

REDRESS

Seeking Reparation for Torture Survivors

reparation news

WINTER 2009



Dear Friends,

Welcome to REDRESS' Winter 2009 edition of Reparation News.

Inside, our legal advisers talk about the impact of recent political events on REDRESS' work and the fight against torture. With President Obama's commitment to close the detention centre at Guantanamo Bay, what will happen now to the detainees? Can justice now be served? We also consider the human rights situation in Zimbabwe and our Sudanese partner describes the daily challenges – and rewards – of advocating for criminal law reform.

We were delighted that the UK Torture (Damages) Bill received its First Reading in both Houses of Parliament during this new parliamentary session. Thank you to all our supporters who have campaigned for the Bill so far.

REDRESS continues to support an increasing number of survivors, such as Necati from Turkey and Luis from Peru, described above on pages 4 and 5, reminding us of the harsh reality of torture being practiced all over the world, every day.

Thank you to all our supporters for your help.

Best wishes

Carla Ferstman
Director

We hope you like the Newsletter's new format. We are grateful to Allen & Overy's Creative Team who provided pro bono support to design the Newsletter.

CONTENTS

Prosecution of War Crimes Suspects in Europe	1
Obama – Future of Guantanamo Detainees	2
Reparations for Survivors in Nepal	3
Latest on the UK Torture (Damages) Bill	3
Torture and Discrimination in Peru: The Case of Luis Alberto	4
Law Reform in Sudan – Ishragha Adam explains how	5
Tortured in Greece: A Survivor tells his Story	5
Human Rights Activists Targeted in Zimbabwe	6
Get Involved!	7

Prosecution of War Crimes Suspects in Europe

REDRESS has just completed year one of a three year project to end safe havens in Europe for suspects of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and torture. The EC funded project is being implemented in partnership with FIDH. Jürgen Schurr, the project coordinator, describes some of the successes, and challenges so far:

There are many international crime suspects in all parts of Europe. Some have been granted refugee status, others are on work or other temporary permits or have some other type of status. Governments are getting better at tracking these individuals but the key challenge is trying to ensure that the crimes are fully investigated, and where sufficient evidence exists, that they are prosecuted. International law allows countries to prosecute individuals for international crimes, even if those crimes were perpetrated elsewhere. Sometimes this can be the only way that justice is served, particularly when it is not possible for the individuals to be prosecuted in the place where the crimes were committed.

Several EU countries, including Denmark, The Netherlands and Sweden, have dedicated personnel and specialised war crimes units within their immigration, police and prosecution services, committed to identifying, investigating and prosecuting suspects of such serious international crimes. In November 2008, REDRESS and FIDH organised an expert seminar in Brussels on the establishment of specialised war crimes units. It was attended by over 40 representatives from Ministries of Justice, immigration services, police and other law enforcement bodies across Europe and Canada. Countries including Belgium, Denmark, The Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and Canada, which already have specialised war crimes units, shared their experiences of the successes and functioning of the units. The value of having specialised war crime units is clear: with the exception of two cases where private parties played a leading role, all convictions for serious international crimes in universal jurisdiction cases have been handled by these specialised units.

REDRESS and FIDH are also working closely with the 'EU network of contact points in respect of persons responsible for genocide and crimes against humanity'.

The Network, formed by the EU in 2002, includes contact points for war crimes within the police and justice systems of each Member State. Following discussions at the EU Network, Interpol organised the first international training course for investigators of serious international crimes. Held on 19-23rd January 2009, REDRESS and FIDH provided training at Interpol's Headquarters in Lyon, France on cooperation between NGOs and law enforcement authorities to 60 police and investigators from all over the world.


Engaging with officials in conferences and trainings such as these provides an important opportunity for REDRESS to ensure that survivors' perspectives and experiences are considered and their concerns are taken seriously by investigators and policy makers alike.

Based on our research on suspects and interviews with survivors, REDRESS has provided substantial information to law enforcement authorities in European countries on suspects currently residing in Europe. This has already resulted in the arrests of several Rwandan genocide suspects in Europe.

