity from prosecution previously enjoyed by members of the security forces and their allied militias has been extended to members of armed opposition groups. Meanwhile, the violence continues, albeit at a much reduced level; since early 1999 about 200 people have been killed every month.

In the year after the Indonesian security forces and allied militias unleashed a wave of violence against the people of East Timor which shocked the international community into taking action, Indonesia continued its path towards democratic reform. Addressing and making amends for its repressive past and establishing accountability before the law are important elements of this process. Credible prosecutions for past human rights violations in Indonesia are a crucial test of the government's commitment to reform. However, political resistance and the weakness of legal and judicial institutions continued to be an obstacle to successful investigations and trials of perpetrators of human rights violations.

New legislation was introduced providing for the establishment of human rights courts to try gross violations of human rights. It was expected that those

suspected of committing crimes, including crimes against humanity, in East Timor in 1999 would be brought to trial under this legislation. However, progress in these cases was slow. Although the Indonesian authorities completed investigations into five cases in October, no human rights court had been established by the end of 2000 to hear the cases. There were also fears that a constitutional amendment adopted in August which bans the retroactive application of legislation might be used to try to prevent suspected perpetrators of human rights violations from being brought to justice under the new legislation.

© Reuters

We do not have copyright for these photographs for the web.

Please contact your nearest section to purchase a copy of the report.

Mothers' groups protest against violence, militarism and human rights violations, September 1999, Jakarta, Indonesia. During 2000 there was a marked deterioration in the human rights situation in parts of Indonesia, including Aceh and Papua.

© Petar Kujundžić/Reuters

We do not have copyright for these photographs for the web.

Please contact your nearest section
to purchase a copy of the report.

An opposition supporter lights a torch during a rally outside the federal parliament building in Belgrade, Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, 6 October 2000. One day earlier, some protesters had stormed the building as part of a popular revolt against President Slobodan Milošević, demanding that he step down in favour of Vojislav Koštunica who had won the elections.

Investigations into events in East Timor during 1999 were also carried out by the UN Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET), but progress was also slow. Indictments were served, but trials had not begun by the end of the year. In the meantime, hundreds of extrajudicial killings and incidents of torture, including rape, committed by the Indonesian security forces and their allied militias were not even investigated.

In Aceh, Indonesia, one civilian and 24 members of the military were found guilty in April of killing a Muslim cleric and over 50 of his followers. However, the trial, which took place in a joint civilian-military tribunal, fell short of international standards for fair trial. Other scheduled trials in Aceh failed to take place and the climate of impunity shielded the perpetrators of human rights abuses in Aceh and Papua where repression of pro-independence supporters intensified.

© Howard Burditt/Reuters

We do not have copyright for these
photographs for the web.

Please contact your nearest section
to purchase a copy of the report.

Women's march for peace, Harare, Zimbabwe, May 2000.

In Zimbabwe, widespread state-sponsored violence started in March and persisted throughout the year, particularly during the months leading up to the June parliamentary elections. The governing Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front (ZANU-PF) party used genuine grievances over land distribution and racial inequalities to foment violence, including killings and torture. These politically motivated violations of human rights and the complete lack of accountability of those responsible took place against a background of decades of impunity.

Serious violations and abuses of human rights during the war of independence (1972 to 1980), especially by the government led by Ian Smith, were covered up by the blanket amnesty that accompanied independence. Zimbabwe was soon after gripped by a new wave of violence as operations by the Zimbabwe National Army 5th Brigade in Matabeleland resulted in thousands of executions, "disappearances" and torture. These atrocities were themselves subject to an amnesty in 1988.

This same pattern of impunity was repeated in October 2000 when President Robert Mugabe issued a clemency order granting a blanket amnesty for all those suspected of politically motivated crimes committed between 1 January 2000 and 31 July 2000. Although the order made exceptions for some grave crimes, the amnesty protects many perpetrators of grave human rights abuses including those responsible for torture and ill-treatment.

In the aftermath of NATO's bombing campaign from late March to early June 1999, reports of human rights violations in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia against opposition activists, non-governmental organizations

and independent journalists increased in frequency and severity. In October 2000, however, the Federal presidential and parliamentary elections, accompanied by mass public protests, brought about the fall of Slobodan Milošević and a significant decrease in the incidence and range of human rights violations. By the end of the year, the new government of Vojislav Koštunica had failed to cooperate with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia by arresting and transferring indicted suspects, including Slobodan Milošević, to the custody of the Tribunal.

In Kosovo delays in establishing a functioning police force and a multi-ethnic, independent and impartial judiciary enabled widespread human rights abuses, particularly against members of minority communities, to be committed with virtual impunity. Early in the year, members of the judiciary were subjected to threats and intimidation, while delays in the establishment of a functioning judiciary led to suspects being held in pre-trial detention for periods exceeding international standards. Other concerns were also expressed about human rights violations perpetrated by the international community – including KFOR (Kosovo Force) and the international police – and about the failure of the UN Interim Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) to protect and promote human rights.

In Colombia the long-running conflict between government forces, illegal paramilitary groups which have the tacit and active support of important sectors of the armed forces, and armed opposition groups, continued to escalate. The conflict has been characterized by a blatant disregard for human rights

and international humanitarian law. At least 4,000 people were killed in political violence in 2000 alone. Hundreds of thousands of civilians, mostly poor peasant farmers from remote rural areas, have been forced to flee their homes.

In July US President Bill Clinton signed a law granting US\$1.3 billion in aid to Colombia, the bulk of it for the Colombian military. According to US law, certain human rights conditions have to be met before military assistance can be given to Colombia, such as civilian trials for armed forces personnel accused of gross human rights violations. AI, together with two US-based non-governmental organizations, presented evidence that these conditions had not been met. President Clinton responded by waiving the human rights conditions on grounds of US national security interests.

One of the cornerstones of impunity in Colombia, and indeed elsewhere, is the failure to try military personnel before civilian courts. Even Colombian military officers have admitted that military tribunals are unfair, cover up crimes and shield high-ranking officers. Many cases never even reach the courts; hundreds of outstanding arrest warrants for known paramilitaries have never been carried out. Known killers continue to walk the streets freely in Colombia.

It can sometimes take many years for the truth about human rights violations to emerge or to be publicly acknowledged. In France, two army generals admitted their direct involvement in torture and extrajudicial executions during the Algerian war of independence (1954 to 1962). Their admission followed growing public pressure on the authorities to acknowledge and

A "regroupment" camp in Burundi, February 2000. In September 1999, the government of Burundi forced more than 290,000 mainly Hutu civilians to leave their homes and enter "regroupment" camps. Conditions in the camps were appalling. Following international condemnation, the camps were closed by September 2000, but no provision was made for people returning to their homes, many of which had been destroyed.



IV 6

condemn torture during the war. There were also moves to make the Paris police grant access to its archives on the October 1961 massacre of Algerians by police officers during a peaceful demonstration in Paris. Disagreement persisted about the number of demonstrators killed, figures varying between 32 and 200. In November AI called for those responsible for war crimes and crimes against humanity during the war to be brought to justice. In AI's view the lack of political will by successive French governments to confront this issue had helped to present torture, summary executions and "disappearances" as a "necessary evil".

Hidden victims

In 2000, as in other years, while some human rights tragedies captured the public imagination and generated anger and action, many others went virtually unnoticed.

In Burundi the civilian population paid the price of the civil war which continued despite the signing of a peace agreement in August. Hundreds of civilians were killed in cold blood by government armed forces and armed opposition groups. In China there was no sign of any relaxation of the 1999 crack-down on fundamental freedoms. Thousands of people were arbitrarily detained for peacefully exercising their rights to freedom of expression, association or religion. Torture and ill-treatment of prisoners continued to be widespread and thousands of people were sentenced to death. In the Democratic Republic of the Congo the continuing armed conflict was used as a pretext to justify widespread repression of peaceful dissent, as the government and armed opposition used imprisonment and torture to silence their critics. In Iraq, air strikes by US and UK forces continued, resulting in further civilian deaths. According to Iraqi government figures around 300 people have been killed since the air strikes began in December 1998. In Russia, the fading of international

© Reuters

We do not have copyright for these photographs for the web.

Please contact your nearest section to purchase a copy of the report.

A Chechen boy looks from a tent window in the Sputnik refugee camp in Ingushetia, October 2000. The conflict in Chechnya caused mass displacement. Russian forces were responsible for gross human rights violations against Chechen civilians. Thousands were killed in indiscriminate attacks and there were widespread reports of torture, incommunicado detention, and summary executions.

attention on the conflict in Chechnya did not mean that human rights violations in the conflict had decreased, just that they could be committed without even the most minimal level of international scrutiny.

For 40 years AI members have struggled to give a voice to the forgotten prisoner, to shine a light on the secret world of the torturer, and to give a name to the anonymous victim. This struggle goes on. While the challenges we face are greater than ever, so are the forces marshalled in support of human rights. The international human rights movement, of which AI is proud to be a part, is growing, diversifying and gaining strength. We urge you to join it.

WHAT IS AI?

Amnesty International (AI) is a worldwide voluntary activist movement working for human rights. It is independent of any government, political persuasion or religious creed. It does not support or oppose any government or political system, nor does it support or oppose the views of the victims whose rights it seeks to protect. It is concerned solely with the impartial protection of human rights.

AI mobilizes volunteer activists — people who give freely of their time and energy in solidarity with the victims of human rights violations. There are more than 1,000,000 AI members and subscribers in over 140 countries and territories. AI members come from many different backgrounds, with widely different political and religious beliefs, united by a determination to work for a world where everyone enjoys human rights.

Many AI members are organized into groups: there are more than 7,500 local groups, youth and student groups and other specialist groups in more than 100 countries and territories. Thousands of other members are involved in networks working on particular countries or themes. In 56 countries and territories, the work of AI members is coordinated by sections, whose addresses are given below. In another 23 countries and territories, AI has pre-section coordinating structures, which are also listed below.

What does AI do?

AI works independently and impartially to promote respect for all the human rights set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. AI believes that human rights are interdependent and indivisible — all human rights should be enjoyed by all people at all times, and no one set of rights can be enjoyed at the expense of other rights.

AI contributes to building respect for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by promoting knowledge and understanding of all human rights and by taking action against specific violations of people's fundamental civil and political rights. The main focus of its campaigning is to:

- free all prisoners of conscience. According to AI's Statute, these are people detained for their political, religious or other conscientiously held beliefs or because of their ethnic origin, sex, colour, language, national or social origin, economic status, birth or other status — who have not used or advocated violence;
- ensure fair and prompt trials for all political prisoners;
- abolish the death penalty, torture and other ill-treatment of prisoners;
- end political killings and "disappearances";
- ensure that governments refrain from unlawful killings in armed conflict.

AI also works to:

- oppose abuses by armed political groups such as the detention of prisoners of conscience, hostage-taking, torture and unlawful killings;
- assist asylum-seekers who are at risk of being returned to a

country where they might suffer violations of their fundamental human rights;

- cooperate with other non-governmental organizations, the UN and regional intergovernmental organizations to further human rights;
- ensure control of international military, security and police relations in order to protect human rights;
- organize human rights education and awareness raising programs.

