

Patrons:

Clive Stafford Smith

Geoffrey Bindman

Phil Shiner

BULLETIN

The Solicitors' International Human Rights Group

**Uniting Lawyers Around the World for Human
Rights**

OCTOBER 2007

The SIHRG Colombian Lawyers

Solidarity Project p 2

Interview with Morgane Landel, SIHRG

Volunteer in Colombia p 4

Fighting Terror in Pakistan and the

UK p 5

Human Rights in Bangladesh p 6

The Right not to Fight p 8

SIHRG News and Events p 9

SIHRG Committee

Chair

Michael Ellman

Vice Chair

Lionel Blackman

Treasurer

Caroline Sawyer

Secretary

Tessa Gregory

Events Secretary

Zoe Bryanston Cross

Press Officer

Caroline Sawyer

Missions Officer

Emma Norton

Committee Members

Julie Tenenbaum, Lucy
Anderson, Karen Mitchell,
Bronwyn Byrnes, Martha Baker
Roaul Fishman, Trudy Morgan

Administrator

Kaite Gwynne

Email:

admin@sihr.org

Bulletin

Editor

Julie Tenenbaum

Assistant Editor

Trudy Morgan

Email

bulletin@sihr.org

The SIHRG Colombian Lawyers Solidarity Project

The Solicitors' International Human Rights Group has led a mission of solidarity uniting members of SIHRG with lawyers in Bogota struggling against the odds in human rights cases. The project has been undertaken in collaboration with Justice for Colombia - the British based trades unions backed NGO. The collaboration arose at the end of a mission of enquiry organised by JFC that took a dozen British lawyers to Colombia in May 2006. Lionel Blackman the vice-chair of SIHRG joined this delegation and its report is available via the SIHRG web site. It was agreed that after a short visit of ten days there was more that the British legal profession could do to assist its fellow professionals in this strife torn country. The committee of SIHRG approved the plan to send a SIHRG member to Colombia for an extended period of three months to deepen ties and mutual understanding. In addition to the protective effect of a professional foreign presence actual legal work and evidence gathering was to be part of the mission.

Morgane Landel, a criminal defence practitioner and duty solicitor from London was selected for the first mission. There was a funding appeal and eventually with contributions from many small firms up and down the country and a few bigger ones (including one from SIHRG's own general funds) the

target was met and Morgane was sent on her way taking unpaid time off work. She is interviewed by Julie Tenenbaum below and her final report is also available through the website. Her courageous mission led to further successful funding appeals for a follow up volunteer.

Separately the chair of SIHRG Michael Ellman was invited to take part in a short mission of enquiry that took place in October this year and here are extracts from the mission's press release:

"The international mission (*of legal experts*) heard victims and witnesses who recounted 132 cases of extra-judicial executions attributable to the armed forces, which in the great majority of cases went unpunished. These testimonies are some of at least 955 cases of extra-judicial executions in Colombia between July 2002 and June 2007 documented by Colombian human rights organisations.

The international mission found common patterns for extra-judicial executions which they recorded in various regions of the country, allowing them to conclude that it was not a matter of isolated incidents, but systematic behaviour indicating prior planning. The victims were generally simple peasants, natives, community leaders and

people on the economic margins of society. In many cases they were arbitrarily robbed of their liberty by the army, subsequently dressed in military clothes and executed. Afterwards they were presented as guerrillas killed in combat.

Despite the fact that the Colombian Constitutional Court has stated in numerous decisions that these cases fall in the jurisdiction of the Public Prosecutor (Fiscal General de la Nación), and that whenever there are doubts, it is he who should undertake the investigation, and not the military. However the mission noted that in many cases the Public Prosecutor did not take on the investigation actively, and did not take steps to raise the conflict of jurisdiction."

