



**Economic and Social
Council**

Distr.
GENERAL

E/CN.4/2003/24
30 January 2003

ENGLISH
Original: ENGLISH/FRENCH

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS
Fifty-ninth session
Item 6 of the provisional agenda

**RACISM, RACIAL DISCRIMINATION, XENOPHOBIA
AND ALL FORMS OF DISCRIMINATION**

**Report by Mr. Doudou Diène, Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of
racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, submitted
pursuant to Commission on Human Rights resolution 202/68***

* Issued in all official languages. Annex in English only.

GE.03-10668 (E) 120303 140303

Summary

This report contains information on the activities carried out by the Special Rapporteur since his appointment on 26 July 2002. During this period the Special Rapporteur established contacts with Governments, several regional political groups (the Group of African States, the Group of Arab States and the Group of 77), intergovernmental organizations (the European Union, the Organization of American States and the Organization of the Islamic Conference) and non-governmental organizations with a view to starting a process of consensus-building in activities to combat racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance.

The report describes serious allegations of racial discrimination and xenophobia, with particular reference to Côte d'Ivoire and Guyana. It also draws attention to racial discrimination against Roma/Sinti/travellers, to the measures taken at the European level to counter such discrimination, and to manifestations of anti-Semitism.

In 2002 the Special Rapporteur examined allegations of racial discrimination and xenophobia in Germany, Spain, the Russian Federation, Greece, Guyana and the United Kingdom. These allegations and the replies thereto from the authorities of the countries concerned are included, together with the Special Rapporteur's comments, in the annex to this report.

In the conclusion, the Special Rapporteur stresses that his initial contacts with representatives of Governments and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations have testified to the urgent need to implement the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action in order to counter the alarming resurgence of expression of conventional racism and the emergence of insidious new forms of discrimination and racism. The Special Rapporteur also stresses in this context the particularly alarming recurrence of situations, which, owing to the deliberate mixing or blending of race, religion and culture, require urgent in-depth responses. The Special Rapporteur therefore proposes, in the light of the final document of the Durban Conference (A/CONF.189/12), a dual strategy, which will be both legal and political (by ratifying and implementing all relevant international instruments and agreements) and intellectual and ethical (through better knowledge and understanding of how deeply rooted are the processes and mechanisms of the culture and mindset of discrimination). It is a question of establishing a close link, through reflection and action, between efforts to combat racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and intolerance and the urgent promotion of dialogue between cultures, civilizations and religions. To that end, the following recommendations are proposed to the Commission:

To promote complementarity and cooperation between all mechanisms for combating racism, discrimination, xenophobia and intolerance, particularly those relating to the implementation of the final document of the Durban Conference, between the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and the Special Rapporteur, and between the Special Rapporteurs;

To give greater attention to discriminatory situations and practices against non-citizens, migrants and refugees;

To consider at greater length in its deliberations the deep intellectual and ethical roots of the culture and mindset of racism and discrimination;

To give a predominant role to dialogue between civilizations, cultures and religions, as a maieutic strategy for surmounting all forms of discrimination, exclusion and intolerance;

To promote all aspects of education (instruction, in particular in history, ethics, human rights as a universal code of ethics, cultures and the values common to all religions and spiritual traditions) as well as information and intercultural communication;

To promote the creative value of pluralism, understood as the recognition, acceptance, and promotion of and respect for diversity. In this context, to promote the concept of identity - an ambivalent notion which may be the legitimate affirmation of a specificity but also the negation of the other.

CONTENTS

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
Introduction	1 - 3	6
I. ACTIVITIES OF THE SPECIAL RAPPORTEUR	4 - 27	6
A. Consultations with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights	4 - 5	6
B. Participation in the seminar of experts for the African region on the implementation of the Durban Programme of Action	6 - 7	7
C. Participation in the work of the General Assembly at its fifty-seventh session	8 - 20	7
D. Participation in the African and African Descendants World Conference against Racism	21 - 23	11
E. Participation in Brazil's black awareness week	24	12
F. Participation in the first session of the Working Group of experts on people of African descent	25 - 27	12
II. CONTEMPORARY EXPRESSIONS OF RACISM, RACIAL DISCRIMINATION, XENOPHOBIA AND RELATED INTOLERANCE	28 - 38	13
A. Racism, racial discrimination and xenophobia in politics	28 - 32	13
1. Situation in Côte d'Ivoire	28 - 30	13
2. Situation in Guyana	31 - 32	14
B. Racial discrimination against the Roma/Gypsies/Sinti/Travellers	33 - 37	14
C. Anti-Semitism	38	15

CONTENTS (*continued*)

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
III. ALLEGATIONS EXAMINED BY THE SPECIAL RAPPORTEUR	39	16
IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	40	16

Annex

Replies to allegations communicated to Governments by the Special Rapporteur		18
A. Germany		18
B. Spain		22
C. Russian Federation		30
D. Greece		35
E. Guyana		39
F. United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland		40

Introduction

1. The mandate of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance was confirmed by the Economic and Social Council on 26 July 2002.
2. This report is submitted in accordance with section IV of resolution 2002/68 adopted by the Commission on Human Rights at its fifty-eighth session.
3. In the report the Special Rapporteur outlines the activities which he has undertaken since his appointment (chap. I); the principal manifestations of racism and racial discrimination which have come to his attention (chap. II); and the allegations of racial discrimination communicated to Governments (chap. III). The Special Rapporteur's conclusions and recommendations are set forth in chapter IV, while the allegations examined by the Special Rapporteur and the responses received from Governments thereto are contained in the annex to this report.

I. ACTIVITIES OF THE SPECIAL RAPPORTEUR

A. Consultations with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

4. From 7 to 9 August 2002 the Special Rapporteur visited the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) at Geneva in order to familiarize himself with the activities of the various programmes and mechanisms for the protection of human rights. He made use of the meetings he had with the Special Rapporteur on adequate housing, and the officials responsible for backstopping the special procedures on migrants, human rights defenders and freedom of opinion and expression, to identify the fields of action in which coordination with his functions might be required. He also had meetings of a similar nature with the officials responsible for providing support to the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and the programmes relating to indigenous populations.
5. On the basis of these consultations the Special Rapporteur formed the conviction that action to combat racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance underpins the majority, if not all, of the programmes and mechanisms for which OHCHR has responsibility. Work is being done by OHCHR to ensure that the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action are translated into a variety of practical measures, whether in regional strategies, the work of treaty-monitoring bodies - such as the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, which has already adopted general recommendations in this regard - or the special procedures. The Special Rapporteur therefore proposes to contribute to this consensus-based process through improved coordination and cooperation with the Committee, teamwork, complementarity with the other Special Rapporteurs, and dialogue with the Office of the High Commissioner, particularly the Anti-Discrimination Unit, and through the various mechanisms involved in the follow-up to the Durban Conference.

B. Participation in the seminar of experts for the African region on the implementation of the Durban Programme of Action

6. At the invitation of the Office of the High Commissioner, the Special Rapporteur participated in the seminar of experts for the African region held at Nairobi from 16 to 18 September on follow-up to the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance. The Special Rapporteur's contribution to the seminar focused on the measures that could be taken to combat discrimination against non-citizens, including migrants and refugees. With a view to combating the exclusion to which non-citizens often fall victim at the hands of the population of the host country, the Special Rapporteur proposed, in particular, that the competent authorities in each country should encourage fraternization between citizens and non-citizens and promote interaction between cultures, civilizations and spiritual traditions. This could be achieved, inter alia, through education, information, recognition of pluralism and the promotion of intercultural dialogue. In the final analysis, it was a question of expressing in the national context the value of unity in diversity and of recognizing specificities while promoting the common values that transcend them, in keeping with the theme of the seminar: "Implementation of the Durban Programme of Action: an exchange of ideas on how to move forward".

7. It emerged from the seminar that African States accord priority importance to the implementation of paragraphs 157 and 158 of the Durban Programme of Action (A/CONF.189/12), which are viewed as holding the key to breaking the centuries-old cycle of oppression, exploitation, injustice and poverty and to paving the way for good governance. The Commission should give urgent attention to this essential point of the recommendations emanating from the Nairobi seminar in order to ensure effective follow-up to the Durban Conference.

C. Participation in the work of the General Assembly at its fifty-seventh session

8. From 21 to 25 October 2002 the Special Rapporteur took part in the work of the General Assembly at its fifty-seventh session, making a presentation to the Third Committee on his approach to his mandate. He emphasized the fact that combating racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance required, in keeping with the spirit and the letter of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, a determination to pursue and address not only legal and political responses, but also the ideological, cultural and psychological foundations, processes and mechanisms which contributed to the perpetuation and resurgence of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance in order to find solutions that go to the root of those scourges.

9. Globalization takes the following forms: cultural homogenization arising from the logic of a global market that ignores cultural identities and national specificities and triggers, by way of a reaction, the tendency to retreat into a core identity; the predominance of the materialistic values of consumption and competition; and the erosion of cultural and spiritual values. Discrimination is nourished, grows, spreads and even becomes commonplace in this setting. It is in the cultural domain that misperceptions and negative images of others are constructed and find their justification and deepest expression. Cultural prejudice, the corollary of ethnocentrism - an essentially ideological construct aimed at justifying discrimination and domination - explicitly

or implicitly provides the principal basis for the mindset and practices of discrimination, racism, xenophobia and intolerance. The exaggeration of the factor of identity, a defensive reflex against homogenization, exacerbates the tendency to turn back in on the nation, community, group, ethnic grouping, religion and way of life, pitting “our values” against “theirs”. The most extreme, violent and intractable of today’s major new conflicts are essentially rooted in cultural antagonisms, the common feature of which is the emergence of the other, often one’s erstwhile neighbour, as a threat, an enemy, someone who is radically and irredeemably different, a “complete stranger”.

10. This ominous trend towards globalization has even been given its own theory, i.e. an intellectual construct providing it with a conceptual and historical justification and rationale. Samuel Huntington’s book The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order is a case in point.¹ In this context reality, illusions, fantasies, strategies and the manipulation of control and domination become intermingled and distort the objective perception of problems and formulation of sustainable responses to discrimination.

11. In the spirit of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, which place the question of racism and discrimination in the wider global context, it is therefore necessary to devise a new approach in which action must be informed by reflection on the underlying causes, mechanisms, processes, expressions and modalities of racism and racial discrimination. In other words, in the fight for political, social and economic democracy, legal instruments and mechanisms must be designed on the basis of an intellectual strategy that seeks to attack the cultural roots of discrimination, which ultimately mould attitudes and behaviour. The Special Rapporteur therefore believes that at the heart of discriminatory cultures and practices stand two particularly sensitive concepts which foster and shape the majority of today’s cultural conflicts: the manipulation of diversity and exaggerated concern with identity.

12. According to the dominant way of thinking, the concept of diversity appears, increasingly, as the response to the risks of cultural homogenization posed by globalization and to exaggerated concern with cultural, religious, ethnic and community-based identity. The concept has ideological and historical connotations and is influenced, to an excessive degree, by context and political, philosophical and ideological factors. Diversity itself is not a value, in the ethical sense of the term. From a philosophical perspective, the notion of diversity had powerful connotations in the philosophical and scientific discourse of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Scientific and philosophical treatises on the diversity of species and races produced theories about natural hierarchies. They served not only as an ideological and philosophical prop for the formulation of theories based on racial, ethnic, social and religious discrimination, but also as an intellectual framework to justify practices of exploitation and domination such as the slave trade or colonialism, which are specifically mentioned in the final document of the Durban Conference. It is precisely this manipulation of diversity which lies at the heart of ethnocentrism. All manifestations of ethnocentrism have been constructed, historically, ideologically and culturally, around the concept of diversity interpreted as radical difference, inequality, and discrimination against the other. It would therefore be useful to revisit the concept of identity in the framework of a new intellectual and ethical strategy against racism and discrimination.

13. The Special Rapporteur has pointed out that the entire history of the relations between peoples reveals the decisive nature of the misunderstanding about identity. Identity is an ambivalent concept, which can be both an affirmation of the self and negation of the other. In the light of the lessons learned from history, and particularly the movement/convergence/interaction dialectic between peoples which has shaped all civilizations and cultures, the Special Rapporteur has suggested, with a view to ensuring that identity is not an obstacle to but a factor that enables dialogue, that a new understanding of (ethnic, cultural or spiritual) identity should be promoted, whereby it is no longer viewed as a ghetto or place of confinement, but is understood, accepted and put into practice as a process, a coming together, a dynamic synthesis. In a context of retreat into core identity, where, as illustrated by most contemporary conflicts, yesterday's neighbour is today's enemy, and where old and new forms of racism, discrimination and xenophobia are emerging, it is necessary to make it manifestly clear that identity is interconnectedness, nexus, movement. Identity is the result of that mysterious alchemy by which a people with its own genius, through the dialectic of give and take and through complex and often random processes, receives, transforms and assimilates influences that come from elsewhere.