AI: a democratic movement

AI is a democratic, self-governing movement. Major policy decisions are taken by an International Council made up of representatives from all national sections. The Council meets every two years, and has the power to amend the Statute which governs AI's work and methods. Copies of the Statute are available from the International Secretariat.

The Council elects an International Executive Committee of volunteers which carries out its decisions and appoints the movement's Secretary General, who also heads up the International Secretariat.

The movement's Secretary General is Pierre Sané (Senegal), and the members of its International Executive Committee are Samuel Zan Akologo (Ghana), Margaret Bedgood (New Zealand), Mahmoud Ben Romdhane (Tunisia), Mary Gray (USA), Paul Hoffman (USA), Hans Landolt (Peru), Jaap Rosen Jacobson (Netherlands), Colm Ó Cuanacháin (Ireland) and Angelika Pathak (International Secretariat).

Finances

AI's national sections and local volunteer groups and networks are primarily responsible for funding the movement. No funds are sought or accepted from governments for AI's work investigating and campaigning against human rights violations. The donations that sustain this work come from the organization's members and the public. The international budget adopted by AI for the financial year April 2000 to March 2001 was £19,510,000. This sum represents approximately one quarter of the estimated income likely to be raised during the year by the movement's national sections to finance their campaigning and other activities.

AI's ultimate goal is to end human rights violations, but so long as they continue AI tries to provide practical help to the victims. Relief (financial assistance) is an important aspect of this work. Sometimes AI provides financial assistance directly to individuals. At other times, it works through local bodies such as local and national human rights organizations so as to ensure that resources are used as effectively as possible for those in most need.

During the financial year April 2000 to March 2001, the International Secretariat of AI distributed an estimated £125,000 in relief to victims of human rights violations such as prisoners of conscience and recently released prisoners of conscience and their dependants, and for the medical treatment of torture victims. In addition, the organization's sections and groups distributed a further substantial amount, much of it in the form of modest payments by local groups to

their adopted prisoners of conscience and dependent families.

Information about AI is available from national section offices and from: International Secretariat, 1 Easton Street, London WC1X 0DW, United Kingdom.

AI Online

AI Online is dedicated to providing AI's human rights resources on the web in English (<http://www.amnesty.org>). It contains more than 10,000 files and receives over six million hits a month. It holds most AI reports published since 1996 and all the latest news releases detailing AI's concerns about human rights issues around the world. Additionally, there is information on the latest campaigns and appeals for action to help protect human rights (<http://www.stoptorture.org>). You will also find contact details for AI's offices around the world and links to hundreds of websites with a human rights theme.

There are also AI international sites in French (<http://www.efai.org/>), Spanish (<http://www.edai.org/>), and Arabic (<http://www.amnesty-arabic.org/>).

AI sections

Algeria Amnesty International, BP 377, Alger, RP 16004

E-mail: amnestyalgeria@hotmail.com

Argentina Amnistía Internacional, Av. Rivadavia 2206 - P4A, C1032ACO Ciudad de Buenos Aires

E-mail: info@amnesty.org.ar

<http://www.amnesty.org.ar>

Australia Amnesty International, Private Bag 23, Broadway, New South Wales 2007

E-mail: adminaia@amnesty.org.au

<http://www.amnesty.org.au>

Austria amnesty international austria, Moeringgasse 10, A-1150 Wien

E-mail: info@amnesty.at

<http://www.amnesty.at>

Bangladesh Amnesty International, 28 Kabi Jasimuddin Road, 1st Floor, North Kamalapur, Dhaka - 1217

E-mail: admin-bd@amnesty.org

Belgium Amnesty International (AI Vlaanderen), Kerkstraat 156, 2060 Antwerpen

E-mail: amnesty@aivl.be

<http://www.aivl.be>

Belgium Amnesty International (francophone), rue Berckmans 9, 1060 Bruxelles

E-mail: aibf@aibf.be

<http://www.aibf.be>

Benin Amnesty International, 01 BP 3536, Cotonou

E-mail: aibenin@nakayo.leland.bj

Bermuda Amnesty International, PO Box HM 2136, Hamilton HM JX

E-mail: aibda@ibl.bm

Brazil Anistia Internacional, Caixa Postal 5013,

CEP 90041-970 Porto Alegre, Rio Grande do Sul

E-mail: anistia@anistia.org.br

Canada Amnesty International, 214 Montreal Road, 4th Floor, Vanier, Ontario, K1L 1A4

E-mail: info@amnesty.ca

<http://www.amnesty.ca>

Canada Amnistie Internationale (francophone),

6250 boulevard Monk, Montréal, Québec H4E 3H7

E-mail: info@amnistie.qc.ca

<http://www.amnistie.qc.ca>

Chile Señores, Casilla 4062, Santiago

E-mail: admin-cl@amnesty.org

Costa Rica Amnistía Internacional, 75 metros al norte de la

Iglesia de Fatima, los Yoses, San Pedro, San José

Côte d'Ivoire Amnesty International, 04 BP 895, Abidjan 04

E-mail: aicotedivoire@globeaccess.net

Denmark Amnesty International, Dyrkøeb 3,

1166 Copenhagen K

E-mail: amnesty@amnesty.dk

Ecuador Amnistía Internacional, Casilla 17-15-240-C, Quito

Faroe Islands Amnesty International, PO Box 1075,

FR-110, Tórshavn

E-mail: amnesty@amnesty.fo

<http://www.amnesty.fo>

Finland Amnesty International, Ruoholahdenkatu 24,

D 00180 Helsinki

E-mail: amnesty@amnesty.fi

<http://www.amnesty.fi>

France Amnesty International, 76 blvd. de La Villette, 75940

Paris cedex 19

E-mail: admin-fr@amnesty.asso.fr

<http://www.amnesty.asso.fr>

Germany Amnesty International, 53108 Bonn

E-mail: admin-de@amnesty.de

<http://www.amnesty.de>

Ghana Amnesty International, Private Mail Bag,

Kokomlemle, Accra - North

E-mail: amnesty@ighmail.com

Greece Amnesty International, 30 Sina Street,

106 72 Athens

E-mail: info@amnesty.gr

<http://www.amnesty.gr>

Guyana Amnesty International, c/o Palm Court Building, 35

Main Street, PO Box 10653, Georgetown

Hong Kong Amnesty International, Unit B, 3/F,

Best-O-Best Commercial Centre, 32-36 Ferry Street, Kowloon

E-mail: admin-hk@amnesty.org

Iceland Amnesty International, PO Box 618,

121 Reykjavík

E-mail: amnesty@rhi.hi.is

<http://www.amnesty.is>

Ireland Amnesty International, Sean MacBride House, 48

Fleet Street, Dublin 2

E-mail: info@amnesty.iol.ie

<http://www.amnesty.ie>

Israel Amnesty International, PO Box 14179, Tel Aviv 61141

E-mail: amnesty@netvision.net.il

<http://www.amnesty.org.il>

Italy Amnesty International, Via Giovanni Battista De Rossi

10, 00161 Roma

E-mail: info@amnesty.it

<http://www.amnesty.it>

Japan Amnesty International, Sky Esta 2F, 2-18-23 Nishi

Waseda, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 169

E-mail: amnesty@mri.biglobe.ne.jp

<http://www.amnesty.or.jp>

Korea (Republic of) Amnesty International, Kyeong Buk

RCO Box 36, Daegu 706-600

E-mail: admin-ko@amnesty.org

<http://www.amnesty.or.kr>

Luxembourg Amnesty International, Boîte

Postale 1914, 1019 Luxembourg

E-mail: e-mail@amnesty.lu

<http://www.amnesty.lu>

Mauritius Amnesty International, BP 69,

Rose-Hill

E-mail: amnesty@intnet.mu

Mexico Amnistía Internacional, Calle Patricio

Sanz No. 1104, Depto. 8, Col. del Valle, CP 03100,

México DF

Morocco Amnesty International, Place d'Angleterre, Rue

Souissra, Immeuble No. 11, Appt No. 1,

Rabat - l'Océan

E-mail: admin-ma@amnesty.org

Nepal Amnesty International, PO Box 135, Bagbazar,

Kathmandu

E-mail: ain@ccsl.com.np

Netherlands Amnesty International, PO Box 1968,

1000 BZ, Amsterdam

E-mail: amnesty@amnesty.nl

<http://www.amnesty.nl>

New Zealand Amnesty International, PO Box 793,

Wellington

E-mail: campaign@amnesty.org.nz

<http://www.amnesty.org.nz>

Nigeria Amnesty International, PMB 3061, Suru Lere, Lagos

E-mail: amnestynig@alpha.linkserve.com

Norway Amnesty International, PO Box 702 Sentrum, 0106

Oslo

E-mail: info@amnesty.no

<http://www.amnesty.no>

Peru Señores, Casilla 659, Lima 18

E-mail: admin-pe@amnesty.org

Philippines Amnesty International, Room 305

CRM Building II, 116 Kamia Road, 1101 Quezon City

E-mail: amnesty@info.com.ph

Portugal Amnistia Internacional, Rua Fialho de Almeida 13-1,

PT-1070-128 Lisboa

E-mail: aisp@ip.pt

<http://www.amnistia-internacional.pt>

Puerto Rico Amnistía Internacional, Calle El

Roble No. 54-Altos, Oficina 11, Río Piedras,

Puerto Rico 00925

Senegal Amnesty International, BP 21910,

Dakar

E-mail: aisenegal@sento.sn

Sierra Leone Amnesty International, PMB 1021, Freetown

E-mail: ai_sl@hotmail.com

Slovenia Amnesty International, Komenskega 7,

1000 Ljubljana

E-mail: amnesty.slo@guest.arnes.si

<http://www.ljudmila.org/ai-slo>

Spain Amnistía Internacional, Apdo 50318, 28080 Madrid

E-mail: amnistia.internacional@a-i.es

<http://www.a-i.es>

Sweden Amnesty International, PO Box 23400,

SE-10435 Stockholm

E-mail: info@amnesty.se

<http://www.amnesty.se>

Switzerland Amnesty International, Postfach CH-3001, Bern

E-mail: info@amnesty.ch

<http://www.amnesty.ch>

Taiwan Amnesty International, Room 525, No. 2,

Section 1, Chung-shan North Road, 100 Taipei

E-mail: aitaiwan@transend.com.tw

<http://www.transend.com.tw/~aitaiwan/>

Tanzania Amnesty International, Luther House,

3rd Floor, PO Box 4331, Dar es Salaam

E-mail: aitanz@intafrica.com

Togo CCNP, BP 20013, Lomé

E-mail: aitogo@cafe.tg

Tunisia Amnesty International, 67 rue Oum Kalthoum, 3ème

étage, Escalier B, 1000 Tunis

E-mail: admin-tn@amnesty.org

United Kingdom Amnesty International,

99-119 Rosebery Avenue, London EC1R 4RE

E-mail: info@amnesty.org.uk

<http://www.amnesty.org.uk>

United States of America Amnesty International,

322 8th Ave, New York, NY 10001

E-mail: admin-us@aiusa.org

<http://www.amnestyusa.org>

Uruguay Amnistía Internacional, Tristan Narvaja 1624, Ap 1,

CP 11200, Montevideo

Venezuela Amnistía Internacional, Apartado

Postal 5110, Carmelitas, 1010 A Caracas

E-mail: admin-ve@amnesty.org

<http://www.amnistia.int.ve>

AI coordinating structures

Bolivia Amnistía Internacional, Casilla 10607, La Paz

Burkina Faso Amnesty International, 08 BP 11344,

Ouagadougou

E-mail: Contact.buro@cenatrin.bf

Caribbean Regional Office Amnesty International C.R.O.,

PO Box 1912, Grenada, West Indies

E-mail: amnestycro@caribsurf.com

Croatia Amnesty International, Martičeva 24,
10000 Zagreb

E-mail: admin@amnesty.hr

Curaçao Amnesty International, PO Box 3676, Curaçao,
Netherlands Antilles

Cyprus Amnesty International, 81 Onasagorou str.,
PO Box 2497, 1011 Nicosia

E-mail: amnesty@logosnet.com.cy

Czech Republic Amnesty International, Palackého 9, 110 00
Praha 1

E-mail: amnesty@amnesty.cz

<http://www.amnesty.cz>

Gambia Amnesty International, PO Box 1935,
Banjul

E-mail: amnesty@gamtel.gm

Hungary Amnesty International, 1399 Budapest,
PF 701/343

E-mail: amnesty.hun@mail.mata.vu

Malaysia Amnesty International, Pro-tem Committee, 43A,
Jalan SS 15/4, 47500 Subang Jaya Selangor Darul Ehsan

