Turkey's Anti-Terror Laws: Threatening the Protection of Human Rights

KHRP Briefing Paper Last Updated: 11/08/08

SUMMARY

In June 2006, Turkey amended its anti-terror laws and enacted a series of draconian provisions which fail to meet its human rights obligations under international law and have in practice been used to violate the human rights of its citizens. In common with anti-terror laws in other states, the amendments were enacted in response to an "escalation of terrorism" and are therefore aimed at addressing a security agenda rather than protecting individual rights and freedoms. Although Turkey's aim of maintaining national security is understandable, protecting the nation need not and indeed should not come at the expense of the fundamental human rights that it has promised to uphold as a signatory to international treaties. In particular, the new law fails to respect these treaties by containing a definition of terrorism which is too wide and vague, by increasing the range of crimes that can count as terrorist offences, and by posing a serious threat to the freedoms of expression and association, the right to a fair trial, and the prohibition of torture. It is important to note that this new Turkish legislation has emerged in an international context in which governments around the world have increasingly shown themselves willing to put security considerations before the protection of human rights.

Human rights defenders in Turkey today face far fewer extrajudicial killings and direct violations of the right to life than during the 1980s and 1990s. Nonetheless, the human rights situation has deteriorated since 2005, particularly in relation to freedom of expression and association, fundamental tenets of any democracy. Turkey's anti-terror laws will only serve to further this deterioration, and should therefore be amended.

CONTENTS

Introduction	3
An unacceptably broad definition of terrorism	4
Restrictions on freedom of thought, expression, communication and the press	5
Threats to freedoms of belief and conscience, assembly, association and the right to protest	7
Jeopardising the prohibition of torture and obstructing the rule of law	8
The influence of laws in other jurisdictions	10
Recommendations to the Government of Turkey, the European Union and the Council of Europe	14

INTRODUCTION

In June 2006, Turkey adopted new antiterror laws amending the Law on the Fight against Terrorism (Act 3713), which 1991.1 was first passed in The amendments were purportedly enacted in response to heightened security concerns. But their worrying effects have included allowing for the hindering of freedom of expression and association, and the interruption of legal civil and political events. They have been used to prosecute and harass national minority groups, members of the media, students, human rights defenders and political dissidents who are not in any way linked to terrorism.² The legislation has been applied arbitrarily by judges and has resulted in protracted, burdensome and unfair trials for those accused.³

Whilst it is acknowledged that all states need to take measures to protect national security, such steps should not be at the expense of the fundamental human rights that Turkey has promised to uphold as a signatory to international treaties.

The inherent problems with the new legislation that have paved the way for violations of fundamental human rights will be examined in more detail below. The amended law will then be placed in the context of deficiencies in anti-terror legislation in other jurisdictions around the world, namely Spain and the United Finally, Kingdom. this paper conclude by offering recommendations to the Government of Turkey for steps that should be taken in order to ensure protection of human rights in the course of efforts to combat terrorism.

News Center - Istanbul, 25 September 2006.

¹ The Law on the Fight Against Terrorism was amended by Law No. 5532 on 29 June 2006. The amended legislation will be referred to throughout this briefing paper as the Anti-Terror Law.

² See, for example, KHRP FFM Report, *Reform and Regression: Freedom of the Media in Turkey* (KHRP, London, October 2007); Amnesty International, "Turkey Justice Delayed and Denied: The persistence of protracted and unfair trials for those charged under anti-terrorism legislation", http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/asset/EUR44/013/2006/en/dom-EUR440132006en.html (last accessed 30 July 2008); Erol Önderoğlu, "IHD Blames Terror Law for Recent Prosecutions", Bia

³ See KHRP Trial Observation Report, *Publishers on Trial: Freedom of Expression in Turkey in the Context of EU Accession Trial Observation Report* (KHRP, London, May 2007).

AN UNACCEPTABLY BROAD DEFINITION OF TERRORISM

The amended Anti-Terror Law maintained the pre-existent very wide definition of terrorism⁴ dramatically increased the number and range of crimes which may be considered terrorist offences, including sexual harassment and prostitution. Such a broad definition and vast classification of actions not only violates the principle of legal certainty but also leaves the law wide open to potential abuse and arbitrary application. The latter is of great concern in a state where, historically, citizens and organisations have been prosecuted simply because of their ethnicity or dissident political opinions.

