

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

INTRODUCTION1

CHINA3

COLOMBIA5

INDONESIA AND EAST TIMOR9

NIGERIA12

TURKEY16

DRAFT DECLARATION ON HUMAN RIGHTS DEFENDERS18

THE DRAFT OPTIONAL PROTOCOL TO THE CONVENTION AGAINST TORTURE AND OTHER  
CRUEL, INHUMAN OR DEGRADING TREATMENT OR PUNISHMENT21

WOMEN'S HUMAN RIGHTS22

LIST OF AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS25

# 1996 UN Commission on Human Rights - A Call for Action

## INTRODUCTION

This year Amnesty International will call on the Commission on Human Rights to take action as a priority on five country situations: **China, Colombia, Indonesia/East Timor, Nigeria and Turkey**. Amnesty International will also focus on the draft **Declaration on human rights defenders**, the draft **Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment** (the Convention against Torture) and **women's human rights** as priority issues this year. A separate document has been prepared on Amnesty International's concern on countries which are already on the Commission's agenda<sup>1</sup>.

This document summarizes some of the evidence of severe and systematic violations of human rights in the five priority countries - including torture, "disappearances", extrajudicial executions and prolonged detention of prisoners of conscience. It sets out recommendations for action by the Commission, including recommendations which the Commission should ensure the governments themselves implement. Amnesty International has also produced separate documents on each of the five priority countries for the Commission, setting out the human rights situation and the record of each government at the international level, in more detail.

Over the last 50 years a whole system of human rights law and mechanisms has been developed to scrutinize states' human rights records and hold them politically and legally accountable. Yet, states with abysmal human rights records like China, Colombia, Indonesia, Nigeria and Turkey blatantly continue to avoid scrutiny. Often their peers shy away from action because of their own perceived economic, military and political interests. The Commission, as the UN's main human rights body, bears a heavy responsibility. The credibility of the UN human rights system will be severely damaged if the Commission continues to ignore the fact that these governments are brazenly suppressing the rights they are legally bound to uphold and protect.

The Commission has developed its own effective mechanisms, including country and thematic experts, to help it investigate situations, and provide the detailed analysis it needs to make decisions about how to address patterns of human rights violations. Their findings must be taken seriously. Outside the Commission bodies such as the treaty monitoring bodies also provide vital analysis and conclusions which the Commission should consider and act on. Such expert conclusions should be fully taken into account and acted on by the Commission.

The Commission has, for example, ignored the clear public report by the Committee against Torture issued in 1993 that torture is systematically practised in Turkey. The Commission has not even acted on the startling observation of its own Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances that it had

---

<sup>1</sup>1996 UN Commission on Human Rights - Recommendations on countries on the Commission's agenda. (AI

INDEX: IOR 41/03/96)

*Amnesty International January 1996AI Index: IOR 41/02/96*

received more allegations of “disappearances” in Turkey than in any other country in 1994. The 52nd session will show whether the Commission will take seriously the conclusions and recommendations made by two special rapporteurs following their joint visit to Colombia last year.

The Commission also needs to build on - and not retreat from - previous action taken on particular countries. The Commission adopted a resolution on East Timor in 1993, but although the Government failed to comply with the conditions in the resolution, the situation in East Timor has only been dealt with in much weaker statements by the Chairman in 1994 and 1995. Furthermore, the government failed to take any action on the recommendations of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions. The Commission has not recognized that the human rights violations in East Timor are symptomatic of a pattern of human rights violations throughout Indonesia.

Sometimes procedural ploys are used by governments to evade scrutiny. In 1995 the call for a “no action motion” on China was defeated and the Commission voted on the substance of the draft resolution entitled “Situation of Human Rights in China”. Amnesty International hopes this year no procedural motions which curtail important debates will be proposed or supported. These motions are rarely based on substantive procedural points but are used by a small number of governments to prevent public discussion of the human rights situation in particular countries.

Amnesty International is also concerned that new draft instruments being prepared by working groups of the Commission are being significantly weakened, sometimes by only a very small group of states. State representatives in a working group of the Commission have been unable to reach agreement on the text of a basic declaration on the rights of human rights defenders. The working group operates by consensus and has been blocked by a few states that have taken advantage of the consensus rule to push for amendments aimed at emphasizing the duties and responsibilities of human rights defenders, rather than protecting their rights and freedoms. The Commission should address the impasse in this working group. The Commission should also reaffirm the fundamental principles which should guide the drafting of the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture.

## **CHINA**

For many years governments were unwilling to raise China’s human rights record at intergovernmental meetings. Since 1991 some members of the Commission have openly criticised China. Until 1995, however, China had successfully avoided the Commission’s scrutiny through procedural motions “to take no action”. The use of such procedural ploys to evade scrutiny is deplorable. No state, not even the most powerful ones, should be immune from examination by the UN’s principal human rights body.

In 1995 the Commission on Human Rights rejected the “no action motion” and voted on the substance of the draft resolution entitled “Situation of human rights in China”. The draft resolution was narrowly defeated by one vote (21 against, 20 votes for, 12 abstentions). The draft resolution, entitled “Situation of human rights in China”, expressed concern at the continuing reports of violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms and called upon the

government to take further measures to ensure the observance of all human rights. It also welcomed the willingness of the government to enter into bilateral dialogue on human rights and invited it to cooperate with all thematic special rapporteurs and working groups.

Since the last session of the Commission, human rights violations have continued. They range from arbitrary detention of people who peacefully express their views, to gross violations of the physical integrity of the person and the right to life.

Thousands of political prisoners, including members of religious and ethnic groups, are in jail, many simply for expressing their views. Often they face grossly unfair trials, with the guilty verdict decided long before they reach court. Countless numbers of other people are held in administrative detention for long periods without ever being charged. Despite increased official tolerance of debate about legal reforms, human rights defenders are persecuted. Arbitrary arrests have continued during the past year and hundreds of people are detained for peacefully expressing their views or beliefs.

Torture and ill-treatment are common during arrest and in police stations, detention centres, labour camps and prisons, sometimes resulting in the death of the victims. Chinese law prohibits only some forms of torture and ill-treatment and the authorities have failed to prohibit all forms in all circumstances. They have also failed to introduce the most basic safeguards to prevent torture or to bring torturers to justice.

The death penalty is widely used to instil fear into the population, particularly during crackdowns on crime. Thousands of people are sentenced to death each year and many of them executed. In many cases, the death penalty is imposed after summary trials, without any safeguards against miscarriages of justice. Increasing numbers are being put to death for non-violent offences.