E-mail: amnesty@tm.net.my

<http://www.crosswinds.net/~aimalaysia>

Mali Amnesty International, BP E 3885, Bamako

E-mail: amnesty-mli@spider.toolnet.org

Mongolia Amnesty International, Ulaanbaatar 21 0648, PO
Box 180

E-mail: aimncc@magicnet.mn

Pakistan Amnesty International, NEC, B-12, Shelozon Centre,
Gulsan-E-Iqbal, Block 15, University Road, Karachi - 75300

E-mail: amnesty@cyber.net.pk

Palestinian Authority Amnesty International,
PO Box 543, Khalaf Building, Racheed Street, Gaza City, South
Remal via Israel

E-mail: admin-pa@amnesty.org

Paraguay Amnistía Internacional, Calle Juan de Salazar 488
casi Boquerón, Asunción

E-mail: ai-info@amnistia.org.py

<http://www.amnistia.org.py>

Poland Amnesty International, ul. Jaškowa Dolina 4, 80-252
Gdańsk

E-mail: amnesty@amnesty.org.pl

<http://www.amnesty.org.pl>

Slovakia Amnesty International, Staromestská 6,
811 03 Bratislava

E-mail: amnesty@internet.sk

<http://www.internet.sk/amnesty>

South Africa Amnesty International, PO Box 29083,
Sunnyside 0132, Pretoria, Gauteng

E-mail: info@amnesty.org.za

Thailand Amnesty International, 61/9 Park Ploenchit Tower,
Soi Sukhumvit 1, Sukhumvit Road, Klongtoey, Wattana,
Bangkok 10110

E-mail: admin-th@amnesty.org

<http://www.thailand.amnesty.com>

Uganda Amnesty International groups, PO Box 23966,
Kampala

E-mail: augamnesty@yahoo.com

Ukraine Amnesty International, Maydan Rynok 6,
Drohobych, 293 720 Lvivska obl

E-mail: officeai@dr.lv.ukrtel.net

Zambia Amnesty International, Private Bag 3, Kitwe Main PO,
Kitwe

E-mail: zebbiesmm@hotmail.com

Zimbabwe Amnesty International, 25 E Bible House,
99 Mbuya Nehanda Street, Harare

E-mail: gertrudena@natfood.co.zw (attn AI Zim)

AI groups

There are also AI groups in:

Albania, Angola, Aruba, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Barbados,
Belarus, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Botswana, Cameroon, Chad,
Dominican Republic, Egypt, Estonia, Georgia, Grenada,
Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan,
Lebanon, Liberia, Lithuania, Macao, Macedonia, Malta,
Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Turkey, Yemen,
Yugoslavia (Federal Republic of)

AI IN ACTION

"The success of the 1961 Amnesty Campaign depends on how sharply and powerfully it is possible to rally public opinion. It depends, too, upon the campaign being all-embracing in its composition, international in character and politically impartial in direction."

So wrote Peter Benenson in his 1961 article in the London *Observer* which founded Amnesty International (AI). From that call for a year-long campaign on behalf of prisoners of conscience has grown a worldwide organization of more than a million members whose activities now extend far beyond those originally envisaged. It is important to remind ourselves that the present reputation and international standing of AI are based on the essential characteristics which were laid out 40 years ago and which still underpin our work.

AI's strength reflects the quality of the materials it produces and the meticulous research on which its campaigning activities are based. During 2000, AI delegates visited more than 70 countries and territories to meet victims of human rights violations, observe trials, and interview local human rights activists and officials.

The facts are gathered in order to generate action. AI members, supporters and staff around the world mobilize public pressure on governments and others with influence to stop human rights abuses. AI makes it possible for any interested person to send messages of concern directly to those who can change the situation.

Activities range from public demonstrations to letter-writing, from human rights education to fundraising concerts, from targeted appeals on behalf of a single individual to global campaigns on a specific country or issue, from approaches to local authorities to lobbying intergovernmental organizations.

AI confronts governments with its findings, by issuing detailed reports and by publicizing its concerns in leaflets, posters, advertisements, newsletters and on the Internet; AI information is available on countless websites worldwide.

AI campaigns to change government attitudes and unjust laws. One of the ways it does this is by feeding a constant stream of information to the media, to governments and to the UN, urging them to take action.

AI also strives to promote awareness and strengthen the protection of human rights. It appeals to international organizations to intervene when a crisis appears likely to develop. It seeks the protection of refugees fleeing persecution and it works with local human rights workers who are subjected to harassment or who are under threat of attack.

Long and medium-term actions

Actions by AI's local groups and networks – based in more than 100 countries – continued to grow steadily during the year. Members took part in actions involving 3,685 named individuals, including prisoners of conscience and other victims of human rights violations, in countries across the world. A total of 993 long-term Action Files were active and running and assigned to 2,732 groups who used a variety of campaigning techniques on behalf of the cases, including letter-writing and public events. A total of 108 new Action Files were produced and allocated during the year while 230 were closed in the same period.

The year saw an increasing number of innovative Action Files being produced for work by AI activists. These included one to provide protection to activists from the Yugoslav group OTPOR (see Youth and students below), as well as a demand to change legislation discriminating against the gay and lesbian community in Uganda and an Action File on Guatemala in support of HIJOS, a youth-based organization in defence of the rights of children of the "disappeared".

Local groups were also involved in Regional Action Networks (RANs), medium-term actions which require campaigning for between one and 12 months. A variety of campaigning techniques were also used in RAN actions. During the year a total of 1,776 groups were assigned to 23 RANs and they took part in 208 actions.

Youth and students

Youth and student groups make up approximately half of the AI membership worldwide and are organized into about 3,500 groups. In 2000 they campaigned vigorously on all AI concerns, including focusing on human rights abuses faced by the Serbian student pro-democracy group OTPOR ("Resistance"). Members of OTPOR travelled to Slovenia, the Palestinian Authority and the United Kingdom (UK) to speak to AI youth and to work with them on creating strategies for addressing human rights abuses in Serbia. AI youth and students sent postcards, e-mails and letters to the Yugoslav and Serbian authorities, created websites about OTPOR, and raised awareness in universities with information stalls, posters and press conferences. The second International Youth Meeting was held in Slovenia where 35 representatives of the youth and students network from all regions of the world came together to create an action plan. Youth camps took place in South Africa (attended by young people from 15 African countries), the Palestinian Authority and the Philippines, and brought together young people to discuss human rights and take practical action.

Urgent Actions

If urgent action is needed on behalf of people in imminent danger of gross human rights violations, volunteers around the world are alerted, and thousands of letters, faxes and e-mails are sent within days.

During 2000 AI initiated 481 such appeals for the Urgent Action network. There were also 347 updates issued to urgent

action appeals; 171 of these asked for further appeals to be sent. These actions were issued on behalf of people in 85 countries and territories, who were either at risk or had been the victims of, for example, torture or ill-treatment; "disappearances"; political killings and death threats; judicial executions; deaths in custody; or *refoulement* (forcible return) of asylum-seekers to a country where they would be in danger of human rights violations.

Health professionals

Among those long recognized as having an important role to play in defending human rights are health professionals. The AI health professional network continued to act in cases of prisoners suffering ill health because of torture, poor prison conditions and deprivation of medical care, and campaigned on some 50 medical actions issued on such cases during 2000. The network, which has members in more than 30 countries, also acted on behalf of many doctors and other health workers whose rights were abused. In May, AI published *Harming the healers: Violations of the human rights of health professionals* (AI Index: ACT 75/002/2000), a report on more than 20 health workers who had been imprisoned, ill-treated or had "disappeared" in recent years. It documented the problems faced by health workers in the context of human rights violations and in the exercise of their profession.

AI health professional groups participated in a number of AI campaigns throughout the year as well as organizing meetings, undertaking human rights education activities and maintaining contacts with national professional bodies and non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

AI health professionals contributed to important initiatives within the medical profession internationally, which included the publication of the Istanbul Protocol on the medical documentation of torture. This was the product of three years' work by a coalition of human rights, legal and medical experts, and was handed to the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, Mary Robinson, in August. The Principles on the Effective Documentation of Torture – drawn from the Istanbul Protocol – were included in an AI compilation: *Ethical codes and declarations relevant to the health professions* (AI Index: ACT 75/005/2000), issued in December.

Crisis response: Sierra Leone

In early May, the capture of around 500 UN peace-keeping troops by rebel forces of the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) and the resumption of hostilities heightened the risk of further mass human rights abuses against civilians. AI responded by stepping up its ongoing work and increasing its research capacity in the country, as well as exploring new areas of campaigning. The intense campaigning by AI members over subsequent months has already contributed to dramatic changes in the international community's approach to resolving the conflict in Sierra Leone.

AI lobbied governments and intergovernmental organizations (IGOs), in particular the UN, to take immediate action to prevent human rights abuses and to ensure that all

efforts to resolve the crisis placed human rights protection as a priority. Specifically, AI emphasized the obligation of the international community to ensure that UN peace-keeping forces in Sierra Leone fulfilled their mandate to protect civilians under imminent threat of physical danger. AI delegates in Freetown, including AI's Secretary General Pierre Sané, held meetings with the Sierra Leone President and other senior government officials, UN representatives, foreign officials and members of Sierra Leone NGOs to discuss AI's concerns and recommendations.

AI researchers in Sierra Leone interviewed many children who had been abducted and forced to fight or "serve" during the conflict, as well as women and girls who had been subjected to rape and forced into sexual slavery. Their testimonies and the children's drawings have been used by AI members worldwide, including women's, youth and student groups, to publicize the plight of women and children in Sierra Leone and to lobby their own governments as well as the government of Sierra Leone to ensure that the needs of victims of the conflict are met.

AI had consistently campaigned against the blanket amnesty granted in the July 1999 peace agreement, believing that there can be no lasting peace unless the perpetrators of human rights abuses are brought to justice. The events of May 2000 forced the international community to acknowledge this. AI made specific proposals on steps to be taken to address impunity which helped to move forward the international debate and contributed to discussions taking place within Sierra Leone civil society. In August the UN Security Council decided to establish a Special Court for Sierra Leone to prosecute those most responsible for the gravest human rights abuses.