⁴ Article 1 states that, "Terrorism is any kind of act done by one or more persons belonging to an organization with the aim of changing the characteristics of the Republic as specified in the Constitution, its political, legal, social, secular and economic system, damaging the indivisible unity of the State with its territory and nation,

authority of the State, eliminating fundamental rights and freedoms, or damaging the internal and external security of the State, public order or general health by means of pressure, force and violence, terror, intimidation, oppression or threat." All references in this briefing paper are based on unofficial translations.

endangering the existence of the Turkish State and

Republic, weakening or destroying or seizing the

Besides being dangerous, the wide definition included in the amended Anti-Terror Law is also redundant, since all crimes that fall under this definition are already accounted for by the Turkish Penal Code. Around sixty crimes defined in the Turkish Penal Code are replicated in the new anti-terror legislation, yet the latter imposes heavier sentences and longer imprisonment. This creates a twintrack system of justice, with fewer due process rights for certain suspects and defendants depending on the supposed motivation for their acts.

maintaining Whilst very broad а definition of terrorism by non-state agents, the law fails completely to address the concept of "state terror". In the late 1980s and 1990s, Turkish security forces forcibly evacuated and destroyed 3,500 towns and villages in the Kurdish regions of Turkey, and illegal detention, torture and extra-judicial killing were also common.⁵ Security forces still maintain a strong presence in the south-east of the country and violent conflicts between the

⁵ KHRP Report, The Internally Displaced Kurds of Turkey: Ongoing Issues of Responsibility, Redress and Resettlement (KHRP, London, September 2007).

Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) and security forces have increased in the past year. Concerns that the security situation might further deteriorate and that the Anti-Terror Law might be used to justify this state violence are all the more that the Turkish pressing, given government has also begun to pursue its anti-terror activities outside its own borders. Since October 2007, Turkey has conducted a number of major military incursions into Kurdistan, Iraq, which threaten to hinder the development of democracy and human rights reforms there.

RESTRICTIONS ON FREEDOM OF THOUGHT, EXPRESSION, COMMUNICATION AND THE PRESS

As identified above, the Anti-Terror Law contains a broad and ambiguous definition of key terms, with the result that legitimate criticism of the state or politicians may be labelled "terrorist propaganda". Punishment for this offence has been increased from fines to imprisonment of 1 to 5 years. 6 Where

members of the press or media publish "terrorist propaganda", this penalty is increased by half, representing the reintroduction of custodial sentences for the media. Such "terrorist propaganda" can include simply revealing the identities of officials engaged in counter-terrorism operations and printing declarations by terrorist organisations.

The media is further limited by the provision that periodicals whose content is found to praise crimes and criminals in framework of terrorist а organisation's activities, or which has "the quality terrorist organisation of propaganda" can be temporary closed.8 Security forces can request prosecutors shut down publications for up to one month, a concerning extension of their powers that threatens the rule of law. This new system contrasts strongly with the situation in the 1990s, when closure and confiscation notices against newspapers and broadcasters could only be effected by a court decision and therefore following a visible legal process,

⁶ Article 7, Anti-Terror Law.

⁷ Article 7. Anti-Terror Law.

⁸ Article 6. Anti-Terror Law.

rather than simply on the orders of a prosecutor. A KHRP mission in July 2007 found that the Anti-Terror Law had been used to close down five pro-Kurdish newspapers in one month alone.⁹ The introduction of such harsh penalties is having a chilling effect on freedom of expression and the right to impart information.¹⁰

The amendments to Turkey's anti-terror legislation have also led to the establishment of "chain liability", whereby it is not only the writer of a disputed text who may be prosecuted, but also those responsible for its publication.

Although freedom of expression is not an absolute right, in a democratic society and according to international standards any restriction on grounds of national security must be necessary and proportionate to the aim.¹¹ and should also be

unambiguous and precise. 12 The broad definitions included in the Anti-Terror Law in relation to freedom of expression mean that it fails to meet these criteria. Further, the law does not provide that, to be convicted of a "terrorist" offence, a person must intend to incite violence; nor does it state that such propaganda must have caused a clear and present danger that such offence would an committed.¹³ This leaves the law wide open to potential abuse, with the consequence that an individual completely opposed to the use of violence may be convicted as a terrorist just for voicing or publishing a dissenting Indeed, opinion. the European Commission noted in its 2006 progress report that the definition of these crimes under Turkish law is not in line with the Council of Europe Convention for the Prevention of Terrorism, and expressed concern that freedom of the press and

⁹ KHRP FFM Report, *Reform and Regression: Freedom of the Media in Turkey* (KHRP, London, October 2007), 57.

¹⁰ KHRP FFM Report, *Reform and Regression:* Freedom of the Media in Turkey (KHRP, London, October 2007).