14. In the final analysis, it is a question of promoting the idea that identity can be the basis of a code of ethics, of the rediscovery of the proximity of the other, and, thus, of dialogue.

15. In this spirit, a sustainable strategy for the eradication of a discriminatory culture and ideology could take its inspiration from the fundamental lesson of biodiversity, which teaches us that the existence and interaction of different species is a source and condition of life and that the demise of any species is fatal for the ecosystem as a whole. To extrapolate this lesson from biodiversity to harmonious coexistence among peoples we must construct a new social vision based on the dialectic of unity and diversity as well as the understanding and promotion of the value of cross-fertilization between cultures, peoples, ethnic identities and religions as vital ingredients for the vitality, even the survival, of society as a whole. In this way, the dialogue between cultures and civilizations would be the expression of a kind of "bioculture".

16. The elimination of discrimination implies the need to transform diversity, a concept with historical and ideological connotations, into a value which, while losing nothing of its multifacetedness, combines unity and diversity in a dialectic process. The value in question is pluralism.

17. Ethnic, cultural, social and spiritual pluralism constitutes a fundamental value in combating all forms of discrimination, particularly in the context of globalization. Pluralism could be defined as the recognition, protection and promotion of and respect for diversity. In its deepest sense, pluralism expresses the recognition and protection of ethnic, cultural and spiritual specificities as well as the acceptance of values, in a given society, that transcend those specificities. It is in this sense that pluralism represents the operating value of the unity/diversity dialectic, which is the most solid basis for achieving balance and harmony in any multicultural society. The promotion of pluralism could therefore be the key value around which to construct a strategy for the elimination of all forms of discrimination. A global strategy implies that pluralism, which the Special Rapporteur suggests should be defined as the recognition,

promotion and protection of and respect for diversity, is translated into concrete measures, worked out democratically in the spheres of law, education, information and communication and transposed into the social arena where discrimination occurs (employment, housing and health).

18. In this new strategy, the intellectual means of combating racism, xenophobia and discrimination could be structured around history, education and trade:

History is the theatre, the enclosure where cultures, civilizations and peoples have constructed their own identity and their relations with others. This is the terrain which engenders all misunderstandings and antagonisms, friendships and enmities, and where attention should be concentrated in the context of the dialogue between cultures and civilizations. It is the sphere of memory, the long memory of history, that makes it possible to go back to the true source of the processes, mechanisms and expressions of dialogue or conflict. This means an urgent review by individual peoples and by all peoples together of the writings, content and teachings of history, as a fundamental factor for dialogue;

In the long term, teaching and education are the true roads to transforming minds and the means of building knowledge, know-how and values. It is here too that the image and perception of the other are transmitted and here that they take root. Here then must the ethics of pluralism and dialogue be etched deeply. Intercultural education is a process of catharsis which forces peoples and cultures to look critically at themselves, to call their certainties into question and spring open the barriers that shut them in. Communication, by means of which the image of self and of the other is formed and transmitted, must also be intercultural so as to be able to express in concrete terms the need for exchange and dialogue within the meaning of Sean McBride's beautiful formula, "Many voices, one world";

Trade also constitutes a primary means of dialogue; at all times and on all continents it has been a vector of encounters, dissemination and cultural, artistic and spiritual interaction. Going beyond the seductive but erroneous theories of antagonism between culture and commerce, the value of dialogue must be stamped on the exchange which is at the heart of trade. It is in this context that the insidious emergence of a new language of discrimination must urgently be revealed, with its explicit or implicit theories explaining underdevelopment by the existence and importance in the societies concerned of archaic and backward values and mindsets which are contrary to "modernity";

Growth and development should therefore no longer be consistent with some market logic or model, but should express the multifaceted forms of living and being. In the final analysis, the issue of dialogue between cultures and civilizations should be an essential factor in negotiation on world trade and the economy. Cultural ethics would therefore have the capacity to assuage the negative aspects of market forces;

In the context of this strategy, particular attention will be given to the productive areas of encounters and interactions, such as tourism, immigration and sport, which may nurture or block racism, discrimination and xenophobia and encourage dialogue between cultures.

19. The Special Rapporteur therefore proposes the following as his priorities:

Full and vigilant implementation of the final document of the Durban Conference, the Declaration and Programme of Action. This will serve as a reference and guide for the choice of the regions and countries to be the object of surveys and studies for his annual report to the Commission and the General Assembly;

The link between combating racism, discrimination and xenophobia and promoting dialogue between civilizations, cultures and religions;

An in-depth survey of the recurring and alarming question of racism in sport, in close cooperation with the competent bodies, including the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and the International Federation of Association Football (FIFA);

Priority missions to countries in regions where the serious nature of discriminatory situations and practices requires urgent action;

The report on the situation of Muslim and Arab peoples in various parts of the world in the aftermath of the events of 11 September 2001, submitted pursuant to Commission on Human Rights resolution 2002/9 (E/CN.4/2003/23).

20. In parallel with the session of the General Assembly, the Special Rapporteur held consultations with representatives of States and of intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations. In Washington, he talked to members of the Organization of American States with a view to better cooperation with this body on follow-up to the Durban Conference, particularly with regard to the proposed drafting of an inter-American convention against racism - of particular significance in a region in which deep and complex multicultural processes are unfolding. In his contacts with human rights organizations, the Rapporteur conducted a broad-based exchange of views, information and suggestions for the implementation of his mandate and follow-up to the Durban Conference, with particularly efficient support from the International Human Rights Law Group.

D. Participation in the African and African Descendants World Conference against Racism

21. On 2 September 2002, the Special Rapporteur received an invitation from the Central Organizing Committee of the African and African Descendants World Conference against Racism Secretariat, to participate in the follow-up conference to the World Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance, to be held from 2 to 6 October 2002 in Bridgetown. As stated by the organizers, the purpose of the African and African Descendants World Conference against Racism was to develop strategies for the implementation of the Durban Plan of Action, to exchange information about effective programmes and projects and to form a global non-governmental pan-African organization by which the African diaspora could continue to work together.

22. At the opening of the Conference, the Special Rapporteur was appalled to observe that a motion presented by an NGO group requested the exclusion of participants, duly invited and registered, on the basis of explicit racial criteria. At the plenary, the Special Rapporteur was the first to express his profound opposition to the motion which, in his view, was contrary to the fundamental United Nations principle of non-discrimination on the basis of race, nationality or ethnic origin, therefore defeating the very purpose and spirit of the World Conference against Racism, which this event intended to follow up on. The Special Rapporteur formally indicated his decision to leave the Conference were it to be endorsed. Participants in the Conference were called to vote on the motion, which resulted in the endorsement of the proposal and the expulsion of participants from the plenary, including interpreters, journalists and NGO delegates. Mixed-race national delegations were hence divided on racial lines.

23. As a consequence, on 3 October 2002, the Government of Barbados which on the basis of its very active role at the Durban Conference, confirmed by facilities for the organization of the Conference, and its policy of building a multiracial society, issued a press statement in which it strongly condemned the decision adopted at the Conference. The United Nations Resident Coordinator in Barbados and the Special Rapporteur withdrew both their participation and their previously expressed endorsement of the Conference, through an official note sent to the Chairperson of the Central Organizing Committee of the Conference on 4 October 2002.

E. Participation in Brazil's black awareness week

24. On 21 November 2002, at the invitation of the Brazilian Government, the Special Rapporteur took part in the inauguration of the National Centre for Information and Reference on Afro-Brazilian Culture in Brasilia, with President Fernando Enrique Cardoso and the President of the World Bank, Mr. John Wolfensohn, who was visiting Brazil. The Special Rapporteur considers that this invitation was a remarkable symbolic message on the part of a country determined to face up to and find radical and sustainable solutions to a historical heritage marked by racial discrimination, the founding principle of the slave system. The representatives of the Afro-Brazilian community, and of the Palmares Foundation in particular, whom the Special Rapporteur also met, confirmed this assessment. Brazil has launched a vast programme of affirmative action or corrective measures on behalf of its population of African origin, essentially in the areas of education and access to public posts, in particular diplomatic careers. Several laws and decrees recently adopted at the federal level (including Act No. 10,558 of 13 November 2002 and Ministry of Culture Decree No. 484 of 22 August 2002) establish a quota of 20 per cent of places for Afro-Brazilians in universities and public posts. The Government's intention is also to make an impact on public sector companies by granting preferential contracts to companies which make efforts to implement this policy of corrective measures. Much remains to be done and the Special Rapporteur proposes to follow these efforts closely and to encourage their continuation.

F. Participation in the first session of the Working Group of experts on people of African descent

25. The Special Rapporteur was invited to take part from 25 to 29 November 2002, in the first session of the Working Group of experts on people of African descent. In particular he explained the important and complex question of redress for populations of African descent to

the Working Group. He made the point that the principle of reparations should not be excluded in the light of numerous precedents, particularly the agreed reparations by pro-slavers following the abolition of slavery, the financial sanctions France imposed on Haiti for many years and the reparations granted to the Jewish people after the Second World War. He considered, however, that priority should be given to moral redress. The Durban Conference had taken a first step by recognizing that slavery and the slave trade were crimes against humanity. A second form of redress is historical and consists in the opening up and accessing of archives in order universally to assess, publicize and teach the entire history of the basic causes and the material and human conditions of what the French historian, Jean-Michel Deveau, has called “the greatest tragedy in human history, in terms of scale and duration”. It will then be possible to demonstrate the direct link between slavery and the underdevelopment of Africa, the Caribbean and South America (owing to its demographic impact on several million persons and four centuries of total and radical destabilization of the production system of the African continent) and to relate this major fact to negotiations on development, and particularly the debt issue. Lastly, the third form of reparation must be that of memory, through the identification, restoration and promotion of all locations carrying memories of slavery and the slave trade (forts, castles, ships, cemeteries, slave markets) and of their intangible legacy (cultural systems constructed by individuals reduced to slavery in order to resist and survive).

26. This triple approach should make it possible to ascertain the responsibilities of all those who planned, encouraged and profited from the slavery system, in Europe and the Americas and the Caribbean, as well as the role of the feudal systems which aided and abetted them in Africa.

27. The Special Rapporteur also took a stand on the definition of persons of African descent and considered that it should include all members of the African diaspora, in the Americas, Europe and Asia.

II. CONTEMPORARY EXPRESSIONS OF RACISM, RACIAL DISCRIMINATION, XENOPHOBIA AND RELATED INTOLERANCE

A. Racism, racial discrimination and xenophobia in politics

1. Situation in Côte d’Ivoire

28. Since 19 October 2002 Côte d’Ivoire has been faced with a complex conflict, which, according to allegations the Special Rapporteur has received, has been accentuated by the exacerbation of inter-ethnic tensions and demonstrations of xenophobia.

29. Some sectors of the population have allegedly been engaged in incitement to ethnic hatred, acts of violence against the populations of the North and xenophobia vis-à-vis foreigners. On 24 October 2002 the Special Rapporteur, along with the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right of freedom of opinion and expression, issued a press release on the situation in Côte d’Ivoire and called for renewed vigilance by the country’s authorities against the risks of ethnic conflict and for the necessary measures to be taken urgently in order to put an end to activities arising from ideas or theories based on the superiority of one group of persons of a certain colour or ethnic origin. Since then human rights organizations in Africa (e.g. the

African Assembly for the Defence of Human Rights) and elsewhere (e.g. Human Rights Watch) have investigated and found evidence of massacres and assassinations which, in view of their number and the ethnic or community origin of the victims, require the urgent intervention of the international community.

30. On 2 December 2002 the Special Rapporteur wrote to the authorities in Côte d'Ivoire to request a visit in situ in order to determine under his mandate what the true situation is as regards discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance and to report to the international community.