Just following Michael's return the second volunteer member of SIHRG travelled to Colombia on the follow up mission of the Solidarity Project. George Zachary was tasked with evaluating the merits and mechanisms for the direct financing of specific court cases. As we go to press he is undertaking numerous meetings with key players in the besieged legal community of human rights defenders in Bogota and elsewhere in the country. The Solidarity Project's next phase then is to divert such future funding as it raises not on

airfares but on direct assistance in promoting human rights standards from within the country.

Useful websites on Colombia

Justice for Colombia

<http://www.justiceforcolombia.org/>

Peace Brigades

International:

<http://www.peacebrigades.org/uk.html>

CAJAR – Colombian Lawyers Association:

<http://www.colectivodeabogados.org/> (in Spanish)

Comision Intereclesial de Justicia y Paz –

<http://es.geocities.com/justiciaypazcolombia/> (in Spanish)

For more information on SIHRG's project in Colombia, please contact:

Lionelblackman@sihr.org

Colombia in Focus:

Images from Morgane Landel's report on the SIHRG Colombian Lawyers' Solidarity Project



Above: Meeting with victims of human rights abuses in Arauquita, near Arauca in Northern Colombia



The water supply in Montes de Maria, south of Baranquilla, North Colombia.

Interview with Morgane Landel, SIHRG volunteer in Colombia

by Julie Tenenbaum

How long were you in Colombia for?

3 months

What motivated you to take part in the project? Did you already have experience of similar work?

I wanted to learn more about the situation in Colombia. I had visited the country as a tourist the year before and had really enjoyed my time there but felt that there was something more sinister about the country, which I wanted to explore. I had also written an Amicus Brief about the law for justice and peace and so had some background of the situation. It seemed like a very worthy project because there seems to be so many problems for people who work for human rights in the country. I had previously worked in Ecuador doing research about the International criminal court for an NGO, and also in Costa Rica at the Inter American Commission of human rights working on a project about human rights in the Caribbean. However, I had never experienced the level of threat and latent violence that I found in Colombia.

What were your activities in Colombia? Did you shadow one lawyer or several? Did you do any legal work there?

The main part of my work there was to meet clients of the lawyers I was working with and discuss their cases with them. It also involved travelling on my own to various parts of the country and meeting with victims of state crime and families of people who were in custody accused of offences against the state (like rebellion). I effectively took testimony from them and reported back weekly to SIHRG and then prepared the report at the end. I also went along with a few different lawyers to

hearings and on prison visits. I did not do any legal work as such.

Can you give us an example of human Rights abuses/cases you witnessed there?

There are two main types of human rights abuses. One relates to extra judicial killings. The state or state controlled agents (paramilitaries) kill or injure anyone who disagrees with state policy. This is done with impunity: no-one is ever brought to justice because there is a lack of will on the part of the authorities to prosecute and even arrest any perpetrators. The other main abuse that I saw related to the criminal justice system in that, again, people who disagree with the state (such as community leaders who make demands from the state for running water etc.) will get arrested for offences like rebellion and kept in custody for up to three years. The evidence that is used to keep them locked up is often contradictory, the witness does not have to give live evidence so there is no opportunity to cross-examine them. Often the witness is paid by the state as a so-called 'demobilised guerilla'. This results in people denouncing anyone and often people who have been pointed out by state agents initially. The prosecution and judiciary does not act as an independent arbitrator and allows these cases to run through the system with the result that people are often convicted of these crimes. One good example is the case of a community leader in Montes de Maria, near Baranquilla. He had spent one year in custody after being accused of rebellion. He had been released for a year when I met with him. He told me that he was nervous because he had been threatened by the Chief of the

Army in 2004 and told that he would either be in custody or dead. He was shot in May 2007 in broad daylight. There are further examples in my report.

What risks did the lawyers you worked with face?

The lawyers faced death threats and were sometimes victims of shootings. They are regularly killed. One of the lawyers I worked with the most was being followed when I was there. Another one had been shot at in December 2006 but had survived because she had bullet proof car. They all have body guards. You have to be prepared to meet people who have suffered through terrible tragedies.

How did you think the project helped the lawyer you sought to protect?