Despite this progress, there are still many challenges to ensuring that perpetrators of these horrific crimes are brought to justice. Even when suspects living in Europe are identified, states may not have the legislation in place to allow prosecutions. In the UK, for example, four Rwandan genocide suspects are currently waiting to hear if their appeal against extradition to Rwanda will be successful. They say they would not face a fair trial in Rwanda, but if the Courts fail to extradite them, it is unlikely that they will be prosecuted in the UK as the UK does not have the legislation to prosecute suspects for the 1994 genocide. In some cases, suspects have been deported from Europe but have escaped prosecution back home. In July 2008, for example, Colonel Karuna, suspected of war crimes in Sri Lanka, was deported from the UK back to Sri Lanka. Yet, in Sri Lanka he faces no prosecution and continues to play an active role in the country's politics.

Universal Jurisdiction

All states have an obligation under international law to ensure that suspects of serious international crimes face justice, wherever these crimes took place. This 'universal jurisdiction' means that countries must either take steps to investigate and prosecute suspects residing in their country or, extradite them to a country where they can be tried. Although all EU states have legislation in place for universal jurisdiction, putting this into practice varies greatly throughout Europe.



© Interpol

Obama – Future of Guantanamo Detainees

REDRESS' Legal Advisers, Lorna McGregor and Kevin Laue, have been working on access to justice and reparation for victims tortured and ill-treated as a result of counter-terrorism measures. Here, they give their opinions on what may change with the new Obama administration.

The Obama administration has said that it intends to close down Guantanamo Bay – what do you think about this?

All human rights activists have undoubtedly welcomed this development. The creation of Guantanamo Bay led to many serious human rights violations, including torture, and the sooner it is closed the better. These violations involved not only what happened to people once they got to Guantanamo Bay, but also the torture involved in and during their kidnapping and rendition from numerous parts of the world. The whole Military Commissions trial system was also misguided and unfair, including the risk that evidence obtained under torture would be used against accused persons.

What do you predict will happen to the prisoners of Guantanamo, especially those who have been tortured and ill-treated?

It seems clear that many detainees can be safely returned either to their state of nationality or, to a third country where they previously had the right to reside either as a refugee or on some other basis. Those who cannot be returned in that way should be allowed to live either in the US or some other democratic state where they will be safe. Wherever they are sent it is important that those who have been tortured or ill-treated are afforded reparations, which would include proper medical and psychological rehabilitation as well as access to justice for compensation. And, of course, nobody should be sent to a state where there is a risk of further torture or ill-treatment.

What access to justice will the detainees who have suffered torture and ill-treatment have? What remedies are available to them and what are the chances of them seeking, and receiving, reparation?

In terms of international law all those who have suffered torture or ill-treatment are entitled to full reparation. *All of them have a right against the US Government as the prime state responsible. In addition, where other states have been involved in their rendition or their interrogation either in Guantanamo Bay or other parts of the world, such other states too can be held responsible.* Some former detainees have already tried to bring legal cases against US officials and aviation companies in US courts, but they have been blocked by 'the State Secrets Doctrine' and the courts have refused to grant them access to justice. Another problem is state immunity which makes it difficult for former detainees to sue the US in courts outside of the US. They may have a better chance of seeking remedies against other states which were involved in their rendition, so long as they are

actually living in one of those states with a proper legal system. REDRESS has submitted legal briefs in the US courts arguing that the State Secrets Doctrine cannot be used as a barrier to access justice in the US courts. REDRESS is also of the view that international law does not permit courts to recognise state immunity as a barrier to reparations in torture cases.

Will closure of Guantanamo prevent torture and ill-treatment of terrorist suspects held in detention in the future or, is there a risk that suspects will be taken to and tortured in other lesser known detention centres?