2. Situation in Guyana

31. The Special Rapporteur has received information from various sources about the deterioration of the political situation in Guyana following the presidential and parliamentary elections held in March 2001. The People's Progressive Party/Civic (PPP/C) won those elections and its leader, Mr. Bharrat Jagdeo, was elected as President of Guyana for a third five-year term. Social unrest and occasional violence marred the post-election period, with the main opposition party, People's National Congress/Reform (PNC/R), led by Mr. Desmond Hoyte, alleging that the election procedures violated the Constitution. In fact, since its independence the political climate of Guyana has been characterized by the legacy from slavery and colonization of tensions between the two major ethnic groups of the country, the Indo-Guyanese population (approximately 49 per cent) and the Afro-Guyanese population (approximately 35 per cent) of the 700,000 inhabitants. The two political parties are heavily divided along ethnic lines, with the PPP/C supported mainly by Indo-Guyanese and the PNC/R supported mainly by Afro-Guyanese.

32. The present situation in Guyana originates in the country's colonial past. It seems that the various communities which peopled Guyana following the forced transfer of African and Indian labour under the British Empire have not been able to surmount their rivalry for the control of power and the equitable management of the country's resources in a peaceful manner. The Special Rapporteur is seriously concerned about the risks of the aggravation of inter-ethnic conflict in Guyana and has informed the authorities of his fears and of his wish to undertake a visit to the country. He has also sent a communication to the Government of Guyana setting out the allegations he has received.

B. Racial discrimination against the Roma/Gypsies/Sinti/Travellers

33. The Roma people are the victims of racial discrimination in almost all sectors of public life, education, employment, housing, access to public places and citizenship. In a number of places of residence they are victims of police brutality and are discriminated against in judicial procedures. The stigmatization of the Roma people in a number of societies affects their ability to enjoy fundamental rights as equal citizens. The lack of tolerance for their culture and customs brings with it their marginalization within society.

34. In Europe, it is reported that Roma people are systematically denied access to restaurants, discotheques, stadia and other public places. The European Roma Rights Centre has reported that the Roma face discrimination in the judicial system and particularly that violent acts committed against them are not adequately sanctioned in a number of countries. Additionally,

many reports on the situation of the Roma indicate that they are more likely to receive harsh sentences for crimes committed, to be kept for longer periods in pre-trial detention and to have difficulty in realizing the right of access to legal counsel. Human rights groups have also found that Roma people tend to be discriminated against in educational institutions and that in regard to housing, they are often the victims of forcible evictions from their homes and suffer residential segregation.

35. On 1 October 2002, the Council of Europe produced its final report on the European Roma Forum, including recommendations of the informal Exploratory Group studying the setting up of a pan-European Roma Advisory Board. This initiative explores ways of ensuring adequate Roma participation in the decision-making processes affecting their lives, by creating a sort of consultative assembly to represent them at the pan-European level. The report discusses the size, composition and selection procedures for a European Roma Forum and the institutional links between the Forum and the Council of Europe, as well as areas of cooperation with international organizations such as the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the United Nations.

36. At the international level, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD), the Human Rights Committee and various other treaty bodies have taken up the question of discrimination against the Roma in a number of concluding observations on States parties' reports.² Furthermore, at its fifty-seventh session CERD adopted General Recommendation XXVI of 16 August 2000, specifically on the question of discrimination against Roma. In it, CERD lists a number of measures that can be adopted by States to combat discrimination against the Roma people and to guarantee their protection. Specifically, CERD proposes measures: against racial violence, to improve living conditions, in the field of the media, concerning participation in public life and requests States parties to include, in their periodic reports, data about the Roma communities within their jurisdiction.

37. The Special Rapporteur notes with appreciation that there is currently an overwhelming concern about the situation of Roma populations in many European countries that his mandate has contributed to highlight. The important developments taking place at the regional level to enhance participation of the Roma in decision-making processes and the recommendations that have been issued at the international level in regard to the protection of their rights are positive trends that the Special Rapporteur intends to support. He will, therefore, continue to monitor the situation of Roma and report to the Commission on Human Rights.

C. Anti-Semitism

38. The Special Rapporteur has received from the Government of Israel and from several Jewish NGOs allegations of the large-scale distribution in the Middle East and in Europe of the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion*. This notoriously anti-Semitic book is an early twentieth-century forgery reporting a plot by the Jews at a Zionist congress to sabotage Christianity and take over the world. The document apparently appeared for the first time in Russia in 1905 and was distributed abroad during the twentieth century, thus fostering anti-Semitism. In one Middle Eastern country, a private television channel has allegedly produced and shown the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* in a 41-episode series. The Special Rapporteur has put the matter to the authorities of the countries concerned by this anti-Semitic propaganda.

III. ALLEGATIONS EXAMINED BY THE SPECIAL RAPPORTEUR

39. In 2002 the Special Rapporteur examined allegations relating to his mandate concerning the following countries: Germany, Greece, Guyana, the Russian Federation, Spain and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Summaries of these allegations and the replies received from the Governments of the countries concerned can be found in the annex to this report, in the original language in which they were submitted.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

40. **In conclusion, the Special Rapporteur stresses that his initial contacts with representatives of Governments and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations have testified to the urgent need to implement the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action in order to counter the alarming resurgence of expressions of conventional racism and the emergence of insidious new forms of discrimination and racism. The Special Rapporteur also stresses in this context the particularly alarming recurrence of situations which, owing to the deliberate mixing or blending of race, religion and culture, require urgent in-depth responses. The Special Rapporteur therefore proposes, in the light of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, a dual strategy, which will be both legal and political (by ratifying and implementing all relevant international instruments and agreements) and intellectual and ethical (through better knowledge and understanding of how deeply rooted are the processes and mechanisms of the culture and mindset of discrimination). It is a question of establishing a close link, through reflection and action, between efforts to combat racism, discrimination, xenophobia and intolerance and the urgent promotion of dialogue between cultures, civilizations and religions. The following recommendations are proposed to the Commission:**

To promote complementarity and cooperation between all mechanisms for combating racism, discrimination, xenophobia and intolerance, particularly those relating to the implementation of the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action, between the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination and the Special Rapporteur, and between the Special Rapporteurs;

To give greater attention to discriminatory situations and practices against non-citizens, migrants and refugees;

To consider at greater length in its deliberations the deep intellectual and ethical roots of the culture and mindset of racism and discrimination;

To give a predominant role to dialogue between civilizations, cultures and religions, as a maieutic strategy for surmounting all forms of discrimination, exclusion and intolerance;

To promote all aspects of education (instruction, in particular in history, ethics, human rights as a universal code of ethics, cultures and the values common to all religions and spiritual traditions) as well as information and intercultural communication;

To promote the creative value of pluralism, understood as the recognition, acceptance, and promotion of and respect for diversity. In this context, to promote the concept of identity - an ambivalent notion which may be the legitimate affirmation of a specificity but also the negation of the other.

Notes

¹ Paris, Odile Jacob, 1997.

² See for instance Human Rights Committee: concluding observations: Czech Republic, 2001 (CCPR/CO/72/CZE); Hungary, 2002 (CCPR/CO/74/HUN); Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights: concluding observations: Croatia, 2001 (E/C.12/1/Add.73).

Annex**REPLIES TO ALLEGATIONS TRANSMITTED TO GOVERNMENTS
BY THE SPECIAL RAPPORTEUR****A. Germany****1. Joint communication of 12 September 2002, sent by the
Special Rapporteur on the question of torture and the
Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants**

1. **Denis Mwakapi**, a 33-year-old man originally from Kenya, and his white German wife, Ursula Mwakapi, were reportedly on their way to a bar in Nuremberg's city centre during a pre-Christmas celebration on 23 December 2000 at around 2 a.m., when they were approached by two American men and their two female companions, who believed that the black African was in some way harassing a white German woman. Denis Mwakapi had reportedly been talking loudly in an animated fashion but not in a manner which could have been construed as being aggressive. The two American men are said to have begun punching and hitting Denis Mwakapi before his wife could explain to them that he was her husband. After Ursula Mwakapi was able to separate the men from her husband and explain their relationship to them, the American men were said to have apologized. Denis Mwakapi reportedly accepted their apologies, even though he is said to have sustained a swollen upper lip during the assault. Three police vehicles reportedly arrived at the scene on *Luitpold Straße* very shortly after the two groups of people had begun to disperse. Two police officers are said to have approached the American men and allowed them to leave after checking their identity. They then reportedly approached Denis Mwakapi and his wife, paying little attention to Denis Mwakapi's complaint that the fight had ensued after he had been assaulted by the two American men, reportedly causing him great indignation. His wife also reportedly attempted to inform the police officers of the background to the incident. The police officers are said to have arrested Denis Mwakapi after he became agitated and refused to calm down. One of the police officers (whose name is known to the Special Rapporteurs) is alleged to have taken hold of Denis Mwakapi's right arm and forcefully twisted it behind his back in order to effect the arrest, fracturing Denis Mwakapi's lower right arm in the process. The police officers are alleged to have subsequently handcuffed Denis Mwakapi and placed him in a police vehicle in spite of the detainee's repeated requests for a doctor and cries of pain. Denis Mwakapi was then reportedly driven to *Nürnberg Mitte* police station, where Denis and Ursula Mwakapi's renewed requests that Denis Mwakapi be medically examined were allegedly refused. Police officers placed him in an overnight holding cell where he was held until his release at around 10.30 a.m. on 23 December 2000. A medical examination conducted on 23 December 2000 at Nuremberg is said to have revealed that he suffered a fractured arm which required immediate medical attention. (...) As a result of his treatment by the police, Denis Mwakapi reportedly lodged with the Public Prosecutor's office criminal complaints of physical assault and denial of assistance against the police officers. The office of the Public Prosecutor is said to have informed Denis Mwakapi's former lawyer on 4 July 2001 that it had terminated proceedings against the two police officers. A subsequent attempt by Denis Mwakapi's lawyer to have the investigation reopened also reportedly failed. The injury to Denis Mwakapi's arm has reportedly produced long-term effects on his ability to resume work. A report of a medical examination conducted by a Nuremberg doctor in February 2002

reportedly stated that the healing of the arm had been a very drawn-out process and that Denis Mwakapi continued to experience pain when exerting pressure or applying weight to it. (...) The injury has reportedly greatly affected Denis Mwakapi's ability to undertake certain types of employment.

2. **Doviodo Adekou**, a 59-year-old Togolese asylum-seeker, was allegedly ill-treated in the town of Mettmann, North Rhine-Westphalia on 1 October 2001. During the incident, he reportedly sustained a serious injury to his right eye, which resulted in his hospitalization. He was reportedly ill-treated on the morning of 1 October 2001 as police officers attempted to detain him for the purposes of placing him in pre-deportation detention. Doviodo Adekou, who had applied for refugee status in Germany, had an appointment at the Office for Foreigners in Mettmann with one of its employees in order to discuss whether his temporary right to remain in the country would be extended. In the course of the meeting, the employee reportedly informed him that he would be deported on 12 October 2001. Doviodo Adekou reportedly requested that he receive the formal decision in writing, be allowed to consult his legal adviser (*Rechtsbeistand*) and prepare for his departure. A second male police officer reportedly then entered the room and placed a handcuff around Doviodo Adekou's left hand and informed him that he was being taken into custody. The police officer reportedly attempted to handcuff Doviodo Adekou's other hand but had to call two more police officers into the room when his attempts failed. The three police officers allegedly grabbed hold of Doviodo Adekou's arms and pulled him face down onto the floor of the office. While he lay on the floor, one of the police officers is said to have deliberately punched him in the region of his right eye, causing it to bleed heavily. The police officers reportedly subsequently gave up their attempts to handcuff Doviodo Adekou. A senior official at the Office for Foreigners reportedly entered the office and instructed a colleague to call an ambulance, which took Doviodo Adekou to Wuppertal clinic where he was said to have been treated as an inpatient at the clinic for nine days until 9 October 2001. According to a report outlining the medical treatment which Doviodo Adekou underwent at the clinic, written by the eye specialist of the clinic, dated 11 October 2001, Doviodo Adekou was treated for a rupture to the covering of the eye which had caused bleeding in the vitreous humour of the eye. The doctor reportedly stated in the report: "[w]ith such an extremely complicated injury an end to the treatment is at the present time not yet foreseeable". Approximately one week before the incident, Doviodo Adekou underwent an operation on his right eye. However, since suffering the blow to his eye on 1 October 2001, he has reportedly lost all sight in his right eye. Concerns have been expressed that whilst Doviodo Adekou was taken into custody for the purposes of his subsequent deportation, one of the police officers involved in the incident may have ill-treated him, by punching him in the region of his right eye. A complaint of serious criminal assault was said to have been lodged with Mettmann's District Police Authority.