Despite the fact that China is a State Party to seven UN human rights treaties and has submitted reports to the treaty monitoring bodies that monitor the implementation of these treaties, violations of fundamental rights remain endemic in China.

The Special Rapporteur on torture has submitted to the government many enquiries about prisoners alleged to have been tortured or ill-treated in detention in China. Many enquires have remained unanswered. When it has responded, the government has usually blankly denied the allegations without providing evidence to show that they were unfounded. In some cases, the government claimed that the allegations had been investigated, but provided no details about the investigations.

The Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions has received replies from the Government to some of his enquiries about the extensive use of the death penalty in China, but many others have remained unanswered. The government has not responded to

enquiries about the use of legislation which provides for summary trial procedures in some death penalty cases, except by stating in a reply in January 1994, that Chinese law provided for “strict controls on the application of the death penalty” and “safeguarded the defendants’ right to defence and appeal”. The Special Rapporteur has stated that he remained concerned at the recurrence of reports of violations of the right to life in China, and noted the persistent contradiction between the numerous allegations received from credible sources and the information provided by the authorities, in view of which he repeated his interest in visiting China. No such visit has yet taken place.

The Working Group on arbitrary detention cited, in its December 1994 report, the cases of 51 political prisoners in China, whose cases had come to its attention. It concluded that the prisoners were arbitrarily detained in violation of international human rights standards. The Working Group's concerns about arbitrary detention in China had been communicated one year earlier to the Chinese Government, who had not responded. The Government has shown unwillingness to cooperate with the Working Group and in February 1995, a Chinese government representative at the Commission attacked the Working Group for making “arbitrary attacks against sovereign states”.

Amnesty International recommends the Commission on Human Rights to:

- adopt a resolution critical of the human rights situation in China;
- ensure that asylum-seekers are not forcibly returned to China if they risk serious human rights violations there, and ensure that the rights of all asylum-seekers, including those in detention, are fully and impartially assessed.

Amnesty International calls on the Commission to urge the Government of China to:

- invite the Working Group on arbitrary detention, the Special Rapporteur on torture and the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions;
- ratify the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and its two Optional Protocols. In addition, China should be urged to withdraw its reservation under Article 28 of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and thereby recognize the Committee’s competence under Article 20 of the Convention to examine reliable information that torture is systematically practised in the country. Furthermore, China should make declarations under Article 21 (complaints from other state parties) and Article 22 (complaints from or on behalf of individuals) recognizing the competence of the Committee under these articles;
- allow independent domestic organisations and relevant international organisations to monitor the human rights situation in China.
- release immediately and unconditionally all prisoners of conscience;
- amend or repeal all provisions in criminal legislation, including state security and state secret legislation, which allow for the detention or imprisonment of people who peacefully exercise

fundamental human rights;

- end impunity and compensate victims of human rights violations;
- urge the Government to stop and prevent torture by granting detainees prompt and regular access to relatives, lawyers and doctors of their choice;
- prohibit all acts which constitute torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, in conformity with the UN Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

## **COLOMBIA**

Amnesty International raised Colombia as a matter of priority last year. At its last session, the Commission on Human Rights had before it the joint report of the Special Rapporteur on torture and the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary and arbitrary executions on their visit to Colombia in October 1994, in which they recommended: "The Commission on Human Rights should keep the human rights situation in Colombia under particularly close scrutiny, with a view to the appointment, unless the situation improves radically in the near future, of a special rapporteur who could cooperate closely with the technical assistance programme."

The special rapporteurs made several specific recommendations, including calling for the government to:

- conduct exhaustive and impartial investigations into all allegations of extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions and torture, to identify, prosecute and punish those responsible;
- try cases of extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions and torture by competent civil courts and not by military courts;
- take necessary steps with a view to strengthening the ordinary judicial system so as to make it more efficient in all circumstances, thus making unnecessary the use of special judicial systems, such as the Regional Justice System;
- ensure that the necessary forensic expertise and ballistic analysis are made available throughout the country with a view to obtaining maximum evidence in each case under investigation; ensure that arrests and gathering of evidence for prosecution is carried out exclusively by civilian judicial police; carry out a substantial reform of the code of military justice, in particular, with a view to remove military jurisdiction over human rights violations committed by members of the armed forces;
- to suspend members of the security forces from active duty when a formal disciplinary or criminal investigation in cases involving human rights violations has been opened against them by the Procuraduría General de la Nación or the Fiscalía General de la Nación; to apply respect for human rights among the criteria when evaluating the conduct of security forces personnel with a view to promotion;
- give priority to taking effective action to disarm and disband paramilitary groups.

During the 1995 session of the Commission the Colombian Ambassador sent a letter to the

Centre for Human Rights, requesting the Centre and special rapporteurs to “regularize their visits to Colombia”. This request was addressed explicitly to the special rapporteurs who visited Colombia in 1994, but extended the invitation to other rapporteurs, especially the Special Rapporteur on the impartiality and independence of the judiciary. The letter also mentioned the intention of the President of Colombia to establish a commission with responsibility for the drafting a new military penal code of procedure.

The Government did establish a commission in charge of drafting the new military penal code of procedure. The Commission is composed of civilian and military personnel. The Commission could not agree on whether or not human rights violations committed by members of the armed forces should be within the jurisdiction of the civilian or military courts. The Government has not taken any decision since the Commission finalized its work as to whether it would follow the recommendation of the special rapporteurs to specifically exclude human rights violations from the jurisdiction of the military courts.

The UN High Commissioner for Human Rights visited Colombia in 1995 and sent a mission to Colombia. At the time of writing, however, there has been no public report of the mission’s visit. In August 1995 the UN Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities adopted resolution 1995/6 in which it expresses its concern at continuing allegations of severe violations of human rights and humanitarian law. The Sub-Commission also called on the government to implement the recommendations made by the thematic rapporteurs and the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances, and to report to the Commission on Human Rights at its 52nd session. Furthermore it recommended that the Commission on Human Rights consider at its 52nd session the developments in Colombia by examining the measures taken by the Government to implement the recommendations made by the thematic rapporteurs and working groups.

The government has made very little progress in implementing the recommendations made by the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions and the Special Rapporteur on torture with regard to the key question of impunity, therefore the Special Rapporteurs did not undertake any additional visits in 1995.