It protected the lawyer if only because the lawyers would never be shot in the presence of a non-Colombian as it would give the country really bad press.

For more information on the SIHRG Colombian Lawyers Solidarity Project or Morgane's detailed report, please email lionelblackman@sihrq.org.

Fighting Terrorism in Pakistan and the UK by Maryam Syed and Paul Snowden

How are Pakistan and the UK meeting the new terror threat?

Sir Winston Churchill said, *“the mood and temper of the public with regard to the treatment of crime and criminals is one of the most unfailing tests of the civilization of any country.”*

The world has changed irrevocably since the appalling events of 9/11. The constant fear of terror – here Muslim led terror and the resulting “war” waged against it - has inevitably led to a slow erosion of civil liberties.

Lawyers have most keenly felt the fundamental shifts in the previously viewed sanctity of our most basic legally protected freedoms.

Two countries who are in the battle lines of this “war” are the UK and Pakistan. Both face political pressures to be seen to be robustly meeting these challenges. But in both jurisdictions the reality has often seen detention without any or proper legal safeguards.

The current position in Pakistan with respect to arbitrary detention and enforced disappearances is a chilling warning to the vigilance we must show in resisting expedient shortcuts to proper legal process here.

While incidents of torture, ill treatment and arbitrary detention have frequently been documented over many years in

Pakistan, the “War” has created a whole new wave of violations.

Amnesty International reported that the practice of enforced disappearance “was rare before 2001”, but in 2006 reported that “Hundreds of people suspected of links to al-Qa’ida or the Taleban have been arbitrarily arrested and detained...[they have] become victims of enforced disappearance”.

The case of Abdur Rahim Muslim Dost is just one example. He had already been arrested with his younger brother by military police at his home in Peshawar in November 2001. The two men were handed over to US authorities and transferred to Bagram, Kandahar and finally to Guantánamo Bay on 1 May 2002. By April 2005, both had been released from Guantánamo neither of them having been charged with any offence.

The brothers returned home and published a book describing their torture in Pakistani and US custody and critical of the role of Pakistani intelligence agencies. Shortly after the book’s publication, Abdur became a victim of enforced disappearance for the second time, on 29th September 2006. He was arrested by police and an intelligence agency as he left a mosque in Peshawar. He is not known to have been charged with a criminal offence. Custodial safeguards, which by law must be available to anyone in Pakistan, have been violated as he has not been brought before a magistrate and not been allowed access to a

lawyer and his family. His fate and whereabouts remain unknown.

Even more disturbingly, Pakistani security and intelligence services appear to be using the new techniques they have learned in the “War” in other areas. For example, enforced disappearance is now being used against nationalists in the decades long dispute in Balochistan province. The Human Rights Commission of Pakistan found in its latest report that: “More and more citizens across the country were...whisked away apparently by State intelligence agencies, to secret centres of detention...subjected to severe torture...the largest number in Balochistan.”

The message is clear: once authorities decide they can shortcut due process for one group, what begins as an exceptional measure, legal or otherwise, eventually becomes the norm.

Although no reports of enforced disappearances exist here, measures have been adopted which would have generally been unthinkable before 9/11.

The Anti-terrorism Crime and Security Act 2001 was rushed through Parliament after 9/11. The Act allowed for the detention, without charge or trial, of those suspected of involvement in terrorism. It currently stands at 28 days.

In April and June 2007, Home Secretary John Reid told the Commons Home Affairs Committee that he wanted consensus on plans to extend that period.

Similar Government plans to allow three month detentions without charge were defeated in the House of Commons in November 2005, Mr Blair's first Commons defeat as Prime Minister.

The 2007 proposals would include a law change to allow terrorist suspects to be questioned after being charged, a sex offender-style terrorist register, and a review into courts using intercept evidence, by a committee of Privy Counsellors.

John Reid also told MPs he was now proposing new measures to toughen control orders relating to fingerprinting, DNA and police powers of entry; an interesting contradiction after he was forced to concede that neither DNA or fingerprints were taken from those on such orders.