AI and other NGOs from around the world joined together to campaign for immediate action to end the trade in diamonds from rebel-held areas which finances military assistance to the RUF, enabling it to continue to commit widespread abuses against civilians. There was unprecedented lobbying of the diamond industry itself, as well as of governments in major diamond-importing countries, the UN and other IGOs. AI's unique contribution to the NGO campaign was its capacity to generate pressure from members around the world directed at all levels of the diamond trade, from jewellery shops to the Diamond High Council. AI's campaigning with other NGOs also aimed to ensure that the UN arms embargo was enforced and that no further military assistance reached RUF forces.

Israel/Occupied Territories/Palestinian Authority

On 29 September at least five people died in Jerusalem and more than 200 were wounded after being shot by Israeli security forces. The days and weeks that followed saw almost daily confrontations between stone-throwing Palestinians and Israeli troops. By the end of 2000, Israeli security forces had killed at least 300 and wounded more than 10,000 Palestinians, many of whom were children under 18.

AI mobilized its membership to take action to stop the killings. AI sections all over the world initiated public events as well as lobbying and mass letter-writing activities. As deaths of children mounted, AI issued a children's action, followed soon after by a report based on its mission in October. The report criticized Israeli security services for using military methods against demonstrators who were not endangering lives; for using ammunition and weapons that were suitable for combat situations, not for policing demonstrations; and for the rapid escalation to lethal force and the frequent impeding of medical assistance.

AI members responded to the escalating situation by sending thousands of letters not only to the Israeli government and officials but also to the Palestinian Authority reinforcing the need to protect children. A UN Commission of Inquiry was set up, though without the hoped-for support of all members. However, massive AI pressure may have helped to influence the Israeli government to agree to set up a judicial commission of inquiry to investigate the circumstances of the killing of Palestinian citizens of Israel.

AI sections were sent regularly a list of Palestinian and Israeli dead, and a poster was produced in Arabic, English and French. Members began to organize increasingly visible actions, from reading the names of the dead out loud at street corners in the USA to organizing the ringing of all the church bells in Switzerland for the dead on 16 December.

Human rights defenders

Human rights defenders play a vital role in holding states to account in respect of their promises and obligations to protect the rights of their citizens. In many countries around the world human rights defenders face constant persecution, in particular in Colombia, Indonesia, Togo, Tunisia and Turkey, on account of their efforts to support the victims of human rights violations and to expose the abuses committed by state agents. Work to strengthen and protect human rights defenders continued to be one of AI's priorities.

In Latin America, AI's special program of protection mechanisms for human rights defenders at risk worked closely with local and international organizations to develop and apply national programs of protection. This work included supporting national and international internships, as well as initiatives to enable mainly foreign nationals to accompany human rights defenders – including witnesses – facing imminent danger. Members of the electronic Human Rights Defenders Network for Latin America took special action on behalf of Brazilian human rights defenders, including AI members. Other actions included Guatemalan defenders threatened and attacked because of their work on impunity, the "disappearance" of Colombian human rights activist Jairo Bedoya Hoyos, and activists campaigning for land rights and against police violence in Pará, Brazil.

In May AI published a report, *Colombia: Protection of human rights defenders – one step forward, three steps back* (AI Index: AMR 23/022/2000) and launched a one-year campaign on Colombian human rights defenders who

continue to work despite the alarming dangers. The report emphasizes that while security measures offered by the authorities for human rights defenders at risk – such as bullet-proof vests and reinforcements for office premises – are welcome, they fail to address the root causes or complexity of the problem of military and paramilitary threats and attacks.

In May AI conducted a workshop in Mexico to discuss the application of the UN Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. The workshop, attended by 40 defenders, was one part of a long-term strategy to build a national program on the protection of defenders.

Following regional and sub-regional consultations during 1998 and 1999, a coordinator was appointed in April for a one-year campaign on human rights defenders in Western Africa. Collaborative discussions with human rights NGOs in a number of countries in the region resulted in a small international consultative meeting in June organized by AI Ghana. This meeting discussed the development of plans for materials and the organization of a launch event, and led to the establishment of coalitions of networks of human rights defenders, including AI members.

Worldwide campaigns

Take a step to stamp out torture

In October the movement began a major new worldwide campaign, *Take a step to stamp out torture*, focusing on three key themes: the means of preventing torture; the role of discrimination in supporting the torture inflicted on certain groups in the population; and putting an end to the impunity which has shielded so many people responsible for torture. The campaign was launched with a rolling program of media events in Tokyo, Beirut, Nairobi, London and Buenos Aires and in most of the countries where AI has a section. A website was set up, www.stoptorture.org, giving visitors and subscribers the opportunity to take immediate action on urgent cases with a risk of torture. For the first time, AI offered notices of urgent cases sent to subscribers' mobile telephones using "SMS" text messages.

AI sections organized scores of publicity events and press briefings to raise public awareness about torture. These ranged from a marathon run in Peru to a motorbike tour in Nepal, a student march in Canada and visits to police stations in South Africa. Government officials and prime ministers publicly signed commitments to end torture. The campaign attracted extensive media coverage and members' protest actions swiftly began to draw responses from governments.

Saudi Arabia

Human rights are no longer a taboo subject in Saudi Arabia. Within days of AI's first-ever campaign against human rights violations in the country being launched in March, the government, in an unprecedented step, announced its belief in the universality and indivisibility of human rights. The authorities also gave undertakings to introduce new legislation with more human rights guarantees and acceded to

the UN Women's Convention. A dynamic and unprecedented debate on human rights began in the media.

Throughout the campaign AI activists demonstrated their concern and outrage at the secrecy surrounding human rights violations and at the suffering of countless victims, left with no safeguards and no form of redress.

AI members in Europe and North America focused their campaigning on economic relations and the role of the business community. They lobbied their governments to voice their concerns about human rights in meetings with Saudi Arabian government officials. Asian members of AI focused on the plight of migrant workers, particularly women domestic workers suffering abuse at the hands of their employers, and organized meetings with trade unions and migrant workers' organizations, as well as their own governments, to raise awareness and discuss solutions. Members in the Middle East and North Africa emphasized the urgency of addressing women's rights, particularly in terms of personal status, freedom of movement and equal opportunities in employment.

An important breakthrough with this campaign was to end the silence of the international community about grave human rights violations in Saudi Arabia. For the first time statements by many governments raised concerns about the situation, in particular the lack of protection given to their own citizens caught up in the criminal justice system, or in some cases demanding proper redress for their lack of protection. AI members campaigned in the streets throughout the world, and thousands of signatures were collected in countries as diverse as the Netherlands and Nepal, Morocco, Venezuela and Nigeria, united in their concern to end the secrecy and end the suffering in Saudi Arabia.

Other campaigns

Other campaigns during the year covered human rights abuses in Algeria, Belarus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Russian Federation and Sudan. AI members also mobilized support for human rights defenders in Colombia, India and Western Africa, continued to develop initiatives on economic relations and approaches to companies, and the transfer of military, security and police equipment, as well as undertaking pioneering work on human rights violations linked to identity-based discrimination. In addition, AI members mounted lobbying operations at many of the worldwide and regional intergovernmental organizations' meetings that took place, and participated actively in meetings including the fifth-year review of the Beijing Platform for Action (Beijing plus Five) and preparations for the World Conference against Racism.

Children's rights

For the 2000 Children's Rights Action and as part of AI's Campaign against Torture, AI launched a report on the torture and ill-treatment of children, *Hidden scandal, secret shame* (AI Index: ACT 40/038/2000). Drawing on AI's field research and other evidence, the report examines the

contexts in which children are tortured, looks at the international legal framework that defines and prohibits torture, and makes numerous recommendations for ending the torture and ill-treatment of children. The report reveals that children are tortured because they are caught up in wars and political conflict; children suspected of criminal activity are most at risk of torture at the hands of the state; children are often detained in conditions that pose a threat to their health and safety; and many children face being beaten or sexually abused by the very adults who are supposed to protect them. AI is calling on governments to fulfil their obligations under the Convention on the Rights of the Child (UN Children's Convention) to ensure that children are protected from torture and ill-treatment. AI members around the world undertook a variety of initiatives such as a painting competition for children; distributing postcards urging governments to "stop the torture of children now"; taking action on appeal cases of children who had been tortured; and organizing school activities including essay competitions.

AI's activists have continued to lobby on the Optional Protocol to the UN Children's Convention on the involvement of children in armed conflict. On 25 May the UN General Assembly adopted the Optional Protocol by consensus. The focus of AI's lobbying, in close cooperation with the International Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers, has now moved on to encourage all states to ratify it, without reservations, to implement it in national law, and to make declarations endorsing 18 as the minimum age at which voluntary recruitment will be permitted. The aim of the campaign is for a minimum of 100 signatures and 50 ratifications of the Optional Protocol by the UN Special Summit on Children in September 2001.

AI's members also took action for the rights of children who found themselves in the firing line in Sierra Leone and in Israel and the Occupied Territories.

AI's work for juvenile justice is ongoing. In 2000 AI's activists continued to investigate cases of people who were facing the death penalty in the USA for crimes they were convicted of committing when they were under 18. The use of the death penalty on child offenders violates numerous international agreements, including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the UN Children's Convention.

Many children who come into contact with the justice system encounter torture, ill-treatment and cruel, inhuman and degrading conditions of detention. AI members continued to campaign on the juvenile detention system, Foundation for the Well-Being of Minors (FEBEM) in São Paulo state, Brazil, which collapsed into crisis in October 1999 when years of overcrowding and ill-treatment led to a series of violent riots in one of FEBEM's detention centres. Since then the reforms undertaken have fallen far short of those required to tackle the crisis. AI called on the São Paulo government to take immediate steps to address the human rights crisis in FEBEM.

Women's Rights

In 2000 AI's Women's Rights Action highlighted the ongoing struggle for women's rights. Central to this was AI's lobbying for the ratification of the Optional Protocol to the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (UN Women's Convention) and work at the review of the 1995 UN World Conference on Women, held in Beijing.

The year 1999 ended with the adoption of the new Optional Protocol to the UN Women's Convention by the UN General Assembly which will provide an effective tool to fight discrimination against women. It creates a mechanism whereby individual women in countries which have ratified the Protocol have the right to bring complaints to the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) alleging a violation of the rights in the Convention. Under the Protocol the Committee will also be able to carry out an inquiry if it receives reliable information indicating grave or systematic violations by a state party to the Convention.

In June, an AI delegation attended, along with UN member states, a special session of the UN General Assembly to review the delivery of commitments to promote women's equality, peace and development drawn up during the Beijing Conference. Delegates from the Middle East, including AI's Moroccan delegate, managed to stage a lightning picket at the main gate of the UN building although they were threatened with arrest. Three days before the end of the UN meeting, the AI delegates mounted a silent protest. Within 24 hours, AI activists produced hundreds of white T-shirts emblazoned with the slogan "No Going Back – Women's Rights are Human Rights" in different languages, which were distributed to women NGO delegates. The message, visible during the final two days of the UN session, was simple and yet powerful.