The human rights situation in Colombia suffered a marked deterioration during 1995. During the year more than 2500 people were victims of politically motivated killings and over 200 “disappeared”. Several hundred people were killed in armed confrontations between the armed forces, their paramilitary allies and armed opposition groups. The vast majority of victims, however, continued to be non-combatant civilians targeted for their real or perceived political allegiances. Tens of thousands of people are internally displaced by the civil conflict. During 1995 scores of people were killed in towns and cities by police-backed “death squads” or guerrilla-backed urban militia groups in what are known as “social cleansing” operations.

Government proposals to initiate peace talks with armed opposition groups were suspended in

July following opposition from the military high command. The Government twice declared states of emergency. The first, in August 1995, coincided with a severe political crisis triggered by investigations into alleged financial support from drug-trafficking organizations in President Samper's 1994 election campaign. Although the state of emergency was dismissed by the Constitutional Court which considered it was unjustified, the government again declared a state "of internal commotion" in November 1995 after the murder of a leading member of the conservative party.

The long-standing civil conflict escalated in several areas of the country as paramilitary forces, in many cases backed by sectors of the Colombian army, launched military offensives aimed at extending their control of territory. These paramilitary groups, declared illegal in 1989, carried out widespread human rights violations including hundreds of politically motivated killings of civilians among them community leaders, teachers, trade unionists and human rights activists. Guerrilla forces also significantly increased their military strength and were responsible for numerous violations of humanitarian standards and human rights abuses, including scores of arbitrary and deliberate killings of perceived opponents and the taking and holding of hundreds of hostages.

The conditions set out by the two thematic rapporteurs, that "the situation improves radically" has not been fulfilled. On the contrary Amnesty International considers that the marked deterioration in the human rights situation in 1995, the lack of progress in implementing the recommendations of the two Special Rapporteurs, requires the Commission on Human Rights now to appoint a special rapporteur to monitor and report on the human rights situation in Colombia, including monitoring the implementation of the recommendations made by thematic mechanisms of the Commission. Amnesty International also calls on the Commission to urge the government of Colombia to implement all the recommendations made by the thematic mechanisms of the Commission, in particular:

- fulfil its commitment to end impunity by excluding the investigation of human rights violations and prosecution of perpetrators of human rights violations from military jurisdiction;
- ensure that security force personnel against whom there is evidence of involvement in extrajudicial executions, "disappearances", or other human rights violations, are prosecuted;
- suspend members of the security forces implicated in investigations into extrajudicial executions, "disappearances", or torture from their posts until responsibilities are established;
- take all necessary measures to protect the security of relatives, witnesses, lawyers and others collaborating with investigations of human rights violations;
- fulfil its commitment to eradicate illegal paramilitary forces and to bring to justice members of such forces responsible for political killings, torture, "disappearances", or other human rights violations;
- take all necessary steps to ensure respect for the fundamental human rights of persons who have been internally displaced by conflict.



## **INDONESIA AND EAST TIMOR**

Amnesty International has over the last three years raised Indonesia and East Timor as a priority country for the Commission to take action on. The Commission adopted in 1993 a resolution on East Timor.<sup>2</sup> The resolution expressed deep concern at continuing reports of human rights violations in East Timor and urged the Indonesian government to:

- account fully for persons missing since the Santa Cruz massacre of 12 November 1991;
- bring promptly to justice all members of the security forces responsible for the massacre and related human rights violations;
- ensure that civilian detainees are treated humanely, that any trials meet international standards of fairness, and that those not involved in violent activities be immediately released;
- implement the recommendations contained in the 1992 report of the UN Special Rapporteur on torture;
- expand access to East Timor for human rights and humanitarian organizations;
- invite four of the Commissions human rights monitoring mechanisms to visit East Timor, namely, the Special Rapporteur on torture, the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, the Working Group on arbitrary detention, and the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances.

The government has failed to :

- fully account for those killed and missing after 12 November 1991;
- hold those responsible for the Santa Cruz massacre accountable;
- release all prisoners of conscience;
- allow East Timorese in detention access to a lawyer of their choice and a fair trial;
- expand access to human rights organizations, despite access by the ICRC to political detainees;
- invite the Special Rapporteur on torture to again carry out fact-finding in East Timor, or the Working Group on arbitrary detention and the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances;
- implement fully the recommendations of the Special Rapporteur on torture.

Despite this, the situation in East Timor was only addressed by the Commission in 1994 and 1995 through statements by the Chairman of the Commission. Both statements expressed concern that the Indonesian Government had failed to fully account for those killed and missing after the Santa Cruz massacre, but acknowledged “efforts made to account fully for those persons” and called on the government to continue its “investigation on those still missing”. The 1995 statement also called on the government to implement the recommendations of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions in his December 1994 report. The Indonesian Government has failed also to implement the recommendations in these statements, with the exception of allowing a visit to East Timor by the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions. Amnesty International is concerned that the government has

---

<sup>2</sup>UN Commission on Human Rights resolution 1993/97  
*Amnesty International January 1996AI Index: IOR 41/02/96*

not yet displayed any intention to implement the recommendations in full.

The statement also welcomed the undertaking of the government to invite the High Commissioner to visit East Timor 1995 and submit his report to the 52nd session of the Commission. The High Commissioner undertook a mission to Indonesia and East Timor in December 1995.<sup>3</sup>

The Commission has only dealt with the situation in East Timor. Human rights violations, however, occur also throughout Indonesia. The human rights performance of the Indonesian Government continues to be characterized by the imprisonment of prisoners of conscience, unfair political trials, harassment and arbitrary detention of alleged government opponents, torture, extrajudicial executions, “disappearances” and use of the death penalty.

The Indonesian Government continues to imprison peaceful critics with dozens imprisoned after unfair trial during 1995 both in Indonesia and in East Timor. These add to at least 200 political prisoners, many of them prisoners of conscience, already sentenced to prison terms of up to life imprisonment, imposed after unfair trials, for their alleged links with armed secessionist movements in Irian Jaya, Aceh and East Timor, and with Islamic activism.

Torture and ill-treatment of political and criminal detainees continues in Indonesia and East Timor. Those at greater risk are individuals from marginalised groups and those who are denied or cannot get access to legal counsel of their choice. In Indonesia, labour, political and human rights activists are frequently subjected to short term detention as a result of their peaceful activities. Such arrests are usually conducted without warrants, by military authorities rather than police, and detainees are denied access to lawyers of their choice, all this facilitates the practice of torture.