Mr Reid has blamed the courts and opposition parties for opposing previous attempts to introduce "tougher" anti-terrorism laws.

Police say gathering evidence from computer hard-drives, mobile phone records and various fake identities means they need more time.

The government's independent reviewer of anti-terrorism legislation, Lib Dem peer Lord Carlile, reiterated his support for extending detention without charge beyond 28 days. He said there may be cases "in which the need to protect evidence, to discover what the evidence is, to de-encrypt computers, to find people, may not be achieved within 28 days". Shadow Home Secretary David Davis and others were quick to respond that 28 days was the longest period in the western world of detention without trial.

The changes since 2001 have been instructive in both countries. We can either give in to the politics of fear and convince ourselves that these frightening new measures are acceptable for the UK, or we can look at the example of Pakistan, reflect on the last 6 years of legislation and ask ourselves what sort of country do we want to be living in 6 years from now?

Maryam Syed – 7 Bedford Row, London©

Paul Snowden – Amnesty International UK©

Human Rights in Bangladesh

By Syed Ahmed

Having been the most corrupt country in the world, Bangladesh has built itself a reputation for defiance of international human rights norms and even legislation enacted by its own government. Those most affected by this state of affairs are the poor and impoverished due to their inability to challenge this injustice. Most victims of human rights violations are unable to seek redress owing to unequal power relations in society, illiteracy, lack of awareness, and highly expensive, ineffective and complex legal procedures. The government's attempt to provide wider access to justice by a national legal aid system has been failing expectations and non-government organisations have taken it upon themselves to step in and fill the grave lacunae.

The relatively recent intervention by independent legal aid associations has provided an invaluable service to the poverty-stricken and thus most vulnerable in society. There are many such organisations that seek to provide legal assistance, the largest of which is Bangladesh Legal Aid and Services Trust (BLAST). The idea of BLAST was mooted through a national conference of lawyers held in 1992 under the auspices of the Bangladesh Bar Council, which recognised the need for establishing a free legal aid organisation. As a follow up to this idea BLAST was established as a not-for-profit Trust, with a board of trustees comprising eminent jurists, lawyers and former judges of the Bangladesh Supreme Court. The organisation was incorporated in May 1993. BLAST employs approximately eleven hundred lawyers to facilitate the demand for legal aid. BLAST's objectives include striving to reduce inequality by increasing access to justice for the poor and the disadvantaged, and instituting public interest litigation for the protection of the constitutional and legal rights of the powerless. The organisation pursues legislative advocacy and policy reform and lobbies for enactment of equitable laws and policies for the benefit of all. BLAST also collaborates with other organisations to strengthen the effectiveness and impact of delivery of legal aid and services to the poor.

Within the legal map of Bangladesh, certain areas have been identified as being those in which human

rights are violated, the rule of law is undermined and where there is a profound and continuing abuse of power by the authorities. One such controversial area is that of unlawful arrests and unlawful detentions. In this area due process is not being observed and police arrest and detain in order to acquire bribes for the release of innocent victims. The offence of rape is also widely used to harass enemies and the legal process is abused, facilitated by inadequacies in the legal system. Similarly there have been scenarios where heinous crimes are committed but the perpetrators evade punishment by bribing those who are responsible to uphold justice. Another cause of concern is a misunderstanding and misapplication of the law by lawyers and judges and this has caused frustration with regards to the juvenile justice system.

BLAST works in all these areas and is highly effective in all its outputs. There are three possible ways in which BLAST responds to a legal issue brought to its attention. First, BLAST usually attempts to resolve the issue by means of mediation where both parties settle their dispute on a mutually agreed settlement. Another method is litigation where BLAST's lawyers assess the merits of the case and make a legal challenge in the relevant court. The third method is the process of public interest litigation (PIL), which is one of the most effective ways to achieve wider social justice. This process challenges legislation that is unfair, discriminatory, a breach of the rule of law or just generally not in the best interest of society. BLAST also hold regular training sessions to create awareness amongst the working class, many of whom have received very little education, if any at all.