Reactions to the outcome of the session were mixed. There was a reaffirmation of the universality and indivisibility of women's rights and human rights, but some governments deliberately avoided repeating the phrase "women's rights are human rights" which appeared in previous UN documents including the Beijing Platform for Action. However, new commitments to combat domestic violence against women and girls were added with specific references to marital rape; crimes committed in the name of honour and passion; and racism and racially motivated violence.

Many AI members around the world took part in the Women's World March 2000 against Poverty and all Forms of Violence against Women. Organized by the *Fédération des Femmes du Québec* of Canada, the event was supported by international and grass-roots women's organizations worldwide. Women's rights activists all over the world marched to raise awareness about poverty and all forms of violence against women as obstacles to women's attainment of equality, development and peace; to demand greater accountability by governments and the international trade and financial institutions for changes required to improve the status of women and women's quality of life; and to forge

global solidarity with grass-roots women's movements around the issues of poverty and violence against women.

As part of the program of action on Saudi Arabia, AI's women's rights activists campaigned against abuses of women. They organized appeal cases, petitions, demonstrations, meetings, workshops and letter-writing actions, as well as approaching Saudi Arabian embassies and foreign ministries in the activists' countries. They also participated in the response to the Sierra Leone crisis, campaigning on the issue of rape and other forms of sexual violence against girls and women. In addition, AI members responded to an action on the trafficking of women from countries of the former Soviet Union to work in the sex industry in Israel.

The rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgendered people

The year was marked by an increasing activism and outreach to the gay rights community by AI led by its own growing network of gay rights advocates and activists in more than 40 countries.

In July, AI took part in World Pride in Rome. This was an important and high-profile event at which gay rights were openly stated as a legitimate human rights issue. Despite efforts to disrupt the event, the mood was very positive with activists from around the world marching to proclaim gay pride. AI's presence highlighting discrimination against the gay community as a human rights issue provided a strong human rights dimension to the media and public perception of the event. AI held a press conference and mounted a rally, which was well covered by local and international media. Human rights defenders from the gay community were present, including one on whose behalf AI members have campaigned.

A leading human rights defender in Zimbabwe, Poliyana Mangwiro, of Gays and Lesbians of Zimbabwe (GALZ), took part in an AI speaker's tour in February and March, visiting nine AI sections. She was met by an enthusiastic and engaged audience at all her speaking engagements and the tour provided wide media coverage to GALZ and the situation of lesbian and gay human rights defenders in Zimbabwe. The tour also gave GALZ contacts with lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) organizations internationally and with the wider human rights movement.

AI's LGBT activists were mobilized to campaign on behalf of prisoner of conscience Anwar Ibrahim, former Deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister of Malaysia, who was sentenced on charges of sodomy, and on behalf of members of the transgendered community in Valencia, Carabobo State, Venezuela, who continue to be harassed and jailed in conditions which may amount to ill-treatment.

AI's work on the USA has continued with actions on prisons in California and Mississippi in response to reports of attacks against gay prisoners and the inadequate care of prisoners with HIV/AIDS. LGBT activists also responded to Urgent Actions on Argentina, Brazil and Saudi Arabia.

Military, security and police transfers

In 2000 the AI Military, Security and Police (MSP) network grew to include coordinators in over 60 countries worldwide. This was matched by a significant increase in campaigning and research undertaken by AI and partner NGOs. Such MSP campaigning and research has become a key focus of AI's work in increasing the pressure on those directly responsible for human rights violations and highlighting the responsibility of supplier governments.

International advocacy and campaigning actions were produced and carried out on a wide range of AI's concerns on MSP issues. This included the international trade in weapons, equipment and training fuelling the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and calls for tougher controls on brokers and greater transparency in MSP export legislation. An action on MSP was produced as part of the program of action on Saudi Arabia.

During 2000, AI activists around the world campaigned with great skill and commitment on a range of MSP issues. During the French Presidency of the European Union, the French World Cup-winning football team called for tough small arms controls, gaining wide media coverage and raising the profile of the debate in France. This was followed by an international conference on small arms at the French Senate, attended by government and civil society representatives from across Europe and West Africa. In Italy the launch of the campaign on small arms engaged decision makers and journalists, and generated mass popular support. South Africa saw the first ever Africa Youth Camp attended by young people from over 25 nations focusing on MSP issues. In the USA, the call for the government to halt transfers of attack helicopters to Israel during the recent conflict had a significant impact on institutional and public opinion, and in the UK the joint AI/Oxfam "tough arms controls" campaign gained the support of top politicians, trade unionists and the public leading to the government proposing new legislation.

AI's crisis work in Sierra Leone and in Israel and the Occupied Territories had a strong focus on MSP issues. During the response to the Sierra Leone crisis, the AI movement campaigned to end continuing military assistance to rebel forces, including by calling for effective controls on arms brokers and an end to the illicit trade in diamonds from Sierra Leone. Linking the sale of conflict diamonds to the flow of weapons into Sierra Leone was a successful issue, stimulating excellent AI activity around the world including in Belgium, Côte d'Ivoire, Israel and the USA. In December AI called for determined action to halt the arms-for-diamonds trade following the publication of the results of a UN investigation.

Companies

More than 20 AI sections worked on approaches to companies in 2000. Training seminars were held in London and New York for AI activists which discussed practical ways in which AI can influence corporate behaviour. AI business groups continued to develop their contacts with companies based in their countries through discussions, smaller bilateral meetings,

and direct talks with companies active in countries facing human rights crises. In meetings with officials of the diamond industry during the Sierra Leone crisis AI stressed the importance of effective international regulation of the diamond trade in ending human rights abuses. The organization also made representations to the diplomatic community and the UN.

As part of its ongoing work, AI promoted the responsibility of companies to adhere to human rights principles. AI also participated in discussions to develop practical components of the Global Compact, an initiative of the Office of the UN Secretary-General. AI representatives spoke at national and international conferences on issues related to corporate conduct, reporting of business activities, and human rights.

As part of the campaign on Saudi Arabia, AI issued a booklet, *Saudi Arabia: Open for business* (AI Index: MDE 23/082/2000). This presented an overview of the Saudi Arabian business world and demonstrated how companies can apply internationally recognized standards on human rights despite difficult operating environments. The business community received it with considerable interest.

Human rights education

AI structures around the world continued to reflect the importance of human rights education (HRE) by implementing a varied range of innovative and effective programs.

In many countries, AI leads the way in lobbying for human rights to be included in the curriculum for primary, secondary and tertiary education. In some cases this is successful, but there are still too many governments in all regions who are unwilling to make the commitment to officially integrate education on human rights into curricula.

A number of AI sections integrated human rights education into their plans for the campaign against torture. For example, AI Belgium, AI Italy and AI Spain worked with schools on developing projects and materials. AI Canada produced materials for youth and students and AI Ecuador organized a schools painting competition on the theme "Stop Torture". AI Mongolia targeted the training of law enforcement personnel and held seminars specifically on torture. AI Nepal initiated a range of activities aimed at children including a regular children's column in the section's newsletter. AI developed a package of materials that teachers can adapt for use in schools.

An HRE strategy is being followed in Africa that demonstrates the long-term planning needed for sustainable HRE programs. The strategy first aims to develop the skills and knowledge required to plan, manage and implement HRE programs. Regional workshops conducted for Côte d'Ivoire, Senegal and Togo as well as for Ghana, Gambia, Nigeria and Sierra Leone have covered such topics as strategic planning, interactive methodologies, evaluation and fundraising. These will be followed up on a national basis with more specific capacity-building programs and the implementation of planned HRE programs.

A small workshop for section activists was held in London to discuss the role HRE can play in developing a better understanding of women's rights. The workshop identified that including women's rights in HRE programs can play a major role in strengthening AI structures. AI Morocco has developed strong links with a number of NGOs that work for women's rights and will include them as target groups in their HRE program.

AI representatives attended the UN Decade of Human Rights Education mid-term review in Geneva. They supported the recommendations that ask countries to reaffirm their commitment to HRE by developing and implementing national HRE strategies and committees and providing more resources and initiatives for HRE structures and programs. The review identified that there were too many *ad hoc* activities and not sufficient attention given to a long-term approach that can ensure human rights are integrated into all parts of society.

Refugees

AI continued to campaign and take action on behalf of asylum-seekers and refugees at risk of being forcibly returned to countries where they might face human rights violations. AI sections and structures across the world provided decision-makers and asylum-seekers with information about human rights abuses in countries of origin, and also took action to try to stop the forcible return of hundreds of individual refugees.

AI Canada intervened with the Canadian Minister of Citizenship and Immigration to prevent the deportation of several Libyans whose asylum claims were not successful, fearing that they would be at serious risk of human rights violations after return. In November, two Egyptian families were granted refugee status in Germany after AI had issued a worldwide public appeal; their initial asylum applications had been rejected as manifestly unfounded in an accelerated procedure. Other appeals issued included the forcible return of Libyans from Jordan, and the ill-treatment and forcible return from Lebanon of Sudanese asylum-seekers and refugees.

AI continued its work to ensure that states fulfil their obligations under international law and scrupulously observe the principle of *non-refoulement* by not closing their borders in situations of mass influx of refugees. AI continued to stress this principle in international forums in connection with the evaluation of the response to the Kosovo crisis in 1999. The same concerns were also reiterated in connection with the closure of the border with Sierra Leone by Guinea and the closure of borders with Afghanistan by Tajikistan and Pakistan.

AI urged that countries still hosting Bosnian refugees observe voluntary repatriation standards, and that those Bosnian refugees who cannot yet exercise their right to return in safety and with dignity to their homes in eastern Republika Srpska should not be forcibly returned to other parts of Bosnia-Herzegovina.

AI also continued to campaign and lobby against restrictive legislative and other measures which would deny asylum-seekers and refugees access to fair and satisfactory asylum procedures. On a regional level, AI participated in the joint UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and Organization of African Unity (OAU) meeting of Government and Non-Government Technical Experts on the 30th Anniversary of the 1969 OAU Convention on the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa. This resulted in a Platform for Action which provides further guidance to governments in the region hosting refugees. AI's European Union (EU) Association commented on EU proposals on "temporary protection", minimum standards for asylum procedures, revision of the Dublin Convention (which currently decides which member state is responsible for considering an application for asylum), reception conditions and carrier sanctions which fall short of international refugee and human rights law and standards. AI's EU Association also successfully campaigned for the inclusion of a provision on the right to asylum and prohibition of *refoulement* and collective expulsion in the non-binding Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union which was endorsed at the EU summit in Nice in December.

Numerous initiatives were taken by AI sections. AI Senegal raised concerns about the quality of decision-making in the National Refugee Commission, the decision-making authority for asylum claims. AI Ghana worked to ensure the rights of refugees from various African countries who had sought protection in Ghana. They had arrived in Ghana claiming that they had been denied effective refugee protection in Burkina Faso. AI Australia reacted against the Australian government's claims that victims of specific forms of gender-based persecution (such as "honour" killings and trafficking) were not deserving of protection under the UN Refugee Convention. AI Sweden successfully participated in a campaign together with other NGOs against a Swedish government proposal on the establishment of a new temporary protection regime in situations of mass flight which would effectively deprive refugees of rights they otherwise would be guaranteed under Swedish law. The proposal was withdrawn before it was voted on in parliament. AI Ireland voiced its concerns about the coming into force of the Irish Refugee Act 1996, mainly on issues of shortcomings in provisions on detention, accelerated procedures, and the short time limits within which representations can be made on behalf of asylum-seekers.