It is certainly true that Guantanamo Bay is the place that everybody knows about and there is a danger that once it is closed the pressure will be eased, which in turn might lead to the (similar) practice continuing in a less well known manner. It is already quite widely accepted (and indeed former-President Bush admitted this) that there are secret or semi-secret places, including in Afghanistan but not only there, where the US has held people. All of these places should be closed and the practice of rendition and secret detention should be abandoned quickly and completely.

What else will the Obama administration bring in countering impunity for torture?

As already mentioned, the US should stop using 'the State Secrets Doctrine' as a barrier against those who want to bring legal cases in the US. It should also not wait for ex-detainees, wherever they are or will be, to try to bring legal claims but should investigate what happened to each and every one of them and afford them proper reparation. Where other states were involved, the US should take steps to encourage these states to investigate and make reparations on the basis of those states' own responsibility for torture. Finally, the US should set up an independent enquiry into how it came about that torture was practiced and if necessary there should be criminal prosecutions of those responsible, including those who devised the rendition programme and ordered it to take place; not just those who carried it out. Institutional safeguards must be set in place so these things can never happen again.

Is there anything you predict we should brace ourselves for or, do you think Obama will improve the US' record in promoting and protecting the absolute prohibition of torture?

A further step which the US should take if it wants to be seen as a leader of international human rights is to ratify the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC) and to strongly support the ICC in its work. Doing this would send a clear message to other powerful states, who to date have refused to acknowledge the ICC, such as China, that international crimes and violations of human rights are unacceptable, will not go unpunished, and victims will be given justice.

Reparations for Survivors in Nepal



Police on guard at the heavily fortified Hanuman Dhoka police station in the heart of Kathmandu. The station is notorious for the widespread practice of torture, including of juveniles.
© Robert Godden

REDRESS is working in partnership with 'Advocacy Forum', a leading human rights NGO in Nepal, to reduce incidents of torture in Nepal and to improve torture survivors' ability to access justice and obtain reparation for what they have suffered. Lucy Moxham, REDRESS' caseworker, talks about her upcoming visit to Kathmandu.

Who is Advocacy Forum?

AF, which will take the lead on the project, was established in 2001 and is

based in Nepal's capital Kathmandu with a network of offices throughout Nepal. It works to combat impunity for human rights violations by documenting such abuses, bringing legal cases against perpetrators and monitoring detention centres.

Is torture still common in Nepal?

Torture and other forms of ill-treatment were systematically practiced in Nepal during the People's War 1996-2006. Since then, the occurrence of torture by the security forces and the Maoists has reduced but, torture remains common, especially in police custody. For example, between January-September 2008, 760 (24.6%) of the 3,095 detainees, including juveniles, interviewed by AF in 15 districts, claimed that they had been tortured or ill-treated.

What is the current political situation in Nepal?

Nepal is a country embarking on post-conflict transition. A Comprehensive Peace Agreement was signed in November 2006 and provided for the establishment of a Truth & Reconciliation Commission and a Disappearances Commission. Constituent Assembly elections were held in April 2008, and the Assembly is tasked with writing a new Constitution for Nepal. In May 2008, Nepal's long-standing monarchy was abolished and Nepal was declared a republic. Despite these significant steps, concrete implementation of many of the commitments made by the political parties are yet to be seen, and tensions among the political parties risk endangering the completion of the peace process and the drafting of a new Constitution.

How are AF and REDRESS helping survivors to obtain justice?

AF is conducting regular visits to detention centres in Nepal to document incidents of torture. REDRESS is working with AF to submit specific cases to the UN Human Rights Committee, and co-facilitating training for lawyers and doctors to improve the quality of medico-legal reports in Nepal.

How is AF ensuring that victims have a voice?

AF is assisting victims to bring their claims to court. More widely, AF is aiming to support victims' groups to advocate for truth and justice in relation to past and ongoing human rights violations, and to campaign for changes to laws and policies.

Any challenges?

Victims' and torture survivors' awareness of their rights in Nepal is very low. Torture is perceived as 'normal' in many sectors of society. Due to a lack of witness and victim protection mechanisms, those victims who do bring a case are often intimidated into withdrawing. In this way, impunity for torture, committed both during and after the conflict, persists in Nepal.