Educating Farm Workers, Naryanganj, Bangladesh.

Since its inception, BLAST has dealt with approximately one hundred and fifty thousand mediation cases, seventy eight thousand litigation cases and sixty thousand PIL cases. One of the most significant litigation cases was the case of Shukur Ali, where a fourteen year old boy was given the death penalty on conviction for crimes of rape and murder of a child. This was a strange decision, as, according to the Children Act 1974, children cannot be given the death penalty. The case is now pending at the Court of Appeal.

In the Public Interest Litigation sector most cases are of paramount importance due to their impact on society and everyday life. One of the most noteworthy cases, the case of Rubel, regards arbitrary arrests and death in the custody of police. Prior to the judgement of this case, the police were able to arrest anybody claiming that they were 'concerned' in a cognisable offence. Subsequently, the judgement recommended certain amendments of the legislation that permitted such arbitrary arrests. Although it has not been enacted yet, it is being followed very closely and likely to become law

soon. BLAST has developed strong relationships with other NGOs, who refer cases whenever a legal issue is raised. Courts even refer cases wherever a worthy client does not benefit from legal representation. BLAST has, over the years, built a strong and reputable profile that is revered and trusted by many, making it a household name when legal aid is required.

Despite such relative success in the provisions of access to justice for the poor, there is still a need to continue this work and implement the rule of law, which seems not only to be undermined but even absent in some areas. Some issues causing great concern include that of dowries, which are illegal but nevertheless widely practised. There have been numerous cases where the failure to fulfil the demand for dowry has led to acid attacks and even murders disguised as suicides. Similarly, issues concerning land law, labour law, child marriage, polygamy, allegations of marriage (for purposes of blackmail), child abuse, and human trafficking need to be addressed with a reinforced vigour.

The Right not to Fight

Progress in standards, challenges in practice by Laurel Townhead

There are refusers in every continent who face prosecution, persecution and discrimination because of their refusal to bear arms.

Conscientious objection in law

The right not to fight is most commonly understood as a right to conscientious objection to military service. It is a hard-won right and one for which the work continues. In the absence of explicit international legal provisions, it has its foundation in the right to freedom of religion and belief (contained in Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Article 18 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights). The right has developed in soft law through the resolutions of the UN Commission on Human Rights.

A right not to fight will only be invoked where there is a requirement to fight: conscription and compulsory military service are obvious examples of such a situation. It is important to understand the obligation on professional soldiers in this way as well. A contract with the military, although entered into voluntarily, binds the employee in ways that no other contract would. In this context, a dereliction of duty or a refusal to obey superior orders is raised to an offence carrying a custodial sentence. Substantial progress was made in the Commission on Human Rights resolutions when the language limiting the right to those faced with compulsory military service was dropped. This small semantic step provided much-needed recognition that conscientious objection can arise

at any point during a volunteer soldier's life.

Conscientious objection in practice: Snapshot of violations worldwide

Europe: Turkey

In Turkey objectors are repeatedly charged with the same offences arising from their objection. Even if objectors are not immediately re-tried and re-imprisoned they face the threat of imprisonment for the rest of their lives. The European Court of Human Rights has labelled this 'civil death' because the threat of further prosecution means that objectors cannot get married, own property or be registered as the fathers of their children.

Latin America: Colombia

On completion of military service conscripts are given a military card. This document is essential for many activities such as graduating from university or getting a job. Young men who, like objectors, are unable to produce a military card are at risk of being rounded up and enrolled in the army.

Africa: Eritrea

Eritrea is one of only two countries to enforce compulsory military service for both men and women. Forced recruitment takes place daily and the relatives of those who refuse and abscond are imprisoned.