INTERNATIONAL AND REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Intergovernmental organizations play an important role in the protection and promotion of human rights worldwide. Throughout 2000, AI continued its efforts to further its human rights work by seeking to influence international and regional organizations both in terms of campaigning against ongoing human rights abuses and in promoting international standards for the protection of human rights. Below are some of the highlights of AI's work with these organizations.

UN Headquarters, New York

AI continued to encourage the **Security Council** to consider the human rights situation of countries they were deliberating as well as the impact of armed conflict on specific groups of people, such as women, children, refugees and the internally displaced. Where the UN has established peace-keeping operations, such as in Kosovo, Sierra Leone and East Timor, AI called for the Security Council to ensure that all UN personnel involved be adequately trained in human rights standards and that there be a system for holding peace-keeping troops accountable for any human rights violations committed, including a complaints mechanism. In the case of East Timor, where the UN is the *de facto* government and custodian of the human rights of the citizens, AI reviewed the role of the United Nations Transitional Authority for East Timor (UNTAET), making specific recommendations in the areas of the creation of a human rights culture; ending impunity and assisting reconciliation; creating human rights institutions; and enacting legislation and mechanisms for the protection of the rights of women, children and minority groups (see *East Timor: Building a new country based on human rights*, AI Index: ASA 57/005/2000). In the case of Sierra Leone, AI provided a detailed analysis of the draft statute of the Special Court for Sierra Leone and encouraged the Council to ensure that the jurisdiction of the Court and the provisions of its statute would enable it to be a just, fair and effective tool towards ending impunity in Sierra Leone (see *Sierra Leone: Recommendations on the draft statute of the Special Court*, AI Index: AFR 51/083/2000).

Working with other non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and in collaboration with the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), AI urged the Security Council to address the impact of armed conflict on women and the fact that women are not adequately represented in decision-making on negotiating, building or consolidating peace. In October 2000, under the Presidency of Namibia, the Security Council held a debate on **women and peace and security** and was briefed by women and NGOs. Following these discussions, the Security Council

unanimously adopted an historic resolution that reaffirmed the important role of women in conflict resolution and peace-building, emphasized the need for a gender-sensitive approach to peace-keeping and invited the UN Secretary-General to report on these matters.

AI participated in the **UN Special Session "Women 2000: Gender Equality, Development and Peace for the 21st Century"** (the Beijing plus Five Review). AI lobbied to ensure that there would be no going back on what had been achieved in the Beijing Declaration and Program of Action, particularly on women's human rights. In addition, AI lobbied strongly for the Outcome Document of the plus Five Review to reflect important developments on women's rights, such as the adoption of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women; the inclusion in the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court of all forms of sexual violence as a war crime and, in certain instances, as a crime against humanity or genocide; and the need for governments to make new commitments regarding the responsibility of the state for particular issues, such as "honour crimes" and abuses by non-state actors. To coincide with the plus Five Review, AI published a report, *Respect, protect, fulfil women's human rights: State responsibility for abuses by "non-state actors"* (AI Index: IOR 30/002/2000).

As part of AI's ongoing work to abolish the death penalty, and with the cooperation of the UN Staff Union, AI arranged for the premier screening of *The Hurricane* in the UN General Assembly Hall. The film illustrates how racism can infect criminal trials, an issue of major relevance in the USA where, for example, race, ethnic origin and economic status appear to be key determinants in who will receive a death sentence and who will not. In December 2000, UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan received a petition of more than three million signatures from all over the world calling for a universal moratorium on the death penalty from representatives of AI, Moratorium 2000 and the Sant'Egidio Community.

UN Geneva

In 1998 the Commission on Human Rights initiated a **review of its thematic and country specific special procedures** with a view to enhancing the effectiveness of those mechanisms. An inter-sessional working group established by the Commission produced a report which was adopted by the Commission in April 2000 but which failed to address adequately the serious problems faced by these bodies. While the number of new mandates created by the Commission has risen by over a third since 1995, resources from the UN regular budget have shrunk and consequently the UN servicing of these mandates has diminished. AI urged the Commission to call upon all states to extend open invitations to the UN special mechanisms, to schedule more time for discussion and follow-up of reports from the special procedures and their recommendations, and to urge member states attending the General Assembly to vote for the necessary funds from the regular budget.

As part of its work in relation to UN **thematic mechanisms**, AI briefed the Special Rapporteur on torture prior to his visit to Brazil and the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions in preparation for a possible visit to the Occupied Palestinian Territories. In cooperation with the Law Society of England and Wales, AI produced a document entitled *The United Nations Thematic Mechanisms – Update 2000: An overview of their work and mandates* (AI Index: IOR 40/020/2000), available in English, French, Spanish, Arabic and Turkish. During the annual meeting of the Commission on Human Rights mechanisms dealing with specific themes or countries, AI encouraged the systematic inclusion of an in-depth analysis of states' performances as well as an assessment of governments' responses in the reports of the mechanisms to the Commission. AI also expressed concern that the limits placed on the length of reports presented to the Commission could result in less satisfactory reports.

At the fifth special session of the Commission on Human Rights concerning the human rights situation in Israel and the Occupied Territories, AI called for the creation of a **standing body of international investigators**. Experiences in Algeria, East Timor, Togo, and most recently the Occupied Territories demonstrate that the UN is ill-equipped to investigate complex human rights violations. Members of the standing body would have proven expertise in international criminal justice and in conducting criminal investigations, including forensic science and ballistics. These highly qualified professionals would be selected by the UN Secretary-General on the basis of nominations from member states or sought out by the Secretary-General. They would undertake to be available for a fixed period of time to form rapid response investigative teams when required. To ensure independence and impartiality, no member of a team would be a national of the country or territory under investigation. The UN would provide training to the experts in international human rights and humanitarian law.

Against a backdrop of initiatives from Australia and the United Kingdom to restrict refugee protection, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) launched a **Global Consultation on International Refugee Protection**. The consultation, which coincided with the 50th Anniversary of the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, is intended to clarify the scope of refugee protection, but AI fears that it might go beyond the UNHCR mandate to protect refugees, as governments seek out new ways to manage migration flows. AI called on the UNHCR and governments to allow NGOs full participation in the process and not to deviate from the issue of refugee protection.

In September 2000, AI sent an **Open Letter to Australian Prime Minister John Howard**, after his government's threat to review its cooperation with the UN treaty bodies and only to cooperate with UN thematic special rapporteurs and working groups if there are "compelling reasons to do so". In the letter, AI stated that the measures announced would undermine the UN human rights protection machinery and set a bad example for other

countries that wish to avoid international scrutiny of their human rights record. AI called on the Prime Minister to abide by treaty obligations to extend full cooperation to the UN thematic and other human rights experts wishing to visit Australia. AI continues to monitor initiatives by states to "rationalize" the treaty-body system.

As in previous years, AI sent a representative to observe the Committee on the Application of Standards of the **International Labour Conference** on governments' effective implementation of international labour standards. AI raised concerns about the situation in Myanmar under the International Labour Organisation Convention 29 on forced labour; in Pakistan under Convention 105 on the abolition of forced labour; and in Colombia and Swaziland under Convention 87 on freedom of association and protection of the right to organize.

Regional intergovernmental organizations

AI made recommendations to the **Organization of African Unity** (OAU) on the establishment of the African Committee of Experts on the Rights and Welfare of the Child. In particular, AI called for the full integration of the work of this Committee into the OAU and urged member states to nominate independent experts for election to the Committee. AI continues to campaign for OAU member states to ratify the African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child, which came into force on 29 November 1999. At the sessions of the **African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights**, AI raised concerns about the human rights situation in Zimbabwe and human rights defenders in Africa.

Throughout the year, AI sought to influence the **European Union** (EU) to act more vigorously and coherently to implement its growing human rights mandate. Through the Brussels office of its EU Association, AI provided information to the Council, the Commission and the European Parliament on the many countries with which the EU has relations. In doing so, AI consistently urged that more substance be given to the human rights clause that constitutes an "essential element" of the agreements the EU concludes with other countries.

AI issued numerous appeals and briefings in efforts to influence the EU **Common Foreign and Security Policy**. AI made special efforts in connection with certain priority countries, including lobbying the EU institutions in Brussels and in the member states' capitals through the AI sections. Some of those countries featured prominently in the EU joint positioning at the 2000 session of the UN Commission on Human Rights – notably Chechnya, subject of an EU-initiated resolution, and China with which the EU is conducting a special human rights dialogue, of which AI has been increasingly critical. AI also submitted information on human rights in the countries in Central and Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean, including Turkey, that are candidates to join the EU.

AI drew attention to human rights abuses within EU member states, especially torture and ill-treatment, and called for monitoring and accountability at national and EU level. In proposals made at the start of AI's campaign against torture in October, the EU was urged to declare the eradication and prevention of torture a key objective of EU human rights policy. AI's suggestion that guidelines on torture be developed for use in relations with non-EU countries (modelled on those the EU had operated successfully on the death penalty since 1998) met with positive interest.

The **European Charter of Fundamental Rights** adopted at the Nice summit in December 2000 prompted AI to reiterate its call for the EU to accede to international human rights treaties, including the European Convention on Human Rights.

An important focus for AI's work at the EU were the comprehensive memoranda drawn up by the respective AI sections and AI's Brussels office and submitted to the incoming presidency government. In 2000 AI thus addressed the Portuguese and French presidencies, and prepared for the 2001 presidencies by Sweden and Belgium.

AI ensured a high profile for the campaign against torture at the Warsaw Human Dimension Implementation Meeting of the **Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe** (OSCE) on "Human Rights and Inhuman Treatment or Punishment" in March. In addition to presenting a statement to the meeting on AI's concerns about torture and ill-treatment in Europe today, the organization held a special interest meeting to introduce the new global campaign to interested members of government delegations and NGO representatives.

AI also undertook training on international standards for fair trial for OSCE trial monitors in Kosovo and distributed AI's *Fair trials manual* (AI Index: POL 30/002/1998). To mark the 50th anniversary of the European Convention on Human Rights, AI published a report and launched an action on the issue of impunity for torture and ill-treatment in member states of the **Council of Europe**. An AI representative attended the Council of Europe intergovernmental conference in Rome. AI also attended a meeting of international human rights NGOs with the Council of Europe Commissioner of Human Rights in Paris.

AI, in cooperation with other NGOs, continued to encourage the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights to develop its work on human rights defenders, including carrying out a close study of their situation. At the General Assembly of the **Organization of American States**, NGOs pushed for the adoption of a stronger resolution on human rights defenders, for action on the use of child soldiers and the situation in Peru, and for public support for the creation of the International Criminal Court (ICC). In the context of discussions on strengthening the inter-American system for human rights, AI continued to raise concerns on retrograde steps taken by Trinidad and Tobago and Peru, and encouraged states to show their commitment to upholding human rights by ratifying the regional standards.