3. **Svetlana Lauer**, who is originally from the former Soviet Union, was reportedly ill-treated by several police officers at her home in Hallstadt, located outside the city of Bamberg, in the afternoon of 20 February 2002. Four police officers were said to have arrived at her apartment at around 3.30 p.m. with a verbal warrant issued by the State Prosecutor's Office to search the apartment for the purpose of securing evidence against her then 17-year-old daughter, Anastasia Lauer. Anastasia Lauer was alleged to have stolen a number of small porcelain figurines from the *REWE-Markt* department store in Hallstadt earlier in the afternoon and was arrested by the police on suspicion of shoplifting. The four police officers reportedly forced their way into her home after she had refused them entry on account of their failure to

produce a written search warrant. She is said to have actively resisted their entry by obstructing their path with her body and arms because she felt that they had no right to enter her home without written permission. While forcing their way into her apartment, the only female police officer among the four officials reportedly grabbed hold of her by the back of the neck and hit her head against an adjacent wall. A second male police officer allegedly grabbed hold of her arm and twisted it behind her back. With his other arm he was alleged to have grabbed hold of her hair and repeatedly hit her head against various doors and walls while leading her through the hallway of the apartment. The two remaining police officers were then said to have aided their colleagues in restraining her and handcuffing her arms behind her back. After Svetlana Lauer spit at the female police officer several times, a second police officer allegedly came to the female police officer's assistance and began hitting Svetlana Lauer. The two police officers were also alleged to have twisted Svetlana Lauer's head back and forth and violently pulled on her handcuffed hands. The upper part of her housecoat was reportedly torn away from her in the process, leaving her in a semi-naked state with her upper body covered only by her bra. The police officers were then reported to have searched Anastasia Lauer's room for the purpose of finding stolen items but were unable to find any evidence. When the police officers decided to leave, they are said to have led her out of the apartment block with her arms restrained behind her back, although by this time the handcuffs had been removed. On the way out of the apartment, Svetlana Lauer reportedly scratched the female police officer in the face after one of her arms became free. The female police officer and a bearded police officer allegedly grabbed hold of her and hit her head against a wall of the apartment. In retaliation, Svetlana Lauer reportedly scratched a male police officer in the face. All four police officers are said to have restrained Svetlana Lauer and to have handcuffed her arms behind her back. One of the male police officers allegedly grabbed hold of her handcuffed hands and dragged her through the hallway of the apartment into a room. He is then alleged to have kicked her and to have hit her head against the floor. The same police officer was then alleged to have placed his foot on her back and continued to hit her as she lay on the floor. After her alleged ill-treatment, the police officers were said to have taken her to the police vehicle parked outside her home in full view of her two children and neighbours in a semi-naked state and without any footwear. The female police officer and her bearded colleague are said to have driven the detainee to Hallstadt police station, where she was later charged with resisting arrest and physically assaulting the police officers. According to a medical report issued on 26 February 2002, Svetlana Lauer's injuries included multiple bruising and grazing to the head, both shoulders, right thorax, back, bottom, arms and legs.

2. Response from the Government of Germany

4. By letter dated 14 November 2002, the Government of Germany transmitted the following information.

5. **Denis Mwakapi** was taken to Nuremberg Central Police station for clarification of the above-mentioned incident because he was reportedly unwilling to clear up the facts on the spot. Physical coercion was needed during his transfer since he put up resistance to it and behaved aggressively. He was placed in preventive detention after his wife expressed fears that she could not cope with him, in particular due to his drunkenness. When he later complained of pain in his arm some hours later, the concerned police officers did not believe him, based upon the fact that there were no visible signs of injury and that Denis Mwakapi repeatedly expressed his desire to

continue celebrating in the city centre. The investigations carried out by the Public Prosecution Office against the two police officers accused of causing bodily harm, failure to lend assistance and prosecution of innocent persons did not result in facts sufficient to constitute an offence. The behaviour of the accused police officers was considered under these circumstances correct, necessary and proportionate. It is not clear whether the spiral fracture of his right forearm that he sustained is the result of the police officers' coercion or of the fight he previously sustained with the Americans. The Nuremberg-Fürth Public Prosecution Office terminated the investigation proceedings. The appeal against the termination order brought by Denis Mwakapi was not granted by the administrative decision of the Regional Prosecution Office attached to Nuremberg Higher Regional Court. After further investigations were conducted upon application of Denis Mwakapi, the Nuremberg-Fürth Public Prosecution Office terminated again the investigation proceedings and the Regional Prosecution Office attached to Nuremberg Higher Regional Court rejected the appeal against the most recent termination. Finally, his application for a judicial decision in the proceedings to force the Public Prosecution Office to bring criminal charges was rejected as unfounded in a Ruling by the Criminal Division of Nuremberg Higher Regional Court dated 27 May 2002.

6. With regard to the case of **Doviodo Adekou**, the Government informed that in the light of the upcoming deportation date and because of the suspicion, based on his having abandoned his living quarters, that he would seek to avoid his deportation, the Mettmann District Enforcement Officers decided to place him in custody and bring him before a magistrate to examine an arrest warrant for ensuring his deportation. A struggle started between him and officers of the District Administration at the moment of his arrest on 1 October 2002. As a result, the enforcement officers sustained injuries and Doviodo Adekou was seriously wounded on his right eye, which could not be saved. The deportation scheduled for 12 October 2001 was cancelled. An investigation was initiated following Doviodo Adekou's complaint filed on 24 January 2002 at the District of Mettmann Police Authority and based on coercion and serious bodily harm during the performance of official duties. A date for the completion of the investigation could not be foreseen at the time the Government submitted its response. The Government has also informed that after this incident, it has been decided by the District Administration that arrests would only be carried out in consultation with police officers and that the enforcement officers would also be trained more thoroughly in the area of arrest techniques.

7. In connection with the case of **Svetlana Lauer**, the Bamberg Public Prosecution Office launched an investigation against the police officers involved in the incident after she had filed a criminal complaint on 22 February 2002. According to the results of this investigation, which is not yet completed, she was not abused, insulted, hit, kicked, or otherwise humiliated by word or act, the officers did not intentionally hit her head against the wall nor pull her hair. She was not pulled by the handcuffs from the hallway into the room that had been searched. Instead, it is reported that Svetlana Lauer behaved very aggressively and that it cannot be ruled out that she hit her head or other body parts against the wall during the physical fight that took place between her and the female police officer when the latter attempted to restrain her. According to a medical examination carried out on 28 February 2002, it could not be conclusively determined, from a forensic medical point of view, whether the documented injuries were the result of mistreatment by the police officers. On the other hand, an investigation proceeding in relation to these facts is pending against Svetlana Lauer based upon obstructing enforcement officers in the execution of their official duties, defamation, and bodily harm.

3. Observations of the Special Rapporteur

8. The Special Rapporteur appreciates the prompt and detailed response that the Government of Germany provided in regard to the three allegations presented. In the case of Doviado Adekou, the Special Rapporteur welcomes the information stating that after the incident the District Administration adopted measures to improve the conditions under which arrests are carried out, including appropriate training in arrest techniques. The Special Rapporteur takes the opportunity to recommend that such efforts be accompanied by additional measures aimed at ensuring that “police and immigration authorities treat migrants in a dignified and non-discriminatory manner, in accordance with international standards, through, inter alia, organizing specialized training courses for administrators, police officers, immigration officials and other interested groups”, in accordance with the Programme of Action of the World Conference Against Racism (art. 30 (e)). The Special Rapporteur would appreciate receiving the final conclusions of the investigations currently under way both in the cases of both Doviado Adekou and Svetlana Lauer.

B. Spain

1. Joint communications submitted on 4 September 2002 by the Special Rapporteur on the question of torture and the Special Rapporteur on the human rights of migrants

9. The Special Rapporteurs have received information on the following cases.

10. **Boaventura Simão Vaz**, a national of Guinea-Bissau and a mechanic by trade, alleged that he was arrested on 1 March 2001 while sitting in the company of two other persons in a Madrid bar. According to the information received, a plain clothes National Police officer asked him for his papers. He was then pushed outside, handcuffed and taken to a police station, where he was informed that he was suspected of drug trafficking. He denied the accusation. He claims to have witnessed, on the premises of the police station, the beating of another person in police custody, whom he had tried to defend. Three officers then punched and kicked him, threw him to the ground and threatened him with a weapon. They also subjected him to racial slurs, calling him a “dirty Black”. Boaventura Simão Vaz states that he did not receive any medical assistance at the police station. He subsequently went to the emergency room of San Carlos hospital, where he complained of a sharp pain in the left side of his chest. On 7 March 2001, the hospital drew up a report stating that he had five broken ribs and internal haemorrhaging; he was hospitalized for several days. On 13 March, the victim lodged a complaint with a Madrid court.

11. **Marta Elena Arce**, a Costa Rican anthropologist living in Catalonia since 1999, claims that she was arrested for having assaulted a police officer on 2 April 2001, in the Plaza de Cataluña in Barcelona, where she met other immigrants every day. Before her arrest, she claims to have taken part in the occupation of the Church of Santa María del Pi in Barcelona; the occupation was organized by immigrants to protest the Government’s immigration policy. On the day of her arrest, four or five police officers who had been informed of the theft of a mobile phone approached the group of immigrants and asked them to show their mobile phones. Marta Elena Arce asked why she and her friends had been asked to produce their mobile phones, and an argument ensued. She claims that the police officers insulted her, calling her a “dirty

Latino”, “whore” and “retard”, and struck her. She was taken to the Rambla Nova police station in the Ciutat Vella district before she was transferred, at her request, to hospital del Mar, in the Drassanes area, where she was issued a medical certificate. The four police officers who had taken her to the police station accused her of having assaulted one officer with a gas bomb. Marta Elena Arce claims that the bomb was in her pocket and went off when she was thrown to the ground. Marta Elena Arce states that she was detained at the police station until 11 p.m. the next day. She was then transferred to the La Verneda detention centre for foreigners, where she spent the night before being brought before a judge. She was released in the afternoon of the same day. According to the source, during her stay in the police station, Marta Arce had had to sleep on a mattress on the floor; she claims that, the first night, she had not been given a blanket and had not been allowed to telephone a lawyer or close friends or relatives. The Special Rapporteurs have been informed that she was not able to see a lawyer until 4 April.

12. **Ibrahim Saad Llah**, a Palestinian born in the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, claims that he was assaulted by a National Police officer on 9 May 2001 on the premises of the police station where he had gone to apply for permission to travel from Ceuta to the Spanish mainland. He claims that two police officers beat him with truncheons while two others punched him. He was beaten on the side, the legs, the head and the chest and held at the police station for two days. According to the source, there was an attempt to expel him to Morocco but the Moroccan authorities refused to accept him. After this attempt, he was abandoned in the immediate vicinity of Sidi Embarek, in Los Rosales area. Passers-by took him to the Red Cross hospital, which drew up a medical report that was later submitted to the court. Ibrahim Saad Llah has lodged a complaint with the Ceuta court against four Spanish police officers.

13. **Abdelhak Archani**, a Moroccan national residing in the commune of Badalona in Barcelona, claims that, in July 2001, he was apprehended and beaten by three plainclothes police officers. According to the information received, the incident took place when the police officers sought to interrogate Abdelhak Archani about a stolen passport. They made him get into a vehicle that they stopped on the side of a motorway. They beat him with a truncheon and made racist insults. Abdelhak Archani was admitted to Holy Spirit hospital in Santa Coloma de Gramanet. The police officers later claimed that they had found him drunk on a public thoroughfare and that they had merely taken him home. The Special Rapporteurs have learned that a judicial inquiry into the incident has been opened, and they would like to be kept informed of the progress and the outcome of that procedure.

14. **Nouredine Hathout**, a Moroccan national managing an export company based in Granada, claims that he was insulted and assaulted by three police officers in Málaga on 24 November 2001. According to the information received by the Special Rapporteurs, Nouredine Hathout was waiting at the Málaga bus station when he saw an elderly Moroccan being manhandled by a young man. He claims that he and some others intervened but that the young man then identified himself as a police officer. Nouredine Hathout explained to his compatriot, in Arabic, that he was dealing with a police officer and should not put up any resistance. The man was taken to a local police station, from which he emerged a short while later claiming that he had been insulted and that another Moroccan, who did not speak Spanish, was still inside. Nouredine Hathout knocked at the door in order to offer his services as an interpreter but a police officer advised him not to interfere, pushed him and asked for his papers. When Nouredine Hathout protested, the officer grabbed him by the chest and pushed him

against the wall, then immediately dragged him inside. There, three officers subjected him to racist insults, searched him, accused him of drug trafficking and threatened to halt the procedure for obtaining Spanish nationality that he had begun. Nouredine Hathout was then taken to a police station where, for over an hour, he was denied the right to contact a lawyer and to be taken to a hospital. Later, other officers arrived and he was taken to Carlos Haya clinic, where he underwent a medical examination that revealed contusions and grazing on both sides of the neck. He was then taken back to the police station where he was beaten again. (...) On 26 November 2001, a complaint was lodged with the duty judge of Granada against the officers involved.