Successes so far?

In October 2008, the UN Human Rights Committee decided the case of Surya Prasad Sharma v. Nepal. The Committee directed Nepal to thoroughly investigate the incommunicado detention and subsequent disappearance of Mr. Sharma by army personnel after his arrest in January 2002, and to provide an effective and enforceable remedy within 180 days. AF and REDRESS hope the decision in Sharma, the first decision against Nepal by the UN Human Rights Committee, will help in the fight against impunity for enforced disappearances.

Read Lucy's Blog www.redressinnepal.blogspot.com
For further information on AF, go to www.advocacyforum.org

Latest on the UK Torture (Damages) Bill

REDRESS would like to say a very big thank you to all our supporters who campaigned for the Torture (Damages) Bill in the last Parliamentary Session.

The Torture (Damages) Bill, if passed, would allow torture survivors in the UK to seek justice against their perpetrators in the UK courts: justice previously denied to them.

For the first time ever, the Bill successfully passed all stages in the House of Lords and had a First Reading in the House of Commons on 14th November. However, the parliamentary year then ended before the Bill could progress any further.

With the start of the 2008-09 parliamentary session the Bill begins its journey again. The Bill has already successfully passed its First Reading in the House of Lords on 14th January 2009, where it was introduced by Lord Archer of Sandwell QC, and has also had its First Reading in the House of Commons on 26th January 2009, introduced by Andrew Dismore MP.

Lucy Moxham, REDRESS' Legal Caseworker campaigning for the Bill said, 'We were delighted that the Bill progressed so far last year. It gives us renewed purpose to campaign



Keith Carmichael, REDRESS Founder, Carla Ferstman, REDRESS Director and Lord Peter Archer of Sandwell
© Caroline Thomas

even harder this year and we urge our supporters to join us. It has been too long that survivors have had to wait for justice in UK Courts.'

To find out how you can support the Torture (Damages) Bill, and for further information on the Bill go to: http://www.redress.org/torture_bill.html

Torture and Discrimination in Peru: The Case of Luis Alberto

By Victor Alvarez, Isabel Marín and Clara Sandoval

Peru began its transition to democracy in 2000. At the time, it was believed that the country had said never again to torture, disappearances and arbitrary killings. Before the transition, between 1983 and 1997, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (2003) reported that 4,625 cases of torture took place in a systematic manner in Peru by State agents. Today, nine years later, the cases litigated by the Coordinadora Nacional de Derechos humanos (CNDDH) and the Centro de Promoción y Defensa de los Derechos Sexuales y Reproductivos (PROMSEX), with the legal advice of REDRESS, corroborate that torture continues to be practiced and tolerated by State authorities. Moreover, particular groups of people such as homosexuals and rural workers have become the main targets of this practice.

Such targeted practice only indicates that discrimination continues to be a ground to justify torture despite the process of transition. This is well illustrated in the case of Luis Alberto, a poor rural worker and homosexual, living in a small village, near Casagrande (Trujillo). On the night of 25th February 2008, he was detained by the gendarmerie of Serenazgo and the National Police. He was not informed of the reasons for his detention and was taken to the local police station where he was kept under incommunicado detention for four hours, and raped by four different police agents, who forced a rod into his anus to punish him for his sexual orientation. Then he was released.

His case also exemplifies the discriminatory practices of Peru's justice system. Indeed, the actions before the justice system were not thorough, effective or carried out within a reasonable period of time, all because of the prejudices against homosexuals. When Luis Alberto approached the authorities, they refused to register his complaint on several

opportunities, as a result of which his case was taken to the press. Finally, his complaint was filed but the investigation was not thorough. In fact, his medical examination, a very important piece of evidence in such situations, only took place four days after his complaint was filed, and when doctors were carrying it out, the prosecutor entered the room to exert pressure on the doctors.