Asia: Republic of Korea

Conscientious objectors are regularly imprisoned. The sentence does not cancel out the duty: objectors can be called up again and

be imprisoned repeatedly or ordered to pay multiple fines. Incitement to conscientious objection is explicitly a crime under the Criminal Code.

Recent developments in international standards

In 2006, the European Court of Human Rights sidestepped the issue of whether violations of the right of conscientious objection are justiciable under article 9 of the European Convention on Human Rights. The Court, however, did find that Turkey's repeated prosecutions of objectors constituted cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment within the purview of article 3 of the ECHR.

Further progress came earlier this year with the decision of the United Nations Human Rights Committee in a case brought by two objectors from the Republic of Korea. The Committee found that by failing to provide a system that could accommodate their objection to compulsory military service the State had violated the objectors' right to freely manifest their religion, as enshrined in the IC-CPR. The Committee noted that "while the right to manifest one's religion or belief does not as such imply the right to refuse all obligations imposed by law, it provides certain protection, consistent with article 18, paragraph 3, against being forced to act against genuinely-held religious belief."

What next?

In addition to the obvious need to ensure that the existing standards are implemented, there are several avenues toward the further development of the international legal framework protecting those who refuse to fight.

The current case law of the regional human rights courts is disappointing. Now may be a good time

for new litigation in these fora – the views of the Human Rights Committee may enable them to take bolder and better decisions. Similarly, cases already lodged with the Human Rights Committee will give the Committee the chance to elaborate their interpretation of the right as protected in the Covenant.

The UK Context

The issues most likely to arise in the UK context are protection for objectors in the form of refugee status and ensuring a right to selective objection. On the former, the House of Lords held in 2003 that there was no internationally protected right of conscientious objection but did so, in the words of Lord Bingham, “with a measure of reluctance since [the view that there was a protected right] may well reflect the international consensus of tomorrow.” Perhaps the decision of the Human Rights Committee has tipped the balance and the Lords’ tomorrow has now arrived.

On the second point, military regulations in the UK currently provide for conscientious objectors to be released from the contracts, regardless of their having voluntarily entered them. Formal provisions are, however, not in place for those individuals who conscientiously object not to participation in all wars but to participation in particular wars – so called ‘selective objectors’. Some selective objectors have been in prison in the UK in the last year and it is in respect of these individuals that greater protection of the right to conscientious objection in the UK is needed.

Further information

The Quaker United Nations Office,
www.quno.org
War Resisters International,
www.wri-irg.org

SIHRG Events: Speaker Meeting Report

By *Trudy Morgan*

This year, SIHRG welcomed speakers from across the field of international human rights to share their experiences and insights at its monthly speaker meetings. With subjects ranging from South America to the Indian Ocean, the International Criminal Court to socio-economic rights, the meetings encompassed a wide range of issues facing human rights legal practitioners and NGOs alike.

At the most recent meeting in September, **Professor Bill Bowring** spoke of his experiences defending human rights in Russia. As a founder of the European Human Rights Advocacy Centre, Professor Bowring's work has helped bring six cases in front of the European Court of Human Rights.

Paul Garlick QC has also had experience of human rights issues in former Soviet Republics. As a Trial Monitor with the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), Paul observed court proceedings and assessed their compliance with national and international fair trial standards. Paul spoke of his experience in Uzbekistan, and how this challenging yet valuable work makes a vital contribution to promoting the right to a fair trial worldwide.

Carla Ferstman spoke about the new opportunities and challenges created by the International Criminal Court. Carla is director of REDRESS, an NGO that works with victims of torture to help rebuild their lives. REDRESS is actively involved with the ICC,

particularly in terms of victim support. Carla named the ICC 'one of the most significant developments' in the struggle of human rights violation victims to achieve justice.

Speaking the following month, **Abdelsalam Hassan** took up this theme in relation to Sudan. Abdelsalam currently works with REDRESS fighting impunity and torture in that country. In the wake of Sudan's rejection of the ICC submission naming war crimes suspects (among them a government minister), Abdelsalam spoke of his hope for bringing those responsible for the atrocities to justice.