Developing international human rights law

AI was active in the negotiations on the **Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict** to raise to 18 years the age at which children can be recruited into armed forces or groups and participate in hostilities. A founder member of the International Coalition to Stop the Use of Child Soldiers, AI worked closely with Coalition partners in campaigning and lobbying activities to strengthen articles during the drafting of the Protocol. In May 2000, the Protocol was adopted by the UN General Assembly. AI is campaigning for a minimum of 100 signatures and 50 ratifications of the Protocol by the UN General Assembly Special Session on Children in September 2001.

AI continued to participate in the elaboration of other international standards, including the draft optional protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the draft international convention on "disappearances".

International Criminal Court

AI continued its work as one of more than 1,000 NGO members of the Coalition for an International Criminal Court, campaigning for states to sign and ratify the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and enact effective implementing legislation. The ICC will be established after 60 states have ratified the Rome Statute. There were 27 ratifications and 139 signatures at the end of the year.

All AI sections and non-section structures have been requested, as a priority, to lobby their own governments and governments in other countries to ratify the Rome Statute. To this end, AI produced an ICC "ratification kit" which provides advice on lobbying, model letters and draft press releases as well as a series of fact sheets containing summaries and explanations of important aspects of the ICC and a "Checklist for effective implementation". The fact sheets cover such topics as prosecuting crimes against humanity, ensuring justice for women, and fair trial guarantees.

As part of its continued work to establish a just, fair and effective ICC, AI participated in all sessions of the Preparatory Commissions for the International Criminal Court and lobbied government delegations to draft effective Rules of Procedure and Evidence as well as the Elements of Crimes, a supplementary instrument designed to aid the Court in interpreting the Statute.

Selected AI reports

- The United Nations Thematic Mechanisms – Update 2000: An overview of their work and mandates (AI Index: IOR 40/020/2000)
- 2001 UN Commission on Human Rights: Bridging the gap between rights and realities (AI Index: IOR 41/014/2000)
- Respect, protect, fulfil – Women's human rights: State responsibility for abuses by 'non-state actors' (AI Index: IOR 50/001/2000)
- Child Soldiers: Criminals or victims? (AI Index: IOR

50/002/2000)

- Sierra Leone: Recommendations on the draft Statute of the Special Court (AI Index: AFR 51/083/2000)
- International Criminal Court: Checklist for effective implementation (AI Index: IOR 40/011/2000)
- Ratification Kit: Lobbying for effective ratification of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (Available as a ratification kit)

Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court

As at 1 January 2001, 139 states had signed the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and 27 of them had ratified it. On 31 December 2000, the deadline for signing the Statute expired. States which had not signed the Statute by that date will have to accede to the Statute in a single step.

*Indicates ratifications or signatures that took place in 2000.

Countries that have signed and ratified	Bulgaria	Malawi
Austria*	Burkina Faso	Malta
Belgium*	Burundi	Mauritius
Belize*	Cambodia*	Mexico*
Botswana*	Cameroon	Moldova*
Canada*	Cape Verde*	Monaco
Fiji	Central African Republic	Mongolia*
Finland*	Chad	Morocco*
France*	Chile	Mozambique*
Gabon*	Colombia	Namibia
Germany*	Comoros*	Nauru*
Ghana	Congo (Republic of the)	Netherlands
Iceland*	Congo (Democratic Republic of the)*	Niger
Italy	Costa Rica	Nigeria*
Lesotho*	Côte d'Ivoire	Oman
Luxembourg*	Croatia	Panama
Mali*	Cyprus	Paraguay
Marshall Islands*	Czech Republic	Peru*
New Zealand*	Denmark	Philippines*
Norway*	Djibouti	Poland
San Marino	Dominican Republic*	Portugal
Senegal	Ecuador	Romania
Sierra Leone*	Egypt*	Russian Federation*
South Africa*	Eritrea	St Lucia
Spain*	Estonia	Samoa
Tajikistan*	Gambia	Sao Tome and Principe*
Trinidad and Tobago	Georgia	Seychelles*
Venezuela*	Greece	Slovakia
Countries that have signed	Guinea*	Slovenia
Albania	Guinea-Bissau*	Solomon Islands
Algeria*	Guyana*	Sudan*
Andorra	Haiti	Sweden
Angola	Honduras	Switzerland
Antigua and Barbuda	Hungary	Syria*
Argentina	Iran*	Tanzania*
Armenia	Ireland	Thailand*
Australia	Israel*	Uganda
Bahamas*	Jamaica*	Ukraine*
Bahrain*	Jordan	United Arab Emirates*
Bangladesh	Kenya	United Kingdom
Barbados*	Korea (Republic of)*	United States of America*
Benin	Kuwait*	Uruguay*
Bolivia	Kyrgyzstan	Uzbekistan*
Bosnia and Herzegovina*	Latvia	Yemen*
Brazil*	Liberia	Yugoslavia (Federal Republic of)*
	Liechtenstein	Zambia
	Lithuania	Zimbabwe
	Macedonia (Former Yugoslav Republic of)	
	Madagascar	

Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict

The Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child (UN Children's Convention) requires 10 ratifications to enter into force. By the end of 2000, 75 states had signed the Protocol and three of them had ratified it. (All signatures and ratifications took place in 2000.) This information is taken from: www.untreaty.un.org.

Ratifications	Czech Republic	Korea (Republic of)	Peru
Bangladesh	Denmark	Lesotho	Philippines
Canada	Ecuador	Liechtenstein	Portugal
Sri Lanka	El Salvador	Luxembourg	Romania
	Finland	Madagascar	San Marino
Signatures	France	Malawi	Senegal
Andorra	Gabon	Mali	Sierra Leone
Argentina	Gambia	Malta	Singapore
Austria	Germany	Mexico	Slovenia
Azerbaijan	Greece	Monaco	Spain
Belgium	Guatemala	Morocco	Sweden
Belize	Guinea-Bissau	Namibia	Switzerland
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Holy See	Nauru	Turkey
Brazil	Iceland	Nepal	Ukraine
Cambodia	Ireland	Netherlands	United Kingdom
Colombia	Italy	New Zealand	United States of
Congo (Democratic Republic of the)	Jamaica	Nigeria	America
Costa Rica	Jordan	Norway	Uruguay
Cuba	Kazakstan	Panama	Venezuela
	Kenya	Paraguay	Viet Nam

Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women

The Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (UN Women's Convention) entered into force on 22 December 2000. By the end of 2000, 13 states had ratified, two had acceded to it, and another 50 had signed it. This information is taken from www.untreaty.un.org. * Indicates ratifications, accessions or signatures that took place 2000.

Ratifications/ Accessions	Signatures	Greece	Norway
Austria*	Argentina*	Guatemala*	Panama*
Bangladesh*	Azerbaijan*	Guinea-Bissau*	Paraguay
Bolivia*	Belgium	Iceland	Peru*
Denmark*	Benin*	Indonesia*	Philippines*
Finland*	Bosnia and Herzegovina*	Kazakstan*	Portugal*
France*	Bulgaria*	Lesotho*	Romania*
Hungary (accession)*	Chile	Liechtenstein	Sao Tome and Principe*
Ireland*	Colombia	Lithuania*	Sierra Leone*
Italy*	Costa Rica	Luxembourg	Slovenia
Mali (accession)*	Croatia*	Macedonia (Former Yugoslav Republic of)*	Spain*
Namibia*	Cuba*	Madagascar*	Sweden
New Zealand*	Czech Republic	Malawi*	Tajikistan*
Senegal*	Dominican Republic*	Mexico	Turkey*
Slovakia*	Ecuador	Mongolia*	Ukraine*
Thailand*	Germany	Netherlands	Uruguay*
	Ghana*	Nigeria*	Venezuela*

Selected international human rights treaties

(AT 31 DECEMBER 2000)

States which have ratified or acceded to a convention are party to the treaty and are bound to observe its provisions. States which have signed but not yet ratified have expressed their intention to become a party at some future date; meanwhile they are obliged to refrain from acts which would defeat the object and purpose of the treaty.

The **UN Convention on the Rights of the Child** has been ratified by all UN member states with the exceptions of Somalia (which has no functioning government) and the United States of America.

- became a state party in 2000
- state is a party
- ◐ signed in 2000
- D signed but not yet ratified

- 22 Countries making a declaration under Article 22 recognize the competence of the Committee against Torture to consider individual complaints
- 28 Countries making a reservation under Article 28 do not recognize the competence of the Committee against Torture to undertake confidential inquiries into allegations of systematic torture if warranted

	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)	(first) Optional Protocol to the ICCPR	Second Optional Protocol to the ICCPR, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women	International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination	Convention relating to the Status of Refugees (1951)	Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees	Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
Afghanistan	○			○	D	○			○ ²⁸
Albania	○			○	○	○	○	○	○
Algeria	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
Andorra					○				
Angola	○	○		○	○		○	○	
Antigua and Barbuda					○	○	○	○	○
Argentina	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
Armenia	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
Australia	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Austria	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Azerbaijan	○		○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Bahamas					○	○	○	○	
Bahrain						○			○
Bangladesh	●			○	○	○			○
Barbados	○	○		○	○	○			○
Belarus	○	○		○	○	○			○ ²⁸
Belgium	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Belize	○			◐	○	◐	○	○	○
Benin	○	○		○	○	D	○	○	○
Bhutan					○	D			
Bolivia	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
Bosnia and Herzegovina	○	○	◐	○	○	○	○	○	○
Botswana	●				○	○	○	○	●
Brazil	○			○	○	○	○	○	○
Brunei Darussalam									
Bulgaria	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Burkina Faso	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
Burundi	○			○	○	○	○	○	○
Cambodia	○			○	○	○	○	○	○
Cameroon	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
Canada	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
Cape Verde	○	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○
Central African Republic	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	
Chad	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
Chile	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
China	D			D	○	○	○	○	○ ²⁸
Colombia	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Comoros					○	◐			◐
Congo (Democratic Republic of the)	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
Congo (Republic of the)	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
Costa Rica	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Côte d' Ivoire	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○

	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)	(first) Optional Protocol to the ICCPR	Second Optional Protocol to the ICCPR, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women	International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination	Convention relating to the Status of Refugees (1951)	Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees	Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
Croatia	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Cuba									○
Cyprus	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Czech Republic	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
Denmark	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Djibouti									
Dominica	○			○	○		○	○	
Dominican Republic	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	D
Ecuador	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Egypt	○			○	○	○	○	○	○
El Salvador	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
Equatorial Guinea	○	○		○	○		○	○	
Eritrea									
Estonia	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
Ethiopia	○			○	○	○	○	○	○
Fiji									
Finland	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
France	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
Gabon	○			○	○	○	○	○	●
Gambia	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	D
Georgia	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Germany	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Ghana	●	●		●	○	○	○	○	●
Greece	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Grenada	○			○	○	D			
Guatemala	○	●		○	○	○	○	○	○
Guinea	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
Guinea-Bissau	●	●	●	○	○	●	○	○	●
Guyana	○	○		○	○	○			○
Haiti	○								
Holy See									
Honduras	○	D	D	○	○		○	○	○
Hungary	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Iceland	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
India	○			○	○	○			D
Indonesia									○
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	○			○		○	○	○	
Iraq	○			○	○	○			
Ireland	○	○	○	○	○	●	○	○	D
Israel	○			○	○	○	○	○	○ ²⁸
Italy	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Jamaica	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
Japan	○			○	○	○	○	○	○
Jordan	○			○	○	○	○	○	○
Kazakistan									
Kenya	○			○	○		○	○	○
Kiribati									
Korea (Democratic People's Republic of)	○			○					
Korea (Republic of)	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
Kuwait	○			○	○	○			○ ²⁸
Kyrgyzstan	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
Lao People's Democratic Republic	●			●	○	○			