Equally, when the prosecutors had to assess the evidence in the case, they openly stated that they did not believe him, concluding that torture and rape did not take place. They argued that if Luis Alberto was raped, he was raped by other people during the days following his release. They alleged that, most probably, Luis Alberto was making up the story to seek revenge from the police who had implicated his two brothers in a homicide case. The Prosecutors and Judge considered that the case should be dismissed. Luis Alberto's lawyers have appealed this decision.

His allegations of torture have not been taken seriously because the prosecutors in charge of the case made evident their lack of understanding of Peru's international obligations under treaties such as the American Convention to Prevent and Punish Torture and the UN Convention against Torture, but also of domestic law. Equally, by treating the case in an unjustifiable manner, they showed their prejudices against homosexuals, legitimating in that way rape as a form to punish them.

Luis Alberto should have had access to an effective remedy before the justice system, capable of producing a thorough investigation into the facts of his case in order to identify those who tortured him and to punish them according to both national and international law. REDRESS is currently advising CNDDH and PROMSEX on the litigation of this case at the domestic level and is considering venues to pursue the case at the international level.

REDRESS is working in partnership with CNDDH, to seek justice and reparations for torture survivors in Peru. This is part of a three year, EC funded programme to monitor and enforce the UN Basic Principles and Guidelines on the Right to a Remedy and Reparation. The programme is being implemented in five countries: Peru, Russia, Sri Lanka, Sudan and Uganda.

Law Reform in Sudan – Ishragha Adam explains how



Ishragha Adam, project coordinator in Sudan
© REDRESS

REDRESS is working closely with the Khartoum Centre for Human Rights and Environmental Development and other civil society groups in Sudan, to advocate for Sudan's criminal law to adhere to Sudan's Bill of Rights and international human rights standards. Ishragha Adam, a Sudanese lawyer, co-ordinates the project in Khartoum.

The project has identified the reform of Sudan's rape law as a priority. Why?

Sudan's criminal law does not protect individuals against rape and sexual violence nor does it enable effective investigations and prosecutions. In fact, it exposes victims to further investigation. Legal action is more likely to be taken against those who report rape, rather than those who commit it.

Since 2005, there has been a significant change in the political climate in Sudan. The National Constitution and the Comprehensive Peace Agreement promote and protect human rights. The likelihood of reforming law is higher now than at any other point in Sudan's history. It is vital to take advantage of this political moment to advocate for policy change and law reform.

What changes in Sudan's rape law is the project calling for?

We want to see legislation that deals effectively with rape and sexual violence. We believe that the definition of rape should be separated from adultery and should be broader to include oral penetration and where other objects are used. Rather than focusing on a victim's "absence of consent", we believe emphasis should be on examination of the perpetrator's use of force or coercion. There should be minimum sentences of between five years and life imprisonment for perpetrators and impunity provisions should be removed.

What are the main challenges for civil society to advocate for such reforms?

The lack of transparent systems for law reform makes it difficult for civil society to engage with the right policy makers at opportune times. Civil society itself is also weak and lacks the resources or knowledge, for example on international standards, to effectively advocate. A key component of the project has been to build a network of NGOs working on these issues, so as to create a stronger voice for law reform and to provide training and support for them.

What do you enjoy most about the project and your role?

I think the project's focus on criminal law reform is much needed. It has been truly exciting to work in an area

that impacts on the law so directly and I am proud to be contributing what I can. Each of the project's law reform issues – and the people working on them – are creating and supporting a greater effort for improved criminal law reform in Sudan. I enjoy the opportunity to influence the way stakeholders and civil society think about their impact in law reform. I also enjoy working with the team, a group of talented, driven and thoughtful people who work hard every day to ensure that these issues are well considered.

What have you learnt as a result of the project so far?

I have experienced first-hand how long and difficult the reform process can be. There are so many obstacles in the political, legal, social and economic levels. Even with the compelling and well-supported arguments for reform that we advocate, it takes an enormous amount of effort and time to see things change.