“Disappearances” continue to be reported in both Indonesia and East Timor. In August 1995, new information came to light about “disappearances” in the Indonesian province of Irian Jaya which had occurred in 1994. Extrajudicial executions of political and criminal suspects continue to be reported in both Indonesia and East Timor. In May, 11 people, including women and children, were executed by the military in the village of Hoesa in Irian Jaya. Both the Indonesian National Commission on Human Rights and the military conducted an investigation into the incident, and four low-ranking officers are believed to be in military detention and awaiting trial in January for their alleged role in the executions. In East Timor at least 13 civilians are thought to have been extrajudicially executed during 1995 alone.

Amnesty International considers that the main factors contributing to human rights violations are a lack of political will to ease restrictions on civil and political rights, the arbitrary use of power by the security forces and virtual impunity for those members of the security forces who commit

---

<sup>3</sup>see *UN High Commissioner on Human Rights Visit to Indonesia and East Timor: 4 - 8 December 1995* (ASA 21/61/95, December 1995)  
*Amnesty International January 1996AI Index: IOR 41/02/96*

human rights violations.

Amnesty International recommends to the Commission on Human Rights to request the Indonesian Government to:

- provide detailed information on the implementation of the 1992 report of the Special Rapporteur on torture and the 1994 report of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, and information on implementation of the UN Commission on Human Rights resolution 1993/97 and the 1994 and 1995 Chairman's Statements;
- commit itself to the ratification of the Convention against Torture, signed by the government in 1985, and to explain what precise progress has been made towards ratification of other international human rights treaties, including the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights;
- invite the Working Group on arbitrary detention and the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances, as recommended by the UN Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, and allow follow-up visits for the Special Rapporteur on torture, the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions and the Special Rapporteur on the impartiality and independence of the judiciary to visit Indonesia and East Timor.

Further Amnesty International calls on the Commission on Human Rights to urge the government to:

- immediately and unconditionally release all prisoners of conscience in Indonesia and East Timor;
- promptly amend or repeal the Anti-Subversion Law and conduct a thorough review of all legislation pertaining to national security and public order to ensure that national security interests cannot be invoked to imprison people for the peaceful exercise of their right to freedom of expression;
- take particular steps to ensure that political trials in Indonesia and East Timor meet minimum UN standards, including ensuring that detainees have access to legal counsel of their own choice, that evidence extracted under force is not used in courts and that independent lawyers and witnesses are not subjected to threats and intimidation;
- prohibit explicitly by law all forms of torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, and ensure that all such acts are recognised as criminal acts and punishable by penalties which take into account the seriousness of the crime;
- grant full access for international and domestic human rights monitors and journalists to all areas of Indonesia and East Timor;
- clarify the functions of the Indonesian Human Rights Commission (Komnas HAM), ensure that it be established by law, provide sufficient resources to enable the Commission to fulfill its functions effectively and ensure that the findings of the Commission are dealt with in such a way that those alleged to have been responsible for committing human rights violations are held properly to account in civilian courts.
- establish a separate independent Human Rights Commission in East Timor in accordance with

the recommendations of the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, and allow for the creation of genuinely independent non-governmental human rights organizations in East Timor.

## **NIGERIA<sup>4</sup>**

The recent unfair trials of Ken Saro-Wiwa and 14 other Ogoni detainees and the subsequent executions of nine of them, despite pleas the African Commission, the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the UN and others for their lives to be spared, are a manifestation of more widespread and systematic violations of human rights in Nigeria. Over the past few years, Amnesty International has documented continuing human rights violations in Nigeria, including: the arbitrary arrest and detention of human rights and pro-democracy activists; the torture of detainees; the killing of unarmed civilians by soldiers; the holding of trials before special tribunals which are not impartial and which do not afford fair trial guarantees to the accused; and the execution of at least 100 people last year and at least 86 this year after unfair trials. Amnesty International has continuously brought these violations of human rights to the attention of the international community.

The Commission last year failed to adopt a draft resolution (rejected by five votes) which could have been instrumental in addressing the deteriorating human rights situation in Nigeria. The High Commissioner for Human Rights made repeated appeals to the Nigerian Government in the case of Ken Saro-Wiwa and other Ogoni detainees, and special rapporteurs and working groups of the Commission made a joint appeal to the Nigerian Government to stop the executions.

The African Commission met in an extraordinary session on 18 and 19 December 1995 in Kampala to examine the human rights situation in Nigeria. The African Commission decided to ask the President of the OAU and the Secretary General to express to the Nigerian Authorities that no irreparable prejudice is caused to the 19 Ogoni detainees whose trial is pending. A delegation composed of the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and the Special Rapporteur on summary and arbitrary executions of the African Commission were requested to undertake a mission to Nigerian from 16 - 21 February 1996. The African Commission will submit a statement to the UN Commission on Human Rights at its 52nd session on the evolution of the situation of human rights in Nigeria in the light of the result of its extraordinary session and the proposed mission. The African commission finally invited the Government of Nigeria to submit its periodic report in conformity with 62 of the African Charter.

The UN General Assembly in its draft resolution A/C.3/50/L.45/Rev 1 (adopted after a recorded vote of 106 in favour, 18 against and 31 abstentions, on 21 December 1995) noted the recent arbitrary executions of Ken Saro-Wiwa and his eight co-defendants and expressed deep concern

---

<sup>4</sup>see *The Ogoni trials and detentions* (AFR 44/20/95, September 1995) and *A travesty of justice: Secret treason trials and other concerns* (AFR 44/23/95, October 1995)  
*Amnesty International January 1996AI Index: IOR 41/02/96*

about the human rights situation in Nigeria. The resolution called upon the government to restore *habeas corpus*, release all political prisoners, guarantee freedom of the press and ensure full respect for the rights of all individuals. It also called on the government to abide by its obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and other instruments on human rights. The resolution also “invites the Commission on Human Rights at its fifty-second session to give urgent attention to the situation of human rights in Nigeria, and recommends, in this regard, that its relevant mechanisms, in particular the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, report to the Commission prior to its next session”.

The Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions in his report to the Commission in 1995 described the persistent reports of the right to life of the members of the Ogoni ethnic group as most worrying. He was, particularly, concerned about the establishment of a special court to curb unrest and insecurity in the area, and to the extension of the scope of the death penalty to offences previously not punishable by death. In addition, special jurisdictions, especially when set up to deal with situations of unrest, very often entail serious restrictions of the safeguards and guarantees for defendants, particularly when they face the death penalty. The Special Rapporteur called on the Government of Nigeria to ensure that proceedings before the special tribunal conform to the standards for fair trial procedures as contained in international instruments, and urged the authorities to take the necessary steps to ensure that security forces, in operations aimed at restoring peace and order, fully abide by norms and regulations governing the use of force by law enforcement officials, and that those employing excessive use of force be brought to justice, in conformity with international law.