15. According to the information received by the Special Rapporteurs, on 22 January 2002 the police launched an attack against immigrants without papers who were demonstrating peacefully in the Alcazaba, the fortress of Almería, in order to obtain residence and work permits. The confrontation resulted in 11 arrests and 20 wounded. The police used tear gas and shot rubber bullets in order to disperse the 300-odd demonstrators. The persons who were arrested were taken to a police station where they were beaten again; they were not allowed access to toilets and received no food or blankets for 48 hours. According to the Government, only two persons were slightly wounded; however, the Red Cross stated that up to 20 persons had suffered from the effects of tear gas, or had been beaten by the police or trampled by other demonstrators fleeing the police charge. Deportation orders had been issued against the illegal immigrants in question, and eight Moroccan nationals were transferred to the detention centre for foreigners in Valencia, where they remained for four days, without medical care, in spite of their pitiable state.

16. The Special Rapporteurs have also received information about the living conditions in a number of holding centres for young immigrants, which are managed by the regional departments of social welfare (*consejerías de bienestar social*) in Ceuta and Melilla, particularly at the Fort Purísima Concepción centre in Melilla and the San Antonio centre in Ceuta, where overcrowding is said to be extreme.* The Special Rapporteurs have received information concerning the following individual cases.

17. **Mohamed Garbagui**, age 13, was arrested in the street by a Ceuta police patrol, which took him to the San Antonio centre. There, two supervision officers took him to a punishment cell where they undressed him, struck him with their bare hands and a stick, and slapped him. They did not give him enough to eat, confiscated his pillow and forced him to sleep on the ground. The boy escaped from the centre and, accompanied by a representative of a non-governmental organization, went to a clinic, where he received medical treatment for his wounds. On 29 July 2001, he lodged a complaint with the second examining court of Ceuta. He lodged another complaint with the Ceuta Directorate-General of Police. The Special Rapporteurs would like information on the progress of these proceedings. It would not be the first time that minors in holding centres were subjected to ill-treatment. According to the information received, in 2000 the Ceuta public prosecutor for minors began an inquiry into accusations of sexual violence against at least 12 children in the centre. The Special Rapporteurs would also like to receive additional information concerning this inquiry.

* Details concerning allegations relating to the treatment of unaccompanied minor immigrants in Ceuta and Melilla may be consulted in the Secretariat.

18. **Said M.** and **Hassan U.**, two Algerian immigrants, the first of whom is 17 years old, were beaten by the Ceuta local police at the time of their arrest on 14 October 2000, and in the police station where they were later taken after having been brutally shoved into a vehicle. (...) At the police station, Said M. lost consciousness; he revived when he was sprayed with water from the hose that had been used to beat him. Forced into a police vehicle, the two men were beaten again and taken to the place where they had been arrested. They were found there by members of the Civil Guard, whom they asked for help and who took them to the hospital of the National Institute of Health (Insalud) in Ceuta. The medical report on their case mentions a number of lesions and cuts. On 19 October 2000, a newspaper published a photograph of the wounds that had been sustained by one of them.

19. **Shihab R.** (pseudonym), a minor, was arrested by members of the Ceuta police force at the end of October 2001 at the port, where he was preparing to attempt a crossing to the Spanish mainland. He was forced to board a vehicle and was taken to a police station, after which he was transferred to the barracks of the Civil Guard. During the journey, he was struck on the arms, legs and head. He was also beaten with a truncheon and kicked. According to the information received, he was again beaten on Civil Guard premises, where he was locked in a room for three hours before being taken to the San Antonio centre. The medical report prepared by the National Institute of Health (Insalud) on 2 November 2001 notes a stable fracture of the second metacarpus of the left hand. Shihab R. did not receive any care until the Carmelites of La Caridad de Vedruna took him to the Red Cross hospital.

20. **Omar H.** (pseudonym), age 16, arrived in Ceuta from Tangiers in September 2001. A few days after his arrival in Spain, he was arrested by the police. Omar H. told the police that he was a minor but was nevertheless taken to a police station where he remained for a whole day. According to the information received, during his stay he was beaten on the back and thighs with a truncheon. He was subsequently taken to the San Antonio centre.

21. **Salah S.** (pseudonym), a minor held at the Fort Purísima Concepción centre, was beaten by two members of the staff of that establishment in October 2001, after an altercation with another inmate. According to the information received, he was slapped and kicked in the back of his legs.

22. **Ayman M.** (pseudonym), age 16, was sent back to Morocco on 28 July 2001 after having spent eight years in Melilla. According to the information received, the director of the centre where he was being held had informed him that he would be brought before a judge with another minor from the same centre and young people from other holding centres. However, all of the minors concerned were taken directly to the border with Morocco and handed over to the Moroccan police authorities of the town of Nador. They were then taken to a police station where officers wearing boots trod on their feet; the minors were wearing light footwear. They were asked where they came from and how they had arrived in Melilla. They were then locked in a warehouse. Before they were released, they were beaten with a high-tension electric club by some 10 officers. Ayman later had contusions on his left wrist. According to the information received between 27 July and 18 September 2001, the Melilla authorities expelled at least 32 unaccompanied minors between the ages of 11 and 17, and there have been at least 70 expulsions of this type as of February 2002. (...)

23. Forty foreign minors between the ages of 13 and 17 living at the Fort Purísima Concepción centre in Melilla began a hunger strike on 4 March 2002 to protest the existing family reunion policy which, according to them, was ineffective since they did not have any family members waiting for them on the other side of the border. They were also protesting because they had not been granted residence permits upon the expiry of the nine-month period required by law, and against the ill-treatment that they had received from some of the centre's supervision officers.

2. Replies from the Government of Spain

24. In a communication dated 14 November 2002, the Government of Spain transmitted the following information.

25. **Mr. Boaventura Simão Vaz** was detained when he, in the company of another Guinea-Bissau national, approached two plain clothes National Police officers, who were on duty. Boaventura Simão Vaz offered the officers tablets, which he showed them, for 500 pesetas. At that moment, the police officers showed him their badges and professional identity cards. As Mr. Simão attempted to run away, the officers intervened rapidly. A scuffle with the officers ensued, and one officer was injured when Mr. Simão grabbed him by the hair and threw him onto the road, causing lesions in the right occipital region, which necessitated emergency assistance. Mr. Simão and his compatriot were finally apprehended; this called for the use of minimum necessary force, since they put up strong resistance and began to shout and insult the officers. During Mr. Simão's detention, a large knife was taken from him. The incident was dealt with in the appropriate manner, and the detainees were informed in writing of the reasons for their detention and of their constitutional rights. Mr. Simão had to be treated at San Carlos clinical hospital; after the medical report was issued, he was returned to prison.

26. In the case of **Marta Elena Arce Salazar**, the Government of Spain states that, on 2 April 2001, a National Police patrol on duty in Las Ramblas in Barcelona was approached by some young people who told the officers that they had been assaulted by a group of Maghrebis, who had taken a mobile phone belonging to one of the young people. A few moments later, the officers proceeded to identify a group of young people that met the description of the group that had committed the theft. The officers sought to determine whether any person in that group was carrying the stolen mobile phone. A few moments later, the victims of the theft arrived but were unable to identify any of the detained youths as the perpetrator of the attack. When the officers returned the documents to the youths, a woman approached them, shouting at them in an offensive manner and refusing to identify herself. The woman stood in the middle of the road, violently resisting the police's attempts to subdue her and taking from her bag a personal defence spray with the intention of using it against the officer, which she did not succeed in doing. She began attacking the members of the patrol, until she was finally apprehended and identified as Marta Elena Arce Salazar. She was informed of her rights and transferred to Percamps hospital in Barcelona, where she was treated, along with one of the police officers, and the relevant medical reports were drawn up. She was then transferred to the Ciutat Vella police station. She was assigned a lawyer, Mr. José Luis Villar. The Bar Association later informed the police that the lawyer who had been assigned was ill, and that a lawyer - member of the Bar No. 19,632 - had been assigned ex officio. The treatment received by Marta Elena Arce Salazar was the same as that accorded to any other detainee.

27. **Ibrahim Saad Ellah**, who claims to be a Libyan-born Palestinian, was detained by police officers attached to the Border Task Force of the Unit for Aliens and Documentation of the Ceuta Police Commissariat. The arrest was made in accordance with the law, and Ibrahim Saad Ellah's name was recorded in the register of detainees. Although Ibrahim Saad Ellah claimed to be Palestinian, the officers proceeded to conduct a search to find out whether he was carrying any identity documents in his clothing. Ibrahim Saad Ellah refused to be searched and actively tried to prevent the procedure, as a result of which he had to be searched by force; no identity document was found. He was not subjected to any degrading or humiliating treatment. At the same time, a telephone call was made to members of the Palestinian representation in Madrid who, after having a direct telephone conversation with the detainee, confirmed that, judging from his manner of speaking, he was not a Palestinian but a Moroccan. At 8 p.m. on 8 May 2001, Ibrahim Saad Ellah was deported. Insisting that he was a Palestinian, the Moroccan police refused to admit him into the country and released him. The complaint lodged by Ibrahim Saad Ellah was dismissed by the judge of Ceuta Examining Court No. 4 on 18 August 2001. Ibrahim Saad Ellah's subsequent request for asylum in Spain was denied by the competent authority, and his whereabouts are currently unknown.

28. The judicial records of the case of **Abdelhak Archani** indicate that he was transported in a police vehicle, not by force but voluntarily. He was found in front of the subdelegation of the Government of Barcelona selling places in line to foreigners waiting to transact official business. Such behaviour gave rise to many arguments among the foreigners awaiting their turn, and police intervention was necessary. Since Abdelhak Archani showed clear signs of inebriation, the police warned him to leave the place, and offered to take him home. During the journey, he gave an incorrect address and expressed his desire to get out of the vehicle. The investigations conducted and the forensic medical report show that at no time was he subjected to ill-treatment by the police. The case was provisionally dismissed, since there was no cogent evidence that an offence had been committed.

29. The case of **Nourdeine Hathout**, accused of the crime of assault, is pending; the trial is scheduled for 29 October 2002. Police records indicate that the person in question was duly informed of his rights, and a lawyer from the Málaga Bar Association was present when he made his statement and was released after 21 hours and 50 minutes of detention. They also indicate that he was transferred to the emergency service of Carlos Haya hospital, where he was treated, along with one of the officers involved; in both cases, the medical reports were appended to the records of the case.

30. On 21 and 22 January 2002, large groups of foreigners led by the *Sindicato de Obreros del Campo* (Farm Workers' Union) gathered in front of the offices of the subdelegation of the Government in López Falcón square in Almería. The National Police intervened in order to prevent people from camping at the site and to enable foreigners who had official business to have access to the Aliens Office. When the Aliens Office closed, some 500 persons remained, and the police began to check their identity. Nine persons were detained, eight pursuant to the Organic Law on the Rights and Freedoms of Foreign Nationals Living in Spain and Their Social Integration, and one for resisting authority. In the early morning of 22 January, approximately 200 foreigners had gathered on the Cerro San Cristóbal (San Cristóbal Hill) with the intention of camping there. The subdelegation of the Government issued instructions to members of the police to disperse the crowd. After giving the mandatory verbal warnings, the

police began to take action in accordance with established procedure. The police were continually attacked and pelted with stones by members of the crowd. Thirty-one people were detained; some of them were injured, mainly as a result of running and falling owing to the dim light and the rugged terrain. In all, 3 police officers and 13 foreigners were wounded, 6 of whom were treated on the spot. The rest were transferred to a treatment centre, where they were treated for light contusions and migraines; one foreigner who had an anxiety attack remained under observation until 11.59 p.m. The police action was carried out in accordance with the law, and care was taken to respect the rights of the persons in question.