For updates on Sudan's criminal law reform, sign up to our listserv. criminal_law_reform_in_sudan-subscribe@yahoogroups.com

In November 2008, REDRESS published: 'Time for Change: Reforming Sudan's Legislation on Rape and Sexual Violence' <http://www.redress.org/reports/Position%20Paper%20Rape.pdf>

This four year project is being funded by the UK Department for International Development.

Tortured in Greece: A Survivor Tells His Story

Necati Zontul fled his native Turkey by boat in 2001. His boat capsized off the Coast of Greece, and Greek Coastguard took him and the group of 160 migrants on his boat, onshore. They were then detained in a makeshift detention centre in Chania, Crete.



Necati Zontul, outside the UK Houses of Parliament

The detainees were beaten by the Coastguard, but Zontul was singled out for special treatment. Two officers raped Zontul with a truncheon, causing him excruciating pain, deep embarrassment and lasting problems. He believes he was singled out because of his sexual orientation.

Ever since the incident, Zontul has been trying to seek justice for what happened to him. Criminal investigations were opened in Greece against five coastguards on charges of offences against human dignity. Two of the Coastguards were eventually convicted, however, the Court saw fit to reduce the penalty to 6 months imprisonment for 'mitigating circumstances' without hearing from Necati or taking into account the continuing impact of the offence on him. The Court further suspended this term for three years, and converted the term, if the suspended sentence were to be lifted, to a small fine.

REDRESS has been helping Necati to demonstrate to Greek authorities that the sentence is just not enough. We have filed an application to the European Court of Human Rights on Necati's behalf, in which we argue that Greek Courts failed to treat what happened to Necati with the

due seriousness that the circumstances require. Despite the extensive pronouncements of international law on the definition of torture, the Greek Court's failed to characterise what happened to Necati as torture because, [they held] "torture presupposes a repetitive and durable physical pain." REDRESS has argued that this definition of torture is far too limiting and does not accord with international law. REDRESS has also argued that the penalty applied against the Coastguard was manifestly disproportionate with the gravity of what happened.

REDRESS represents many survivors like Necati in all parts of the world. At present it has about 50 active case files relating to about 800 torture survivors. More information on our casework programme can be found on our website at: http://www.redress.org/casework_and_other_submissions.html.

Human Rights Activists Targeted in Zimbabwe

By Kevin Laue, REDRESS Legal Advisor and a founder of Zimbabwe Lawyers for Human Rights

The past year has been a particularly bad one for Zimbabweans who have faced an ever-deepening and multi-faceted economic, humanitarian and human rights crisis. Difficult as it is to imagine that things could get worse, they have indeed sharply deteriorated in the last two months with the complete collapse of the Zimbabwe dollar and the widespread outbreak of cholera on top of yet another upsurge in torture of civil and political activists, and journalists.

Torture in Zimbabwe was common before independence in 1980 and the practice continued thereafter. Since 2000 a pattern emerged of a clear increase in the use of torture before elections, particularly of opposition Movement for Democratic Change (MDC) supporters and activists. The MDC President himself was detained and tortured with other political leaders in 2007.

However, late 2008 saw a fresh round of abductions, including that of leading human rights defender Jestina Mukoko, head of the Zimbabwe Peace Project (ZPP). The ZPP is one of the organisations specifically monitoring torture, extra-judicial killings and other forms of organised political violence. In the early hours of 3rd December 2008, Mrs Mukoko was forced from her home at gunpoint, in front of her family, by unknown persons in unmarked vehicles. She disappeared for some three weeks. The police denied in writing and before the courts that they knew anything about the matter, and yet just before Christmas they produced her. Although there is credible evidence that Mrs Mukoko was tortured, the full extent is not clear as she remains in custody and the authorities have refused to allow private doctors to properly examine and treat her.