In March 1995, 43 prisoners including former Head of State retired General Olusegun Obasanjo and his former Deputy, retired Major-General Shehu Musa Yar'Adua, were convicted of treason and related offences after secret and grossly unfair trials by Special Military Tribunal following an alleged attempt to overthrow the government. Amnesty International considers these persons to be prisoners of conscience. Friends and relatives of the defendants, as well as journalists and human rights activists, who have exposed the injustices of these arrests and trials, have themselves been arrested and secretly convicted by the Special Military Tribunal on charges of concealment of treason or being accessories to treason, and sentenced to long prison terms.

Others, including leading members of human rights organizations, have been detained without charge or trial in connection with the alleged coup attempt. Some remain imprisoned, including Moshood Abiola, who was democratically elected in the presidential elections in 1993 and human rights and pro-democracy activist Sylvester Odion-Akhaine, Dr Olatunjii Abayomi, Chima Ubani and Abhul Oroh. Most of them are being held in administrative detention, held incommunicado and without charge or trial. Harassment and detention of human rights activists, journalists, opposition politicians and other critics of the government have increased. Many have had to go into hiding to avoid arrest. Dozens of newspaper editors and journalists have been arrested for publishing articles critical of the government, some held briefly but many detained

for weeks incommunicado and usually released without trial or charge.

The trial of 19 Ogoni detainees, charged with the same murders for which Ken Saro-Wiwa and eight others Ogoni prisoners were executed, is due to commence before a Civil Disturbances Special Tribunal in January 1996. Although the Federal High Court in Lagos has ordered the trial temporarily suspended while it considers a constitutional challenge brought by the accused. Amnesty International fears that the Nigerian government will ignore the court's ruling and proceed with the trial. If that happens, Amnesty International is concerned that the 19 could be tried unfairly, sentenced to death and executed without right of appeal to a higher court, in violation of Nigeria's solemn treaty commitment under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

Finally, the Nigerian government has dramatically escalated its use of the death penalty. This year, more than 86 had been executed by October 1995, all convicted of armed robbery by Robbery and Firearms Tribunals, which, in contravention of international standards for fair trial, do not allow for right of appeal.

Amnesty International recommends to the Commission to appoint a Special Rapporteur for Nigeria and that the special rapporteur work closely together with the thematic mechanisms of the Commission. Amnesty International also calls on the Commission to urge the government of Nigeria to:

- release immediately and unconditionally all prisoners imprisoned for the non-violent expression of their political views;
- abolish the Special Military Tribunals;
- release immediately and unconditionally all other political prisoners unless they are charged and tried promptly and fairly with full rights of defence and without imposition of the death penalty. Those convicted should have their convictions and sentences reviewed by a higher and independent judicial body;
- establish an independent and impartial judicial inquiry, consistent with international standards, into Clement Tusima's death in detention, the results of which should be made public, with a view to determining the cause of his death and bringing to justice any person found to be responsible for his alleged medical neglect while in detention;
- introduce safeguards to protect detainees from all forms of ill-treatment, including medical neglect;
- allow all detainees full and immediate access to their families, lawyers, doctors and necessary medical care, as required by international standards, and ensure that they are held in conditions which conform with the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners;
- halt all executions and end the use of the death penalty;
- publish full transcripts of the secret treason trials before the Special Military Tribunal in connection with the alleged coup plot of March 1995;
- revoke the 1984 State Security (Detention of Persons) Decree, No. 2 of 1984 and subsequent

amendments, which allows arbitrary detention and removes the power of the courts to safeguard detainees from torture or other ill-treatment;

- set up an independent, judicial inquiry to investigate the reports both of extrajudicial executions by government forces and inter-ethnic killings in Ogoniland in 1993 and 1994, and of the illegal and incommunicado detention, torture, ill-treatment and medical neglect of Ogoni detainees, with a view to bringing to justice those responsible;
- ratify the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, which the government signed in 1988.

## **TURKEY**

Amnesty International continues to consider that the human rights situation in Turkey is so grave that it demands priority attention by the Commission. But it is also a situation which could still be remedied. The Turkish Government has the power, resources and infrastructure to halt the widespread violations by police and gendarmerie forces under its control if it had the political will to make changes.

The most serious human rights violations - imprisonment of prisoners of conscience, torture, “disappearance” and extrajudicial execution - persisted throughout 1995. While refusing to take any of the steps recommended for years by expert bodies of intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations, the Turkish Government gave enormous publicity to a series of legal and constitutional changes of almost no significance for basic human rights. There are still no legislative safeguards against incommunicado detention, torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, “disappearances” and extrajudicial executions, and there is a genuine lack of reform to ensure freedom of expression. Such safeguards and freedoms of expression reforms are needed in order to bring Turkey’s law and practice into line with Turkey’s obligations under international law.

The Turkish Grand National Assembly approved some amendments to Article 8 of the Anti-Terror Law. Under the revision “separatist propaganda” remains an imprisonable offence, even when the defendant has in no way advocated violence, but the phrase “irrespective of the methods and aims and ideas” has been removed. The amendment resulted in the release of at least 70 people - many of them prisoners of conscience. Amnesty International welcomed the releases but expressed deep regret that the changes still leave intact legislation under which people can be imprisoned for expressing non-violent opinions. Prison sentences are still being handed down under the new phrasing of Article 8, several prisoners of conscience still remain in custody, and it is likely that many of the released prisoners of conscience will be re-arrested in early 1996 to have their cases re-tried. Also, the prosecutors are now increasingly using Article 312 of the Turkish Penal Code, which provides for up to six years imprisonment, against “separatist” statements. A journalist and a trade union leader are currently imprisoned serving

sentences under that Article.<sup>5</sup>

At its 1995 session, the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities considered a draft resolution condemning the imprisonment of intellectuals, scholars, writers, journalists and parliamentarians on the grounds of their opinions, and calling on the Government to invite the Special Rapporteur on freedom of opinion and expression to visit Turkey as soon as possible. The resolution was withdrawn when it turned out that Turkey had already extended an invitation to the Special Rapporteur, and instead, a decision was adopted which took note of the "positive initiatives undertaken by the Turkish authorities in the field of freedom of expression". However, the Government subsequently postponed the visit by the Special Rapporteur. The "positive initiatives" which led the Sub-Commission to postpone consideration of the question of human rights in Turkey have therefore not been implemented. It is essential that the Commission take some action to address the situation in Turkey, which has certainly not improved since the Sub-Commission resolution was tabled.