31. With regard to the situation of **unaccompanied minors**, in Spain both the constitutional principles concerning children and the family, and the provisions of the Legal Protection of Minors Act are based on the relevant international conventions, particularly the Convention on the Rights of the Child, which was ratified by Spain on 30 November 1990. On the other hand, the Organic Law on the Rights and Freedoms of Foreign Nationals Living in Spain and Their Social Integration, which is currently in force, as well as its regulations, provide clear guidelines for government action with respect to unaccompanied foreign minors. If State security forces or agencies locate an undocumented foreign national whose status as a minor cannot be determined with certainty, the public prosecutor attempts to determine the person's age with the assistance of health-care institutions. If the person is found to be a minor, and during the period when efforts are being made to determine that person's age, the public prosecutor places the person in the care of the competent services for the protection of minors; the autonomous communities and cities have competence in this area. The General State Administration decides either to return the minor to his or her country of origin or to the country where the minor's family resides, or to allow the minor to remain in Spain, after having heard him or her and after having received a report prepared by the services for the protection of minors. When the minor has been in the care of the services for the protection of minors for a period of nine months, and if it has not been possible to return the minor to his country of origin, the minor is issued documents with a view to ensuring his integration.

32. With regard to the alleged ill-treatment of minors in the San Antonio Centre, now called the "La Esperanza" Centre, which is operated by the Ceuta social protection services, the following points should be made.

33. The centre, a former military residence, was opened in 1999. It held some 70 unaccompanied minors, who were given food, clothing, accommodation and training. In the beginning, housing conditions were not ideal. In March 2001, work was begun to expand the centre in order to accommodate some 110 minors. It is not true that girls were held at the centre or that minors lacked a recreation area. The centre is for male minors and has sufficient green areas. The minors held at the centre have complete freedom to come and go as they please within the established times. It is not true that minors have been locked in a "small, dark and dirty room". The treatment of minors is professional and in no way reflects any authoritarian approach to social care. All minors are provided with schooling, although some who are over the age of 17 do not attend classes, since they have the freedom to come and go as they please. The Assistant Ombudsman, a high commissioner for the Spanish Parliament [and who is responsible for] the supervision of the administration, visited the centre on 10 May 2001. He ruled out the existence of ill-treatment and stated that there were no current investigations into that practice.

34. In Ceuta, there have been no cases in which minors unable to return to their countries or to remain in the care of the Moroccan services for the protection of minors have been summarily returned. (...) In Ceuta, the General Commissariat for Aliens and Documentation contacted the Moroccan embassy in Madrid with a view to repatriating minors to their country; the embassy replied that negotiations should be held directly with the authorities of Tetuan province, which would see to it that the minors were reunited with their families. Consequently, the National Police Corps Commissariat in Ceuta contacts the aforementioned authorities and, within a period of not less than 15 days from the communication of the agreement on family reunion, hands over the minors in compliance with that principle.

35. The claim that there is no official body responsible for guaranteeing that unaccompanied children in Ceuta receive the care and protection to which they are entitled by law is completely groundless. Under the law, the autonomous city of Ceuta exercises its competence and responsibility through the Department of Social Welfare. There is no delegation of competence or responsibilities of officials of the national Government to local authorities; each one exercises those assigned to it by the legal system and, if any abuse of the legal system comes to the attention not only of the authorities and officials but also any Spanish citizen, such persons are obliged by law to report such abuse to the nearest judge or prosecutor. Coordination between the central and autonomous administrations is ongoing and smooth and is carried out between the Department of Social Welfare, the Migration and Social Services Institute and the regional office of the Government.

36. On 20 June 2002, police records were transmitted to Examining Court No. 2 in Ceuta, accusing two care-givers of the San Antonio Centre for Minors of causing lesions to **Mohamed Garbagui**. When the examining court was contacted, it stated that the proceedings had been terminated. The last record of the minor's presence in Ceuta was on 22 February 2002, the date on which he was detained on the order of the city's juvenile court.

37. On 14 October 200[?], forces of the Civil Guard took a sworn statement concerning alleged aggression resulting in injuries. The complainants were two Algerian citizens, **Said Mohamed** and **Hassan Uaharami**, who claimed that the incident had occurred at 10 p.m. on the previous day. When Examining Court of First Instance No. 3 was contacted, it made a verbal statement that the proceedings had been terminated on 13 April. Both in this and the preceding case, termination of proceedings is a declaration by the court that the case has been closed owing to a lack of the necessary prerequisites for instituting oral proceedings or issuing an indictment.

38. There is no information that any kind of sexual abuse has taken place at the San Antonio Centre for Minors. However, on 14 April 2000, the director of the Centre informed the National Police Corps Commissariat that an individual driving a car used to prowl the area looking for minors that he could sexually abuse. Members of the Minors' Unit of the National Police Corps began investigations that resulted in the detention of three individuals on whom case documents were prepared and who were handed over to Examining Court No. 4. All three individuals were released. The Ombudsman expressed interest in the case and began informal pre-trial proceedings. He received a summary of the relevant information and, in a document dated 2 October 2000, terminated the proceedings.

39. In the cases of **Shihab R.** and **Omar R.**, there is no record of the alleged acts and it is impossible to verify the truth of the claim, which would make it possible to set in motion the relevant investigation of the alleged acts. In the case of **Salh S.**, the acts referred to in the allegations of the Special Rapporteurs do not correspond to reality. The injuries suffered by Salh S. were caused by another minor, an inmate of the Purísima Concepción Centre for Minors in Melilla. The only action taken by the staff of the centre was to separate the two minors and obtain medical assistance. It has not been possible to verify the case of **Ayman M.** Nevertheless, it is not true that the person in question was repatriated in the circumstances described in the allegations. In 2002, 72 minors in Melilla were repatriated; handcuffs were never used, nor were the minors ever subjected to any ill-treatment by the authorities.

3. Observations by the Special Rapporteur

40. The Special Rapporteur thanks the Government of Spain for its very detailed reply. Since Spain has become a crossing point for continuous immigration to Europe, he recommends that the Spanish authorities should take measures to ensure that the dignity of migrants, whether they are illegal or not, is respected in accordance with the international human rights instruments to which Spain is a party. The Special Rapporteur suggests that the border police and the Civil Guard should be made aware of those texts through training seminars in which the Commission on Human Rights could be involved.

C. Russian Federation

1. Communication dated 28 August 2002

General manifestations of racism, racial discrimination and xenophobia

41. It has been reported that there is a growing trend of violence against ethnic minorities and foreigners in the Russian Federation. Generally, the victims of racist attacks include persons from Africa, Asia, Central Asia, the Caucasus, including ethnic Chechens, and refugees and asylum-seekers. It is alleged that law enforcement officers are reluctant to register attacks as racist when there is evidence that the attacks are racially motivated and that officers fail to understand the serious implications of racially motivated violence. Police and other law enforcement officials themselves are routinely accused of subjecting racial and ethnic minorities to harassment and intimidation.

42. Specific examples illustrating the above-mentioned treatment include the following incidents:

- It is reported that when **Adefers Dessu**, an Ethiopian refugee, and his wife Sarah were beaten by a 20 year-old boy armed with chains in Moscow in February 2001, the medical report stated that their injuries were the result of a “fall” and the police registered the attacker as a minor.

- In October 2001, when a crowd of 300 youths brandishing iron bars attacked a Moscow market staffed by ethnic minorities and left an Armenian, an Indian and a Tajik dead, initial police statements referred to the perpetrators as football “hooligans”. In the Siberian city of Tyumen, a series of seven attacks on a synagogue last year were characterized as “young people’s hooliganism”.

Incitement to racism, racial harassment, race-related torture and ill-treatment by State agents

43. In addition, it is alleged that the authorities have failed to respond to racist statements by public figures in Russia’s regions and that federal authorities allow city and regional authorities to ignore federal laws governing freedom of movement that discriminate against ethnic and racial minorities. It is reported that members of racial and ethnic minorities are disproportionately targeted for document checks on the street, which commonly leads to extortion and can result in detention, torture and ill-treatment.

44. The following are reported incidents:

- On 19 April 2002, reportedly members of the Moscow City and Moscow District Organized Crime Force (RUBOP) were implicated in the torture, ill-treatment, extortion and fabrication of evidence against Tajik migrant workers. It is alleged that their actions were accompanied by racist insults and stereotyping of Tajiks as Islamic fundamentalist fighters and drug dealers. Authorities are accused of blocking attempts by the victims to formally complain.
- It is alleged that Krasnodar authorities refuse to grant residence permits to approximately 13,000 Meskhetian Turk residents in Krasnodar Territory, rendering them “stateless” and unable to work legally or to own land. On 1 April 2002, Krasnodar authorities announced the establishment of deportation centres, staffed by paramilitary units, to deport those accused of being “illegal migrants”.

2. Reply dated 20 August 2002 from the Government of the Russian Federation

45. With regard to the disturbances and disorderly conduct that caused the death of three persons near the Tsaritsyno metro station in Moscow on 30 October 2001, criminal proceedings have been brought under articles 105 (murder), 111 (serious deliberate attacks on physical integrity), 212 (disturbances) and 213 (disorderly conduct) of the Penal Code of the Russian Federation. Ten individuals have been indicted. The investigation has been completed and the Moscow city court began to hear the case on 16 July 2002.

46. On 28 October 2001, criminal proceedings were brought, pursuant to the offence described in article 213, paragraph 2 (a), of the Penal Code, against unidentified individuals for breaking the windows of a building currently under construction and belonging to the Jewish Aviv cultural association in Tyumen. On 10 February 2002, the proceedings were terminated

because it was impossible to identify the persons responsible for the offence. On 19 September 2002, the decision of the investigating body to close the case was overturned by the office of the procurator of Tyumen region, which requested additional information.

47. In June 2001, similar acts were committed against a building belonging to the Aviv association. On 2 July 2001, the investigating body of the Tyumen municipal office of internal affairs decided not to institute criminal proceedings because the acts were not sufficiently serious. On 23 September 2002, the procurator overturned the decision not to institute proceedings pursuant to the offence described in article 213 (disorderly conduct) of the Penal Code of the Russian Federation.

48. There is not enough evidence to conclude that these offences were motivated by national or racial hatred.

49. The office of the Moscow city procurator decided to investigate reports that officials of the Moscow city and regional office for combating organized crime participated in acts of torture, extortion and falsification of evidence against Tajik immigrants. To date, the investigation has not been completed owing to the absence, in the communication, of specific information concerning the place where the militia officers allegedly committed these reprehensible acts or concerning any appeal that the victims may have lodged with the law enforcement agencies. The office of the procurator of Moscow region has found that no measure was taken on 19 April 2002 against Tajik citizens by officials of the Main Department of Internal Affairs of Moscow region.

50. Efforts to verify reports that two Ethiopian refugees, Mr. Adefers Dessu and his wife Sarah, were assaulted by a group of youths armed with chains have yielded the following results:

According to information received from the Ethiopian embassy, the attack took place in Podolsk district of Moscow region. Records for 2001 and the beginning of 2002 have been verified and do not indicate that the persons in question lodged a complaint of an attack by unknown persons. All the hospitals in Moscow region that Mr. and Mrs. Dessu could have visited to obtain treatment are currently being contacted. The results of the operational investigation will be verified.

Over the past seven years, the Office of the Procurator-General of the Russian Federation has repeatedly conducted investigations into the observation of the fundamental rights of the Meskhetian Turks in Krasnodar territory.

The problems relating to the settlement of Meskhetian Turks in this region of the Russian Federation began after the outbreak of ethnic disturbances in Uzbekistan in 1989.

In accordance with Decree No. 503 of 26 June 1989 of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), on the provisions governing conditions of sojourn in the regions of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (RSFSR) for Turks who were forced to leave their places of permanent residence in the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic, and bearing in mind the existing possibilities for providing housing and ensuring normal living conditions for the persons in question, a place of permanent

residence was assigned for this category of Soviet citizens in the regions of the non-chernozem zone of RSFSR (including Moscow region), as well as in Belgorod, Voronezh and Kursk regions.

While Krasnodar territory is not one of the regions designated for such resettlement and does not have the necessary infrastructure, in 1989 and 1990, after the massacres in Fergana and Tashkent regions of the Uzbek SSR, some 15,000 Meskhetian Turks moved, on their own initiative, to Krasnodar territory (including 10,000 in the districts of Abinsk and Krymsk), with a view to settling definitively in the Akhaltsikhe region in Georgia, where they are originally from.