Jestina Mukoko is not the only person who has been targeted since the power-sharing agreement between the MDC and the ruling Zanu-PF party was signed in mid-September. In the last couple of months the authorities have abducted around 30 civil and political activists, many of whom are still missing. All those who have been

brought to court have alleged a variety of forms of torture, including beatings, falanga and near-drowning. Prior to this latest upsurge the period between the March and the re-run June presidential elections also saw a massive increase in government-directed violence aimed at those who had dared to give the MDC support – the majority of the population. This included the widespread use of torture, extra-judicial murders and destruction of property; hundreds were killed and tens of thousand internally displaced; huge numbers continue to stream into South Africa seeking refuge.

With the now complete breakdown of the rule of law there are no clear ways to prevent further gross violations of human rights, and to obtain reparations for victims. Even the sporadic relief the courts used to give has now ended, and in any event the authorities have long since stopped paying attention to court orders. There are still human rights activists who are endeavouring to record, and where possible treat, torture victims. Such a record can be used when a semblance of democracy is ultimately established, for a deeper assessment of the extent of violations, including the judiciary's abdication of its responsibilities, with the aim of seeking some degree of proper justice for victims.

Any future dispensation needs to include clear mechanisms for bringing the perpetrators to account, many of whom have been identified. Indeed, it is because of such monitoring by organisations such as the ZPP that Jestina Mukoko was targeted. One of the key perpetrators, security minister Didymus Mutasa, admitted in court that his agents abducted Mrs Mukoko, but said their identities should not be revealed as this would prejudice national security. The judge agreed.

Unless South Africa forces Mugabe to step down, which it could quickly do by withdrawing its support within the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and the African Union, torture in Zimbabwe will escalate.



Protesters outside the Zimbabwean Embassy in London
© REDRESS

Get Involved!

2009 London Marathon

Do you have your own place in the Flora London Marathon on 26th April 2009? Join REDRESS' team and we will support you all the way. There is no minimum fundraising target – every contribution makes a difference.

This year REDRESS has five Golden Bond runners in the marathon, who have each pledged to raise £1,200 for REDRESS. We wish them all the best of luck! You can sponsor Adrian Hicks, Francis Fitzgibbon, Katie Wepplo, Louise Jackson and Nick Goulds by going to www.justgiving.com.

British London 10K



Our 2008 British London 10K team
© REDRESS

If the Marathon sounds too far, then join us in the Asics British 10K London Run on 12th July 2009. REDRESS now has places available!

To take part in our events, email: events@redress.org or call 020 7793 1777.

Mixt Nutz Comedy Night



Smiles all round at the Comedy Night
© REDRESS

On 18th December 2008, Mixt Nutz devoted one of their weekly comedy nights to REDRESS. The show was held in The Tabard Pub, West London and it was a great success. The room was packed and the five comedians and MC kept everyone laughing. The headline act, Imran Yousef, was a show stealer as he came bounding on stage shocking us to hysterics

while forcing us to question our attitudes of other people and the impact these have. An appropriate end to the show. REDRESS is very grateful to Mixt Nutz for hosting the evening and to everyone who came to the show and gave generously. Stay tuned for future events!

Latest Publications

REDRESS' publications are available to view at <http://www.redress.org/reports.html> or, for hard copies please email dikey@redress.org.

- The United Kingdom, Torture and Anti-Terrorism: Where the problems lie (Dec 2008)
- Victims and the ICC: Still room for improvement (Nov 2008)
- Time For Change - Reforming Sudan's Legislation on Rape and Sexual Violence (Nov 2008)
- Survivors and Post-Genocide Justice in Rwanda (Nov 2008)
- Extraditing Genocide Suspects from Europe to Rwanda - Issues and Challenges (Sept 2008)

Join REDRESS' Facebook Page!

facebook

You can now keep in contact with REDRESS and show your support by joining our Facebook page. Search 'REDRESS' to join us.



REDRESS' interns
© Caroline Thomas

Key contact details

REDRESS
87 Vauxhall Walk, London SE11 5HJ
Tel: +44 (0)20 7793 1777
info@redress.org
www.redress.org
UK Registered Charity 1015787