Amnesty International has documented a serious deterioration in the human rights situation in Turkey since 1990. Torture is a long-standing problem in Turkey, described by the Committee against Torture in its 1993 public report as "systematic". Extrajudicial executions started to occur with increasing frequency in 1991, mainly in the southeast, but also in Istanbul and Ankara. "Disappearance" in police custody, previously almost unknown in Turkey, was reported with increasing frequency until, in its annual report for 1994, the UN Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances made the startling observation that it had received more allegations of "disappearance" from Turkey than from any other country in 1994.

During the beginning of 1995 there was some reduction in the numbers of "disappearances and death in custody, but this positive development is already under threat. In October and November there was a significant increase in reported cases of "disappearances". On 30 October, six people, including three children, reportedly "disappeared" after being detained near Dargecit, in the Mardin province. Two people "disappeared" in Istanbul in circumstances suggesting that they were abducted by the police.

The Turkish Government faces tough security problems and is tackling an armed insurgency which has cost more than 20,000 lives since 1984. Several armed opposition groups in Turkey are committing serious human rights abuses. Turkey should, however, observe the minimum international standards, in particular with regard to ending torture and ill-treatment, "disappearances" and extrajudicial executions, when confronting this security threat.

Amnesty International recommends that the Commission encourage the government to take a number of modest and practical steps to address systematic human rights violations in the country. In particular, Amnesty International calls on the Commission to urge the government to:

- implement the recommendations contained in the November 1993 report of the UN Committee

---

<sup>5</sup>see *Unfulfilled promise of reform* (EUR 44/87/95, September 1995)

*Amnesty International January 1996AI Index: IOR 41/02/96*



against Torture, especially that all detainees, including those detained on suspicion of offences under the Anti-Terror Law, should be given access to legal counsel, and that the maximum period of police detention should be reduced from the present maximum of 30 days, so that detainees are brought promptly before a judge;

- extend invitations to the UN Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, as well as the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances, to visit the country in 1996;

- abolish Article 8 of the Anti-Terror Law or amend it so that it no longer allows the imprisonment of people solely for the expression of their non-violent opinions;

- account for the scores of people who have “disappeared” in security forces custody since 1991;

- carry out impartial and independent investigations into all reports of extrajudicial executions and make public the reports of these investigations;

- ensure that the Law on the Prosecution of Civil Servants (which permits local governors to block prosecution of security forces in the 10 provinces under emergency legislation) is not applied to allegations of extrajudicial executions, torture or ill-treatment by police or other civil servants.

## **DRAFT DECLARATION ON HUMAN RIGHTS DEFENDERS<sup>6</sup>**

Amnesty has pushed for more than a decade for the elaboration of an international instrument that recognizes and strengthens the right to defend human rights<sup>7</sup>. Defenders work on the whole spectrum of human rights - trade union rights, right to land, economic rights, women's rights, minority and language rights, rights relating to physical and mental health, and many more - not just the more limited range of civil and political rights that Amnesty International focuses on in its research and campaigning. However, the protection of those who defend and promote all these rights is a matter of high priority for the organization, which is committed to using its resources to ensure that those who defend human rights can do so openly and fully, without fear of being imprisoned, harassed, tortured or killed.

Meanwhile, governments have singularly failed to protect human rights defenders. For more than 10 years state representatives at the Commission have been unable to reach agreement on the text of a basic declaration aimed at recognizing and strengthening the right to defend human rights. The debate over the Declaration has been characterized by the constant tension between those who are trying to protect defenders, and reinforce the rights necessary for human rights work, and governments that would like to impose a set of limitations and obligations on defenders that would make their work practically meaningless.

Most of the rights that make the defence of human rights possible are already guaranteed to all

---

6i.e. Declaration on the Right and Responsibility of Individuals, Groups and Organs of Society to Promote and Protect Universally Recognized Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms

7See AI's report entitled "Human Rights Defenders: Breaching the Walls of Silence: Issues at Stake in the UN Draft Declaration on Human Rights Defenders", AI Index: IOR 40/07/95, September 1995 for further information.

*Amnesty International January 1996AI Index: IOR 41/02/96*

people; the right to freedom of expression or the right to freedom of association and peaceful assembly for example. Governments, however, can be very inventive in finding ways to restrict the exercise of human rights, and given that existing international instruments contain sufficient restrictions already, the purpose of this Declaration should be to fortify defenders' rights in the face of real and sometimes violent suppression by governments and their agents. Governments, on the other hand, do not need any additional protection from those who are peacefully exercising their fundamental rights and freedoms.

The working group responsible for the draft operates by consensus, and progress has been blocked by a few states that have taken advantage of the consensus rule to push for amendments aimed at emphasizing the duties and responsibilities of human rights defenders, rather than their rights and freedoms. The introduction of restrictive proposals, especially from Cuba, China, Syria and Mexico, has accelerated during the last two sessions. Other states, including the USA, United Kingdom and Greece, have made valuable proposals on many issues but have objected to clauses that would allow third parties to take court actions to protect human rights of others. This could leave the most in need, like the "disappeared", without protection. A small group of governments would like to subordinate the activities of defenders to national law, which often falls short of the rights and protections offered by international human rights standards. There has also been attempt to limit outside financial and material support. Cuba, supported by China, has proposed a wording that would restrict defenders to defending their own rights although the primary role of human rights defenders is to act on behalf of others.

Amnesty International recommends to government delegations in the Working Group to agree that the consensus rule cannot be exploited in order to provide *de facto* power of veto. It is vital that no new limitations on the rights of defenders be added to those already adopted if the Draft Declaration is to fulfill its intended purpose. The Draft Declaration should guarantee the right to defend human rights, and the full exercise of all the rights and freedoms that this entails. As an absolute minimum this should include:

- the right to defend rights of other people
- the right to form, join or affiliate to national or international human rights organizations
- the right to advocate human rights ideas freely and openly
- the right to choose to defend any or all human rights
- the right to obtain and utilise the resources necessary for the work
- the right to communicate with national and international NGOs, and to have unrestricted access to intergovernmental organizations

- the right to participate in peaceful actions aimed at promoting the observance of human rights
- the right to use the law and state institutions in the defence of human rights, and to appeal to them when the victims cannot do so for themselves
- the right to defend human rights in every dimension, independently of state ideology, on both national and international level.

Amnesty International urges governments to attend the next session of the working group responsible for the drafting of the Declaration on Human Rights Defenders and to finish the elaboration of a strong declaration. Also, it urges that governments remove the procedural obstacles to the adoption by the Working Group of the declaration on human rights defenders and to adopt the draft Declaration and forward it to the Commission on Human Rights at its 52nd session.