In accordance with article 23, paragraph 3, of the Act of the Russian Federation on the right of citizens of the Russian Federation to move freely and choose freely their place of sojourn or residence within the national borders, "place of residence" means the house, apartment or any other dwelling where a person resides permanently or most of the time as the owner, by virtue of a contract or lease, or for any other reason provided for in Russian legislation.

The majority of Meskhetian Turks do not register their deed to the lodging that they have acquired. Moreover, in most cases, such acquisition has not been the subject of a written contract.

Since they do not have proof, as required under article 6 of the aforementioned Act, of the legal acquisition of their dwelling, the owners cannot register in the place of residence that they have chosen.

Since they often do not hold a legal document of permanent residence (residence permit), most Meskhetian Turks do not have the right to be recognized as citizens of the Russian Federation, under the Federal Act on Russian citizenship. Of the 15,500 Meskhetian Turks currently in Krasnodar territory, some 12,000 are stateless persons.

The acquisition of Russian nationality by the Meskhetian Turks living in large numbers in Krasnodar territory must be considered on a case-by-case basis, in strict application of the aforementioned Act. Thus, according to the information received from Krasnodar territory court, the district courts of Abinsk, Anapa, Belorechensk and Krymsk examined 42 requests made by Meskhetian Turks with a view to legalizing their residence in Russian territory before the entry into force of the Federal Act on Russian citizenship. Thirty-seven of those requests were approved. The Krymsk district court and the Primorsk district court in Novorossiisk have responded favourably to two complaints lodged by Meskhetian Turks concerning the refusal of officials of the Passport and Visa Service to register them.

Currently, 4,000 Meskhetian Turks are officially registered in their place of residence. Some 3,000 of them have been able to establish their Russian citizenship.

Between the beginning of 2000 and June 2001, register offices recorded the births of 548 Meskhetian Turk children.

According to information received by employment agencies of districts with high concentrations of Meskhetian Turks, as of the beginning of this year no member of that community had registered as unemployed with a view to obtaining employment.

The questions of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, as well as the defence of State interests and of the legitimate rights of the inhabitants of Krasnodar territory are constantly at the centre of attention of the bodies attached to the Office of the Procurator. The working group, composed of representatives of the Directorate of the Federal Security Service, the General Directorate of Internal Affairs and the General Directorate of Justice of Krasnodarsk territory, which was established under the Procurator of the territory, seeks to ensure compliance with acts of all government bodies responsible for preventing and suppressing manifestations of political extremism by social and religious organizations and associations.

The question of defining the legal status of the Meskhetian Turks has been repeatedly considered at the federal level. In particular, in its Decree No. 1280-r of 14 August 2000, issued pursuant to Presidential Order No. K-285 of 24 March 2000, the Government of the Russian Federation extended the mandate of the Interministerial Commission on the Settlement of the Question of Meskhetian Turks Residing in Russian Territory.

At its first meeting, on 28 September 2000, the Commission adopted a plan of action to stabilize the ethnic and political situation in areas with high concentrations of Meskhetian Turks in southern Russia.

The main provisions of the plan deal with the question of repatriating the Meskhetian Turks in their region of origin in Georgian territory and facilitating the return of those who wish to live in Georgia, and with the establishment of the legal status of Meskhetian Turks who wish to acquire Russian citizenship and the means of issuing identity documents to the persons concerned.

On 14 March 2001, the ad hoc inter-ministerial working group concluded that the question had to be settled between States. The survey involving 1,989 Meskhetian Turkish families (or 10,644 persons), carried out pursuant to the Ministry's recommendations, made it possible to establish that 568 families wished to remain in Krasnodar territory, 125 families wished to go to another State, and 1,044 families wished to return to their country of origin.

It should be noted that no Meskhetian Turk has been expelled from Krasnodar territory. The obligations that Georgia undertook when it joined the Council of Europe regarding the repatriation of the Meskhetian Turks in its territory have not been fulfilled. In addition, no measure has been taken since the publication in 1996 of the Georgian president's decree on the repatriation of the persons concerned.

51. In the light of the foregoing, the information contained in the Special Rapporteur's communication concerning the refusal of the Krasnodar authorities to issue residence permits to 13,000 Meskhetian Turks, and concerning the creation of "deportation centres", the staff of which is allegedly made up of members of paramilitary groups, does not correspond with reality.

3. Observations of the Special Rapporteur

52. The Special Rapporteur thanks the Government of the Russian Federation for its reply. With regard to the general manifestations of racism and incitement to ethnic hatred, the Special Rapporteur recommends that the Russian authorities organize a national campaign against racial discrimination and in favour of social harmony. With regard to the disorderly conduct that caused the death of three persons in the vicinity of the Tsaritsyno metro station in Moscow on 30 October 2001, the Special Rapporteur would like to be informed of the conclusions of the Moscow city court. With regard to the behaviour of the police towards ethnic and racial minorities and foreigners, the Special Rapporteur encourages the authorities of the Russian Federation to take measures to improve the behaviour of the police so that their actions are more in conformity with respect for human rights. Such measures could include training police officers in human rights, in particular in non-discrimination in the performance of their duties. Finally, the Special Rapporteur takes note of the detailed information on efforts to find solutions to the problems of the place of residence and nationality of the Meskhetian Turks. He remains very interested in the resolution of this extremely worrying situation.

D. Greece

1. Joint communication of 13 September 2002, sent together with the Special Rapporteur on the question of torture

Summary of allegations

53. The Special Rapporteurs have received information on the following individual cases.

54. **Lazaros Bekos** and **Eleftherios Kotropoulos**, two Roma youths aged 17 and 18 respectively, were reportedly beaten during their detention in Mesolongi police station on 8 May 1998. A forensic report allegedly stated that both of them received "medium bodily injuries, inflicted with a broken instrument" during their detention. It is also reported that a sworn administrative inquiry conducted by the police recommended that the two officers be placed on "temporary suspension" because "during the early hours of 8 May 1998 they behaved with exceptional brutality towards the two youths". According to the information received, three police officers were indicted for "jointly-induced bodily harm caused by a person, whose duties are the investigation of possible criminal acts, with the intent to extort deposition or information" after the two youths pressed charges. It is alleged that, following another sworn administrative inquiry launched by the police, sanctions were imposed on two police officers. These sanctions were reportedly made in the form of an around US\$ 100 fine. A third officer, the Director of the Security Service at the police station concerned, is reported to have been tried for these alleged beatings. He is believed to have been accused of "not preventing the ill-treatment of the two arrested individuals" but to have been eventually acquitted for lack of evidence on 8 October 2001.

55. **Andreas Kalamiotis**, a 21-year-old Roma, was reportedly arrested and beaten by police officers on 15 June 2001 in Pefkakia, Agia Pefkakia region. According to the information received, he was listening to music with some friends at his house when at around 2 a.m. a police officer requested them to turn the music off. One of the officers allegedly pointed his gun at him and threatened to shoot him. He is reported to have been subsequently handcuffed and arrested. It is reported that as he was barefoot his wife tried to fetch him a pair of shoes but was not allowed to do so. He was allegedly dragged to a police car and beaten with the hands and with truncheons. It is alleged that he was kicked after falling on the ground. He is believed to have been beaten in the car as well and to have been taken out of it and beaten again. He was allegedly interrogated about who had allegedly fired with a carbine. He was reportedly taken to a police station where he was allegedly insulted and threatened by a police officer. According to the information received, when he asked for some water to drink he was told to take some from the toilet and was given proper water only half an hour later. On the following day he was reportedly taken to the police headquarters in Athens in order to take some pictures of him. It is alleged that when he asked to have his handcuffs removed in order to be able to sit down properly he was insulted and threatened again. He is reported to have been subsequently brought before a public prosecutor and accused of resisting arrest and of insulting and threatening the police authorities. The Special Rapporteurs have been informed that he went to the forensic service in Aghias Anapafseos Street, where he was allegedly told that in order to be examined by a forensic expert he had first to press charges or submit a complaint to the police station of Agia Paraskevi. Andreas Kalamiotis is believed to have avoided filing a complaint for fear of retaliation.

56. **Theodore Stefanou**, a 16-year-old Roma boy from Patras, was reportedly beaten by a police officer in Argostoli on 4 August 2001. According to the information received, two or three police officers went and looked for him in a truck in which he was sleeping during his stay in Argostoli but did not find him since he was outside. It is reported that when Theodore Stefanou learnt that the truck had been searched, he went to the police station. There he was reportedly questioned about the theft of an important sum of money from a kiosk. The boy is believed to have been punched and slapped in the face for 15 minutes by a policeman (whose name is known to the Special Rapporteurs) and in the presence of two other officers, one of whom is thought to be the Commander of the Argostoli police station. It is alleged that he was then taken handcuffed to his truck and subsequently brought back to the police station where he was reportedly interrogated and beaten again. He is reported to have been released after the owner of the kiosk stated that he did not see him around his kiosk at the time of the theft. The Special Rapporteurs have been informed that he subsequently went to a hospital and that according to a medical report, he was found to be suffering from a head injury caused by beating received 12 hours earlier, a slight weakness in focusing, swelling and sensitivity on the ridge of his nose and a small frontal left bruise. It is reported that on 7 August 2001 he went to the Prosecutor's Office in order to press charges against the Commander of the Argostoli police station. According to the information received, four other Roma relatives, **Nikos Theodoropoulos**, aged 18, **Nikos Theodoropoulos**, **George Theodoropoulos** and **Vasilis Theodoropoulos** were arrested and taken to the same police station in connection with relation to the same alleged theft. Nikos Theodoropoulos was reportedly taken to a room where the police commander and another officer allegedly interrogated, beat, punched and slapped him and stepped with their boots on his almost naked feet. Nikos Theodoropoulos is reported to have been kept in custody and to have been woken up at 4 a.m. to record an official deposition. He

was reportedly beaten again when he allegedly said that he would not sign anything in the absence of a lawyer. It is believed that he eventually signed an allegedly false deposition in which he confessed to the theft. Nikos Theodoropoulos was reportedly beaten as well. According to the information received, Nikos Theodoropoulos was acquitted on 6 August 2001 after the judge took into consideration his version of the facts and the allegations of ill-treatment.

2. Response of the Government of Greece dated 28 November 2002

57. **Lazaros Bekos and Eleftherios Koutropoulos**, both minor Romanians were arrested on 8 May 1998 at 12.45 a.m. by a police patrol in Mesolongi, while they were trying to burgle a kiosk. They were taken to Mesolongi police station and the day after, were brought before the competent prosecutor, who released them after fixing a date for their hearing. While the minors did not file a complaint during their detention or at the prosecutor's office, after their release, they complained to the Helsinki Watch Greek Branch that they had been abused by police officers. The representative of this NGO accompanied both minors to the State Hospital of Mesolongi. A medical report of the examination of both minors stated that they were bruised. A second medical report, produced after a private doctor was consulted, indicated that the first minor had two ecchymoses and the second one had multiple ecchymoses inflicted by a battering object. Following a written denunciation by the NGO in question, an administrative inquiry was conducted. No definite conclusions could be drawn as to when, how and by whom the minors' moderate injuries had been inflicted. Nonetheless, a disciplinary sanction was imposed on the Commander of the Security Department of Mesolongi for insufficient supervision and control of his subordinates, since their injuries had been probably inflicted during their detention, although the possibility that they had been caused during their arrest, in which citizens participated, cannot be ruled out. The sanction applied to the Deputy Commander was revoked after the minors testified under oath that he had not participated in their questioning. Criminal proceedings were instituted against three police officers. The case was brought to the Judicial Council, which discharged two police officers and committed to trial the Commander of the Police Station. He was later acquitted by a three-judge court of appeal in Patras, because it was ascertained that the injuries documented by the coroner were most probably caused during their arrest, as they both engaged in a violent fight with the owner of the kiosk.

58. **Andreas Kalamiotis** was arrested after police arrived at his home following a complaint by neighbours that he was disturbing their peace by playing loud music. The police officers advised him and three other persons who were with him to switch off the music because it was disturbing the neighbours. However, he refused and moved threateningly towards the officers, who withdrew to ask for help. Six patrol cars rushed to help them. When Mr. Kalamiotis saw them, he withdrew into his dwelling, while his three friends did not resist and were brought to the police station of Agia Paraskevi for identification and were subsequently released.

59. Mr. Kalamiotis finally exited his dwelling after being invited to do so by the police officers, but he turned against them and swore at them. When they tried to arrest him they met stiff resistance, which led to a fight. He was handcuffed and brought to the police station, where he was unfettered, only to be handcuffed again because he unsuccessfully tried to assault a policeman. The general impression was of a behaviour suggesting alcohol abuse.