● became a state party in 2000

○ state is a party

● signed in 2000

D signed but not yet ratified

²² Countries making a declaration under Article 22 recognize the competence of the Committee against Torture to consider individual complaints

²⁸ Countries making a reservation under Article 28 do not recognize the competence of the Committee against Torture to undertake confidential inquiries into allegations of systematic torture if warranted

		International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)	(first) Optional Protocol to the ICCPR	Second Optional Protocol to the ICCPR, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women	International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination	Convention relating to the Status of Refugees (1951)	Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees	Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
● became a state party in 2000	Latvia	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
○ state is a party	Lebanon	○			○	○	○			●
● signed in 2000	Lesotho	○	●		○	○	○	○	○	
○ signed but not yet ratified	Liberia	○			○	○	○	○	○	
	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
22 Countries making a declaration under Article 22 recognize the competence of the Committee against Torture to consider individual complaints	Liechtenstein	○	○	○	○	○	●	○	○	○
	Lithuania	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	○	○
	Luxembourg	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
	Macedonia (former Yugoslav Republic of)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
	Madagascar	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
28 Countries making a reservation under Article 28 do not recognize the competence of the Committee against Torture to undertake confidential inquiries into allegations of systematic torture if warranted	Malawi	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
	Malaysia									
	Maldives									
	Mali	○			○	○	○	○	○	○
	Malta	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
	Marshall Islands									
	Mauritania						○	○	○	
	Mauritius	○	○		○	○	○			○
	Mexico	○			○	○	○	●	●	○
	Micronesia (Federated States of)									
	Moldova	○			○	○	○			○
	Monaco	○		●	○	○	○	○		○
	Mongolia	○	○		○	○	○			
	Morocco	○			○	○	○	○	○	○ ²⁸
	Mozambique	○		○		○	○	○	○	○
	Myanmar					○				
	Namibia	○	○	○	○	○	○	○		○
	Nauru									
	Nepal	○	○	○	○	○	○			○
	Netherlands	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
	New Zealand	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
	Nicaragua	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
	Niger	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
	Nigeria	○			○	○	○	○	○	○
	Norway	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
	Oman									
	Pakistan					○				
	Palau									
	Panama	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
	Papua New Guinea						○	○	○	
	Paraguay	○	○		○	○	●	○	○	○
	Peru	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
	Philippines	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
	Poland	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	○	○ ²⁸
	Portugal	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
	Qatar						○			●
	Romania	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
	Russian Federation	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
	Rwanda	○			○	○	○	○	○	○
	Saint Kitts and Nevis					○				
	Saint Lucia					○				
	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	○	○		○	○	○	○		

	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)	(first) Optional Protocol to the ICCPR	Second Optional Protocol to the ICCPR, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women	International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination	Convention relating to the Status of Refugees (1951)	Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees	Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment
Samoa					○		○	○	
San Marino	○	○		○					
Sao Tome and Principe	◐	◑	◑	◐	○	◑	○	○	◑
Saudi Arabia					●	○			○ ²⁸
Senegal	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
Seychelles	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Sierra Leone	○	○		○	○	◐	○	○	◐
Singapore					○				
Slovakia	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Slovenia	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Solomon Islands				○		○	○	○	
Somalia	○	○		○		○	○	○	○
South Africa	○			◐	○	○	○	○	○
Spain	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Sri Lanka	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
Sudan	○			○		○	○	○	◐
Suriname	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	
Swaziland						○	●	○	
Sweden	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Switzerland	○		○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Syrian Arab Republic	○			○		○			
Tajikistan	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
Tanzania	○			○	○	○	○	○	
Thailand	○			○	○				
Togo	○	○		○	○		○	○	○
Tonga						○			
Trinidad and Tobago	○	○		○	○	○	●	●	
Tunisia	○			○	○	◐	○	○	○
Turkey	◑			◑	○	◐	○	○	○
Turkmenistan	○	○	●	○	○	○	○	○	○
Tuvalu					○		○	○	
Uganda	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
Ukraine	○	○		○	○	○			○ ²⁸
United Arab Emirates						○			
United Kingdom	○		○	○	○	○	○	○	○
United States of America	○			◐	◐	○	○	○	○
Uruguay	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Uzbekistan	○	○		○	○	○			○
Vanuatu					○				
Venezuela	○	○	○	○	○	○		○	○
Viet Nam	○			○	○	○			
Yemen	○			○	○	○	○	○	○
Yugoslavia (Federal Republic of)	○	◐		○	○	○	○	○	○
Zambia	○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○
Zimbabwe	○			○	○	○	○	○	

● became a state party in 2000

○ state is a party

◑ signed in 2000

◐ signed but not yet ratified

²² Countries making a declaration under Article 22 recognize the competence of the Committee against Torture to consider individual complaints

²⁸ Countries making a reservation under Article 28 do not recognize the competence of the Committee against Torture to undertake confidential inquiries into allegations of systematic torture if warranted

Selected regional human rights treaties

Organization of African Unity (OAU)

States which have ratified or acceded to a convention are party to the treaty and are bound to observe its provisions. States which have signed but not yet ratified have expressed their intention to become a party at some future date; meanwhile they are obliged to refrain from acts which would defeat the object and purpose of the treaty.

This chart lists countries which were members of the OAU at the end of 2000.

- became a state party in 2000
- state is a party
- ◐ signed in 2000
- ◑ signed but not yet ratified

	African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (1981)	African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child
Algeria	○	◑
Angola	○	○
Benin	○	○
Botswana	○	
Burkina Faso	○	○
Burundi	○	
Cameroon	○	○
Cape Verde	○	○
Central African Republic	○	
Chad	○	●
Comoros	○	
Congo (Democratic Republic of the)	○	
Congo (Republic of the)	○	◑
Côte d'Ivoire	○	
Djibouti	○	◑
Egypt	○	◑
Equatorial Guinea	○	
Eritrea	○	●
Ethiopia	○	
Gabon	○	◑
Gambia	○	
Ghana	○	◑
Guinea	○	●
Guinea-Bissau	○	
Kenya	○	●
Lesotho	○	○
Liberia	○	◑
Libya	○	◑
Madagascar	○	◑
Malawi	○	○
Mali	○	○
Mauritania	○	
Mauritius	○	○
Mozambique	○	○
Namibia	○	◑
Niger	○	○
Nigeria	○	
Rwanda	○	◑
Sahrawi Arab Democratic Republic	○	◑
Sao Tome and Principe	○	
Senegal	○	○

	African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (1981)	African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child	
Seychelles	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	● became a state party in 2000
Sierra Leone	<input type="radio"/>	D	○ state is a party
Somalia	<input type="radio"/>	D	▶ signed in 2000
South Africa	<input type="radio"/>	●	D signed but not yet ratified
Sudan	<input type="radio"/>		
Swaziland	<input type="radio"/>	D	
Tanzania	<input type="radio"/>	D	
Togo	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
Tunisia	<input type="radio"/>	D	
Uganda	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	
Zambia	<input type="radio"/>	D	
Zimbabwe	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	

Organization of American States (OAS)

States which have ratified or acceded to a convention are party to the treaty and are bound to observe its provisions. States which have signed but not yet ratified have expressed their intention to become a party at some future date; meanwhile they are obliged to refrain from acts which would defeat the object and purpose of the treaty.

This chart lists countries which were members of the OAS at the end of 2000.

- became a state party in 2000
- state is a party
- ◐ signed in 2000
- ◑ signed but not yet ratified

62 Countries making a Declaration under Article 62 recognize as binding the jurisdiction of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (on all matters relating to the interpretation or application of the American Convention)

	American Convention on Human Rights (1969)	Protocol to the American Convention on Human Rights to Abolish the Death Penalty	Inter-American Convention to Prevent and Punish Torture (1985)	Inter-American Convention on Forced Disappearance of Persons (1994)
Antigua and Barbuda				
Argentina	○ ⁶²		○	○
Bahamas				
Barbados	○			
Belize				
Bolivia	○ ⁶²		◑	○
Brazil	○ ⁶²	○	○	◑
Canada				
Chile	○ ⁶²		○	◑
Colombia	○ ⁶²		○	◑
Costa Rica	○ ⁶²	○	●	○
Cuba*				
Dominica	○			
Dominican Republic	○ ⁶²		○	
Ecuador	○ ⁶²	○	○	◐
El Salvador	○ ⁶²		○	
Grenada	○			
Guatemala	○ ⁶²		○	●
Guyana				
Haiti	○ ⁶²		◑	
Honduras	○ ⁶²		◑	◑
Jamaica	○			
Mexico	○ ⁶²		○	
Nicaragua	○ ⁶²	○	◑	◑
Panama	○ ⁶²	○	○	○
Paraguay	○ ⁶²	○	○	○
Peru	○ ⁶²		○	
Saint Kitts and Nevis				
Saint Lucia				
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines				
Suriname	○ ⁶²		○	
Trinidad and Tobago				
United States of America	◑			
Uruguay	○ ⁶²	○	○	○
Venezuela	○ ⁶²	○	○	○

* In 1962 the VIII Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs decided to exclude Cuba from participating in the Inter-American system

Council of Europe

States which have ratified or acceded to a convention are party to the treaty and are bound to observe its provisions. States which have signed but not yet ratified have expressed their intention to become a party at some future date; meanwhile they are obliged to refrain from acts which would defeat the object and purpose of the treaty.

This chart lists countries which were members of the Council of Europe at the end of 2000.

	European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (1950)	Protocol No. 6*	European Convention for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (1987)	
Albania	○	●	○	● became a state party in 2000
Andorra	○	○	○	○ state is a party
Austria	○	○	○	● signed in 2000
Belgium	○	○	○	◻ signed but not yet ratified
Bulgaria	○	○	○	
Croatia	○	○	○	
Cyprus	○	●	○	
Czech Republic	○	○	○	
Denmark	○	○	○	
Estonia	○	○	○	
Finland	○	○	○	
France	○	○	○	
Georgia	○	●	●	
Germany	○	○	○	
Greece	○	○	○	
Hungary	○	○	○	
Iceland	○	○	○	
Ireland	○	○	○	
Italy	○	○	○	
Latvia	○	○	○	
Liechtenstein	○	○	○	
Lithuania	○	○	○	
Luxembourg	○	○	○	
Macedonia	○	○	○	
Malta	○	○	○	
Moldova	○	○	○	
Netherlands	○	○	○	
Norway	○	○	○	
Poland	○	●	○	
Portugal	○	○	○	
Romania	○	○	○	
Russian Federation	○	◻	○	
San Marino	○	○	○	
Slovakia	○	○	○	
Slovenia	○	○	○	
Spain	○	○	○	
Sweden	○	○	○	
Switzerland	○	○	○	
Turkey	○	○	○	
Ukraine	○	●	○	
United Kingdom	○	○	○	