## **THE DRAFT OPTIONAL PROTOCOL TO THE CONVENTION AGAINST TORTURE AND OTHER CRUEL, INHUMAN OR DEGRADING TREATMENT OR PUNISHMENT**

Amnesty International supports the drafting of a strong Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The protocol would create a global system for the inspection of places of detention as a way of preventing torture and other ill-treatment. It is a unique initiative because of its emphasis on prevention. A sub-committee of the Committee against Torture would combine the technique of fact-finding, to identify practices which facilitate torture and other ill-treatment, with the initiation of a confidential dialogue with governments to discuss practical, remedial measures.

There is no shortage of international standards prohibiting torture and ill-treatment. This initiative seeks to implement these standards more effectively. The proposed sub-committee would not act as a quasi-judicial body investigating alleged violations of treaty obligations after the fact. Rather, the experts would go and see for themselves the conditions in places of detention and particular practices which facilitate the incidence of torture and ill-treatment.

The initiative has been discussed in the Commission since it was first introduced by Costa Rica in 1980 and the Working Group on the Draft Optional Protocol has been meeting since 1992 to review the original text. At its 1995 session, the Working Group on the Draft Optional Protocol successfully concluded its first reading of the original Costa Rican draft text. To capitalize on the substantial progress already made, it is essential that the second reading begins in 1996. Amnesty International recommends that the Commission allocate the necessary time and resources for the Working Group to meet for two weeks in 1997 and continue its important work.

Amnesty International is concerned that relatively few states have been actively participating in the sessions of the Working Group. It urges states in all regions to work together to create an effective and widely supported system.

Amnesty International urges states to express their support for this initiative and for the drafting of a strong text which would create a truly effective system for the prevention of torture. In the light of the discussions in the working group, Amnesty International reiterates that an effective text should include the following:

- the sub-committee should have the authority to carry out missions to any state which has ratified the Optional Protocol, as provided for in the draft text, without having to obtain further consent from a State Party for each individual mission;
- the sub-committee should be effectively supported by experts participating in missions and assisting its members;
- the sub-committee should enjoy full access to all places where people are deprived of their liberty and the right to interview any relevant person in private;
- the sub-committee should be able to issue a report or public statement or partially release a confidential report where a state fails to cooperate with the sub-committee;
- reservations should be prohibited as the Optional Protocol does not create new substantive standards, but rather establishes a mechanism which can only function effectively and coherently if the same powers and limitations apply to all State Parties.

## **WOMEN'S HUMAN RIGHTS**

Amnesty International regards Commission Resolution 1995/86 on integrating the rights of women into the human rights mechanisms of the UN and the elimination of violence against women as an important step in the Commission's work on the human rights of women and the implementation of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action. Amnesty International welcomed the preliminary report of the Special Rapporteur on violence against women, including its causes and consequences, and urges the Commission to continue to give its full support to her work.

The international community is becoming increasingly aware of the need to improve women's enjoyment of human rights. The Fourth UN World Conference on Women constituted an opportunity to consolidate and reaffirm commitments made at other UN Conferences in a single document focused on the role of women, in the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action. In particular, it reaffirmed the commitments on women's rights made in the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action.

The Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action advanced several concepts such as the principle that women's rights are human rights; the need to take action to curb all forms of violence against women including a clear reference to state responsibility for violence against women;

and the condemnation of female genital mutilation as a form of violence. However, the Platform for Action was weak as it did not identify many human rights violations against women which are prevalent throughout the world, in peace as well as in conflict, such as rape or sexual abuse and other forms of torture and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment in custody. There was insufficient attention to all international human rights treaties and, in particular non-treaty standards which are important for the full protection of women's human rights. It failed to make specific recommendations, particularly at the International level. Nonetheless, in many respects it represents an important step forward by the world's governments towards acknowledging the reality of human rights violations against women and girls.

The challenge is for the international community to ensure the implementation of the provisions on human rights of women in the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action and the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action. The Commission on Human Rights will need to look at how it can implement the recommendations made in the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, especially, with regard to the provisions on violence against women, women in armed conflict and women's human rights.

The High Commissioner on Human Rights stated in his report to the General Assembly that high priority is attached in the United Nations human rights program to the equal status of women and human rights of women, whose integration into the mainstream of system-wide activities was called for by the World Conference on Human Rights. The main issues identified in the report are: (a) obstacles to the realization of the human rights of women; (b) elimination of gender-based violence against women in public and private life; (c) traditional practices affecting the health of women and girl children; (d) cooperation and coordination between relevant organs and bodies, in particular with the Division for the Advancement of Women of the Secretariat; (e) reflection of problems related to the human rights of women in the reporting guidelines and procedures of various human rights treaty bodies; (f) the equal status and rights of women in the mainstream of the Centre of Human Rights activities (including the programme of technical cooperation and publications) and the establishment of a related focal point in the Centre; and (g) coordinating activities related to women's rights system wide, with the aim, *inter alia*, of developing a strategy for ensuring the provision of more comprehensive information system-wide and for greater media coverage on women's issues.

Amnesty International welcomes the fact that the High Commissioner's office and the UN Centre for Human Rights are carrying out an evaluation and assessment of all activities of the human rights program with a view to mainstreaming the gender-perspective; placing increased emphasis on training programs and technical assistance for the promotion and protection of human rights of women, and developing a network with UN agencies, member states, and NGOs to publish data and information on violence against women and the violation of women's rights. Amnesty International hopes that more attention will be given to include delegates with expertise in women's issues, who should preferably be women, as full members of delegations on on-site visits and, wherever possible, use of female interpreters to facilitate the collection of information

from victims of rape and sexual abuse or in circumstances where women may not feel able to speak freely to male delegates. It would be highly appropriate for the Special Rapporteur on violence against women to undertake joint missions with other thematic or country rapporteurs to investigate situations where women are at risk.

Amnesty International attended an expert meeting on the development of guidelines for the integration of gender perspectives into United Nations human rights activities and programmes, held in Geneva in July 1995 under the auspices of the High Commissioner on Human Rights and organized by the Centre for Human Rights and the United Nations Development Fund for Women. Amnesty International regretted the fact that the treaty bodies, thematic mechanisms and country rapporteurs were sparsely represented. The report of the expert group should therefore be endorsed by the Commission on Human Rights and submitted to the treaty bodies, the country rapporteurs and thematic mechanisms of the Commission for their consideration of how to implement them and/or expand them. The expert group should meet before the next session of the Commission with a view to taking into consideration the comments made by the treaty bodies, country rapporteurs and thematic mechanisms of the Commission and submit a final report to the 53rd session of the Commission.