60. A criminal case file was opened against him for resisting, insulting and threatening police officers and he was brought before the competent public prosecutor, who instituted criminal proceedings against him and committed him to trial.

61. The administrative inquiry revealed that the two police officers who had participated in the arrest, detention and committal of Mr. Kalamiotis had acted legally, as Mr. Kalamiotis had used violence against them and refused to comply with their orders and follow them to the police station, unlike his friends, who followed the policemen and no violence was used against them. According to the inquiry, the scratches he suffered had been caused by the resistance he offered to avoid being handcuffed by the policemen and his fight with them. They were minor scratches and grazes, absolutely compatible with the degree of violence used against him. The allegation that his wife was not allowed to give him shoes proved false, as a police officer gave him his shoes at the police station, but he threw them away. His allegation that 20 patrol cars of the Hellenic Police had gone to his house was also false.

62. According to the data kept in our Service and on the basis of the information mentioned above, Mr. Kalamiotis did not file a complaint against police officers, while it is not clear whether or not he requested to be examined by a coroner. It should be noted that during his detention and when he was brought before the public prosecutor he did not ask to file a complaint against the police officers or to be examined by a doctor.

63. The sworn administrative inquiry that was conducted to investigate allegations made revealed that they were groundless, as the persons who were allegedly abused testified under oath that no one had mistreated them, except for minor **Theodoros Stefanou**, who claimed that a policeman had used violence against him, in the presence of the Commander, an allegation that was not corroborated by any of the statements by other witnesses, although at least five other Romanies were present in the Department during his stay there.

64. The claim that **Romani Nikos Theodoropoulos** was tortured and forced to sign a statement confessing a robbery he had not committed is not true, because the criminal case file that was opened against him and three other Romanies for the said robbery does not contain any such confession.

65. According to a certificate issued by the Argostoli Hospital, where **Stefanos Theodorou** went on 5 August 2001 at 7.30 a.m. after leaving the Security Department of Argostoli, his examination showed that he was suffering from "a reported head injury, caused by beating 12 hours before. He complains about dizziness and bad headache". According to testimonies by other witnesses and to his statement, when he went to the Security Department his arm was tied and he was in pain, which (in conjunction with the possible time of infliction of the injuries according to the hospital's certificate) leads to the conclusion that they had been caused under unspecified circumstances before he voluntarily went to the Security Department at 12.40 a.m. that day.

66. According to the correspondence kept in our Service, none of the said Romanies filed a complaint against police officers.

3. Observations of the Special Rapporteur

67. The Special Rapporteur thanks the Greek authorities for their replies. He recommends that the police forces continue to avoid resorting to the undue use of force when making arrests. He also suggests that, whenever possible, mediation should be used to solve the problems arising from the proximity of the Roma and other Greek populations. The Government could initiate a dialogue with the representative of the Roma community on ways in which the Roma can establish social harmony with their compatriots

E. Guyana

1. Communication dated 31 October 2002

68. It has been reported that the social and political life in Guyana is marked by constant ethnic tensions between the Indo-Guyanese and the Afro-Guyanese populations.

69. There is a perception in the Afro-Guyanese community that the Indo-Guyanese community has benefited financially and politically in the country at their expense. Furthermore, the lack of confidence between the two communities is allegedly attributed to the constant fear and palpable threat of violent crimes and racially motivated police brutality. Violent crime, including harassment, beating and robbery of Indo-Guyanese, are perpetrated predominantly by members of the Afro-Guyanese population and in many cases also originate from persistent opposition and street protests. The Afro-Guyanese population alleges widespread discrimination against them in politics, education, employment and housing and extrajudicial killings by the police.

70. The racialization of national politics is allegedly translated into the political sphere and the division of the electorate along racial lines, with Afro-Guyanese giving their allegiance mostly to the Congress/Reform (PNC/R) and Indo-Guyanese supporting mainly the People's Progressive party/Civic and the People's National (PPP/C).

71. In April 2001, after his election, President Bharrat Jagdeo, who is the leader of PNC/R, met Mr. Desmond Hoyte the leader of the People's National Congress/Reform (PNC/R) and they committed themselves to working to reduce ethnic tension and social unrest. However, these commitments failed to bear any fruit, as the outbreak of violent crime continued, killing several people, including eight policemen.

72. The most recent manifestation of this racial cleavage occurred on 3 July 2002, when several demonstrators, including supporters of PNC/R, broke through the gates of the Presidential complex, overturned and burned several cars, and torched and looted nearby stores. Police shot and wounded about 8 of the protesters and arrested 17, including 2 of the alleged leaders. The President's Office blamed the attack on the opposition party, describing it as an attempt to assassinate the President and topple the Government.

2. Response of the Government of Guyana

73. In a letter dated 3 December 2002, the Permanent Representative of Guyana to the United Nations indicated that the letter of the Special Rapporteur was only received on 25 November 2002 and that his Government will be responding as soon as possible.

3. Observation by the Special Rapporteur

74. The Special Rapporteur is looking forward to the response of the Government of Guyana, which will be reflected in his next report to the Commission.

F. United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

1. Joint communication of 13 September 2002, sent together with the Special Rapporteur on the question of torture

75. **Zahid Mubarek** was reportedly beaten to death with a table leg by his cellmate, Robert Stewart, in Feltham Young Offenders Institution and Remand Centre, Middlesex, in March 2000. Robert Stewart was said to have been convicted of murder later in the year. An internal prison service investigation into this murder is believed to have identified a number of management failures and other major problems affecting Feltham. It is also reported that this investigation concluded that the establishment was institutionally racist. The management was reportedly aware of racist abuse against both staff and inmates belonging to ethnic minorities and of the measures which it should take to address the problem, but failed to take action. According to the information received, Zahid Mubarek was indeed placed in the same cell as Robert Stewart, even though prison officers were, or should have been, aware of Robert Stewart's racial prejudices and violent behaviour. Robert Stewart was on remand charged under the Harassment Act with sending racially motivated malicious communications, including a letter in which he stated that he would consider killing his cellmate in order to get "shipped out" if he did not get bail when he appeared in court on 7 February. On 5 October 2001, the High Court is said to have ruled that the Home Office should initiate a public and independent investigation into the failures which led to the death of Zahid Mubarek. The judge is reported to have stated that, as there would not be an inquest into the death of Zahid Mubarek, the obligation to hold an effective and thorough investigation could only be met by holding a public and independent investigation with the family legally represented, with disclosure to the family's representatives of relevant documents and with the right to cross-examine the principal witnesses. The Home Office reportedly decided to appeal against the ruling, maintaining that there were sufficient investigations into the killing in connection with the trial of Robert Stewart and through the internal prison service investigation mentioned above. In March 2002, the Court of Appeal ruled that a public inquiry was not necessary. The Court of Appeal judges said that it had already been established that the prison service was at fault, an inquiry into this had been held and the family invited to be involved; that the cause of death had been established by Robert Stewart's conviction for murder; and that there was no basis for prosecuting any member of the prison service. They also added that there were no "factual unknowns" which would impede the family from bringing a claim in the civil courts for damages. The family of Zahid Mubarek were reportedly planning to appeal to the House of Lords.

2. Response of the Government of the United Kingdom

76. On 18 November 2002, the Home Office of the Government of the United Kingdom responded to the joint allegation stating that "this was a wicked crime which occurred while Zahid was in the care of the Prison Service. He and his family had a right to expect he would be looked after safely, but the Prison Service failed to do so".

77. Since the tragic death of Zahid, a number of measures have been introduced to ensure that such a tragedy does not reoccur. These include the introduction at Feltham of procedures for risk assessments for cell-sharing. These were initially trialled at Feltham and introduced nationally in June 2002. In addition, an improved health-care screening process is being introduced to better identify prisoners with serious physical and mental health problems. Procedures are also being developed to ensure a better exchange of information between Prison Service and external agencies when a prisoner comes into custody.

78. The Director-General of the Prison Service has admitted that the Prison Service is institutionally racist and is determined to rid the Service of all forms of racism. He is also determined to eradicate discrimination in the treatment of prisoners. Much progress has been made since Zahid's death. Meanwhile an investigation into race relations within the Prison Service, which has been under way for almost two years, is now nearing completion.

Zahid Mubarek

79. While the summary of the allegations as set out in the annex to the letter of the Special Rapporteurs are broadly accurate, the facts of the tragic incident are as follows:

- On 21 March 2000, at approximately 3.35 a.m., a call alarm was activated in the Swallow Unit at HM Young Offenders Institute and Remand Centre Feltham. On attending, the officer on duty saw that one of the occupants, Zahid Mubarek, was lying in bed badly injured. The other occupant, Robert Stewart, had a stick in his hand that looked like a table leg. The scene confronting staff suggested that Zahid had been badly beaten around the head with this table leg;
- Staff arrived on the scene, including health-care staff who administered first aid to Zahid. Although his injuries were extensive, he was still breathing and not bleeding heavily. Staff continued to administer first aid until the paramedics arrived. Zahid was then taken to Ashford General Hospital at 4.36 a.m. and was later transferred to Charing Cross Hospital. Tragically, he died on 28 March 2000 as a result of the injuries sustained.

80. The following circumstances should be taken into account when assessing the implications of this allegation:

- The assertion that staff knew that Robert Stewart was racist is not totally correct. Neither the warrants of the court nor the list of Mr. Stewart's pre-convictions provide any evidence to suggest that he was a racist. Although it has since been suggested that the harassment offence for which he was remanded in custody was racially

motivated the only indication that this might be the case is a production order served at HM Prison Altcourse in November 1999 where it recorded that Robert Stewart was a suspect in an allegation of racially motivated malicious communication and harassment. There was no mention of any racial motivation on the subsequent court warrants;

- No other evidence that Robert Stewart exhibited racist behaviour towards prisoners or staff during his time at Feltham was found. He shared a double cell with Zahid Mubarek from 8 February onwards with no apparent problems until the tragic event of 21 March. During this time, Zahid made no complaints against his cellmate nor did he request to move cells.

Present status of any uncompleted investigation

81. The Director-General of the Prison Service, Martin Narey, also asked the Commission for Racial Equality in November 2000 to consider the circumstances leading to this death as part of its wider-ranging investigation into racism in the Prison Service. This investigation is now nearing completion.

Compensation

82. Compensation of £20,000 was offered to the family of Zahid Mubarek in September 2001. They have not yet responded formally to this offer.

Any other information/observations

83. The investigation highlighted a number of areas at the prison where improvements were necessary. In all, it made 26 recommendations addressing areas such as screening on reception, and the availability and scrutiny of medical records; protection from harassment procedures; policy and procedures for reading and stopping mail; the availability of security information files from previous establishments; security, reception and Duty Governor training; and the searching strategy. Of these 26 recommendations, all but one have been implemented in full. The outstanding recommendation concerned the provision of a single "stopped letter" register to each wing. This was felt to be unworkable and a single register had been provided for the entire establishment.

84. The part of the investigation on racist behaviour led to the conclusion that Feltham was institutionally racist. This conclusion was based on the fact that there was clear evidence of a lack of understanding of racism and race relations amongst staff as well as including the suggestion that a minority of staff did behave in a racist manner to their colleagues and to prisoners.

85. It should be noted that, following her inspection of Feltham in January 2002, the outcome of which was published on 15 October 2002, Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Prisons was very positive about improvements at Feltham in general, and about race relations in particular. She

noted that “the Governor and his staff has shown major commitments to good race relations” and commended “the very considerable efforts that were demonstrated in a wide range of initiatives across the whole of the establishment”.

3. Observations of the Special Rapporteur

86. The Special Rapporteur would like to thank the Government of the United Kingdom for the detailed response to his communication. The Special Rapporteur welcomes the numerous measures put in place, both at Feltham and at the national level, since the tragic murder of Zahid Mubarek, to ensure that such atrocities do not reoccur in the future. Furthermore, the Special Rapporteur considers that the grave recognition that the Prison Service is institutionally racist leaves the authorities with a critical responsibility to combat, as a matter of urgency, all aspects of racism in this environment. In this connection, the Special Rapporteur would greatly appreciate receiving the findings of the investigation into racism in the Prison Service upon its completion by the Commission for Racial Equality. The response of the Government of the United Kingdom refers to the fact that the Director General is “determined to rid the Service of all forms of racism” and that considerable efforts have already been made to improve race relations in Feltham. The Special Rapporteur would welcome receiving more information on these efforts and the concrete measures which have been put into practice to address the problem of racism.