Responding to heightened international concern over Robert Mugabe's regime, SIHRG joined forces with the Bar Human Rights Council to host a special event in April highlighting the plight of lawyers and the justice system in Zimbabwe's current political climate. **Arnold Tsunga**, the Director for Zimbabwe Lawyers for Human Rights, and **Gugulethu Moyo**, previously a lawyer for the Associated Newspapers of Zimbabwe, gave insight into the Zimbabwean legal system and their campaigning work. The event raised support and funds for a project to help protect lawyers in Zimbabwe.

Protecting lawyers was also the aim of SIHRG's project in Colombia. **Morgane Landel** discussed her experiences as the inaugural volunteer for the project, set up by SIHRG and Justice for Colombia to provide protection, show solidarity and bear witness to the true situation in Colombia.

Morgane was joined by **Eberto Diaz Montes**, leader of the Agrarian Union, who discussed the struggle of trade unions like his for fundamental rights. The unions' concept of democracy, Eberto explained, means having somewhere to live, food, health and education. When you have dignity, then you have democracy. This is what the trade unions are struggling to achieve in Colombia, against violent opposition.

A wider definition of fundamental rights could be the next stage for the human rights movement - and the concept of 'dignity' would be at its heart, according to **Professor Geraldine Van Bueren**, Professor of International Human Rights Law at Queen Mary's. At June's meeting, Professor Van Bueren discussed the development of social and economic rights and the possibilities for future incorporation.

Widowhood in conflict and post-conflict zones is a human rights issue that is often overlooked or underestimated. **Margaret Owen**, of Widows for Peace through Democracy, spoke in July of the social death widows can suffer and the sheer number of women who are at risk of suffering isolation, derogatory treatment, poverty and worse: in Iraq, at least 35 % of all adult women are widows or their husbands are missing.

Other speakers addressed international human rights issues from a UK perspective. With legislation encroaching on civil liberties in response to the threat of terrorism, how do rights in the UK compare to international standards? This was the question **Gareth Peirce**, the renowned criminal defence solicitor, addressed in January. Gareth described how through her work

she has witnessed repeated human rights infringements and the distortion of due legal process by the UK government since 2001, undermining fundamental principles of criminal law. There is the greatest need for lawyers to make their voices heard, to capture public attention and make people care.

Richard Gifford also spoke of his legal battle with the UK Government, as solicitor for Chagos Islanders Group Litigation - evicted from this British Indian Ocean Territory island in 1973. ECHR rights have become crucial to this case, as Richard explained last November: if direct effective control of the UK government since 1965 can be established, the Chagos Islanders would fall within the UK's obligations.

Sharmi Chakrabarti, director of Liberty, challenged the UK's fulfilment of other international obligations at last October's speaker meeting - this time, the UK's commitments under the UN Geneva Convention on Refugees. From the compassionate post World War Two spirit in which the UN Convention was signed, we have arrived at a situation where asylum is 'the new dirty word'; where, instead of helping refugees, we go out of our way to prevent them entering. Like Gareth Peirce, Sharmi stressed the importance of lawyers adding their voice to the public concern over UK complicity in human rights abuse.

SIHRG speaker meetings are open to members and non-members alike. Entrance is free though donations are welcome. All our upcoming events are posted on the website, www.sihrg.org

SIHRG UPCOMING EVENTS

SIHRG and Diversity Arts Forum

'The Art and Law of Human Rights'
21 November

Phil Shiner

Public Interest Lawyers
& SIHRG Patron

Talk at 7.15pm

Artists

Gonkar Gyatso
Rosanne Raymond
Maria KheirKhah
Zory Farnghis-Sharokhi

**Private view from
6.45pm**

St Ethelburga's Centre for Peace & Reconciliation

78, Bishopsgate, London
EC2N 4AG
Tube: Liverpool Street /
Bank



**For guest list,
please email
events@sihrg.org**