## **LIST OF AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS**

The following documents are available from Amnesty International section offices, the International Secretariat or the Amnesty International UN office in Geneva

### **GENERAL**

*Amnesty International Report 1995*  
(POL 10/01/95)

*Statements to the 51st session of the Commission on Human Rights*  
(IOR 41/04/95, March 1995)

*Human Rights Defenders: Breaching the Walls of Silence: Issues at Stake in the UN Draft Declaration on Human Rights Defenders*  
(IOR 40/07/95, September 1995)

### **CHINA**

*Dissidents detained without charge or trial since 1994*  
(ASA 17/02/95, March 1995)

*Fourteen Monks arrested in Tibet*  
(ASA 17/08/95, February 1995)

*Death penalty figures recorded for 1994*  
(ASA 17/17/95, March 1995)

*Trade unionists in China; a ban on pluralism*  
(ACT 73/03/95, May 1995)

*Persistent human rights violations in Tibet*  
(ASA 17/18/95, May 1995)

*Update on 11 Tibetan nuns arrested in 1993*  
(ASA 17/25/95, April 1995)

*Christians arrested during Easter and others serving sentences*  
(ASA 17/26/95, May 1995)

*123 political arrests in Tibet in three months*

*1996 UN Commission on Human Rights - A Call for Action*

(ASA 17/27/95, May 1995)

*Six years after Tiananmen: increased political repression and human rights violations*  
(ASA 17/28/95, June 1995)

*Women in China: Imprisoned and abused for dissent*  
(ASA 17/29/95, June 1995)

*New Crackdown on dissidents before 4 June anniversary*  
(ASA 17/31/95, May 1995)

*Three detained in Panchen Lama controversy*  
(ASA 17/40/95, June 1995)

*40 Public Security and Reform-Through-Labour officers take Chen Ziming back to prison*  
(ASA 17/44/95, June 1995)

*Wei Jingsheng held in secret for 16 months*  
(ASA 17/52/95, August 1995)

*Update on dissidents detained around 4 June 1995*  
(ASA 17/69/95, September 1995)

*Crackdown to Tibetan dissent continues*  
(ASA 17/74/95, September 1995)

*Chen Ziming's health deteriorates*  
(ASA 17/76/95, October 1995)

*Harassment and surveillance of the families of dissidents in China during the World Conference on Women*  
(ASA 17/84/95, October 1995)

*Death Penalty Log: January to June 1995*  
(ASA 17/94/95, November 1995)

*Death Penalty continues to expand in 1995*  
(ASA 17/104/95, December 1995)

## **COLOMBIA**



*Political violence in Norte de Santander and south of Cesar Department escalates*  
(AMR 23/37/95, August 1995)

*Women in Colombia: Breaking the Silence*  
(AMR 23/41/95, September 1995)

## **INDONESIA/EAST TIMOR**

*Continuing Human Rights Violations*  
(ASA 21/10/95, February 1995)

*The Liquiza Killings*  
(ASA 21/15/95, February 1995)

*Attacks on free speech*  
(ASA 21/22/95, April 1995)

*Parliamentarian questioned after demonstrations - a pretext for silencing peaceful opposition?*  
(ASA 21/24/95, April 1995)

*Trade unionist in Indonesia*  
(ACT 73/06/95, May 1995)

*Workers' rights still challenged*  
(ASA 21/29/95, June 1995)

*East Timor: Twenty years of violations: Statement before the UN Special Committee on Decolonization, 11 July 1995*  
(ASA 21/33/95, July 1995)

*Indonesia: Predictions of a psychic: a threat to national stability?*  
(ASA 21/34/95, July 1995)

*The 1965 prisoners - A briefing*  
(AI 21/36/95, July 1995)

*The 1965 Prisoners - Update*  
(ASA 21/55/95, July 1995)

*Irian Jaya: National Commission on human rights confirms violations*  
(ASA 21/47/95, September 1995)

*Women in Indonesia and East Timor: Standing against repression*  
(ASA 21/51/95, December 1995)

*Trade unionists arrested*  
(ASA 21/59/95, November 1995)

*UN High Commissioner on Human Rights Visit to Indonesia and East Timor: 4 - 8 December 1995*  
(ASA 21/61/95, December 1995)

## **NIGERIA**

*The Ogoni trials and detentions*  
(AFR 44/20/95, September 1995)

*A travesty of justice: secret treason trials and other concerns*  
(AFR 44/23/95, October 1995)

## **TURKEY**

*A policy of denial*  
(EUR 44/01/95, February 1995)

*Recommendations for action to combat systematic violations of Human Rights*  
(EUR 44/06/95, January 1995)

*Torture of 13-year-old in Istanbul*  
(EUR 44/18/95, February 1995)

*A policy of denial - update I*  
(EUR 44/24/95, February 1995)

*Mothers of “disappeared” take action*  
(EUR 44/55/95, May 95)

*Mothers of “disappeared” take action - update I*  
(EUR 44/67/95, June 1995)

*Families of “disappeared” subjected to brutal treatment*  
(EUR 44/80/95, September 1995)

*Unfulfilled promise of reform*  
(EUR 44/87/95, September 1995)

Amnesty International is a worldwide voluntary movement that works to prevent some of the gravest violations by governments of people's fundamental rights. The main focus of its campaigning is to:

·*free all prisoners of conscience*. These are people detained anywhere for their beliefs or because of their ethnic origin, sex, colour or language - who have not used or advocated violence;

·*ensure fair and prompt trials for all political prisoners*;

·*abolish the death penalty, torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment of prisoners*;

·*end to extrajudicial executions "disappearances"*.

**Amnesty International** also opposes abuses committed by armed opposition groups which are contrary to minimum international standards of humanitarian conduct such as hostage-taking, torture and deliberate and arbitrary killings of prisoners and other civilians and non-combatants.

**Amnesty International** is impartial. 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 victims whose rights it seeks to protect. It is concerned solely with the protection of human rights regardless of the ideology of the government or opposition force or the belief of the victim.

**Amnesty International** promotes awareness of and adherence to all the rights embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and elaborated in human rights instruments adopted by the United Nations (UN) including the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights although the specific rights on which it takes action are found in the latter treaty. All human rights are universal and indivisible and the specific rights which are the focus of Amnesty International's actions are inextricably linked to other human rights.