¹¹ Article 10, European Convention on Human Rights.

¹² Principle 1.1 of the Johannesburg Principles on National Security, Freedom of Expression and Access to Information, UN Doc. E/CN.4/1996/39(1996).

¹³ Article 5, Council of Europe Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism; and Article 7, European Convention on Human Rights.

media could be undermined by these provisions.¹⁴

THREATS TO FREEDOMS OF BELIEF AND CONSCIENCE, ASSEMBLY, ASSOCIATION AND THE RIGHT TO PROTEST

The amendments to the Anti-Terror Law mean that the following offences can now be punished on the grounds that they indicate membership or support for armed organisations:

- The carrying of emblems and signs belonging to a terrorist organisation, and the wearing of uniforms bearing these emblems or signs;¹⁵
- The carrying of banners and leaflets and the shouting or broadcasting of slogans via sound systems.¹⁶

These provisions criminalise such behaviour as wearing a headscarf or the red head strap of the Alevi youth. In the absence of direct mention of incitement to violence, decisions about whether to count forms of dress as evidence of "propaganda for a terrorist organisation or its aims" are again open to an excessively wide margin of interpretation, amounting to a disproportionate interference with freedom of assembly and freedom of conscience.

Similarly, the law provides that "conscientious objection", a right in other Council of Europe countries, is a "terrorist offence", 17 a further interference with the right to freedom of conscience.

Article 7 of the new law targets the right of individuals to hold political meetings and demonstrations, both necessary components of freedom of association and freedom of assembly. Political meetings are threatened by the fact that any "terrorist offence" committed on the premises of political parties, trade unions or student dormitories will receive double the usual penalty, with the use of this

http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_docu ments/2006/Nov/tr_sec_1390_en.pdf (last accessed 5 August 2008)

¹⁷ Article 3, Anti-Terror Law.

7

¹⁴ Commission of the European Communities, Turkey 2006 Progress Report (COM (2006) 649 final), 6. Available at

¹⁵ Article 7/b, Anti-Terror Law.

¹⁶ Article 7/b, Anti-Terror Law.

broad term creating huge potential for arbitrary punishment.

Finally, the law makes it an offence to "willingly" provide funds "directly or indirectly" for the financing of a terrorist organisation. The wording of this offence is ambiguous and has been extended to include funding of a large number of unconnected crimes and organisations.¹⁸

JEOPARDISING THE PROHIBITION OF TORTURE AND OBSTRUCTING THE RULE OF LAW

The new Anti-Terror Law reduces vital procedural safeguards for suspects of terrorist offences, exposing them to a greater risk of torture and ill-treatment, and undermining the rule of law. Indeed, the EC has expressed concern that the law "could undermine the fight against torture and ill-treatment" Problematic aspects include the following:

The right of detainees suspected of committing a terrorist offence to have access to a lawyer restricted. A judge may delay legal advice for the first 24 hours of detention, placing the individual at high risk of torture.²⁰ The right to immediate access to legal counsel had only recently been introduced in Turkey as part of the reform process²¹ and this provision therefore represents a major step backwards. Ιt is particularly alarming given the use of torture and ill-treatment in police custody, which was particularly widespread in the past but continues to this

 Lawyers are prevented from examining the contents of the file about a suspect and obtaining copies of documents, where it is judged that full access to this file might endanger the aims of the investigation.²² This is a clear violation of the principle of

day.

¹⁸ Article 8, Anti-Terror Law.

¹⁹ Commission of the European Communities, Turkey 2006 Progress Report (COM (2006) 649 final), 13. Available at

http://ec.europa.eu/enlargement/pdf/key_docu ments/2006/Nov/tr_sec_1390_en.pdf (last accessed 5th August 2008)

²⁰ Article 10/b, Anti-Terror Law.

²¹ Article 149, Code of Criminal Procedure (Law No. 5271), 4 December 2004.

²² Article 10/d, Anti-Terror Law.

equality of arms and is very likely to compromise the detainee's right to a fair trial. 23 In addition, where there is evidence of a defence lawyer acting as an intermediary between an organisation and a suspect, an official can be present during meetings between detainee and his lawyer, and a judge can examine documents them.²⁴ passing between This violates client's right to confidential meetings with his lawyer.25

Persons suspected of terrorist offences are limited to just one lawyer, as opposed to three for non-terror related crimes.²⁶ The law does not specify that counsel in cases involving terror charges must be paid by the state, in contrast with cases involving alleged crimes by law enforcement officers, where the state is to cover the legal fees of

three defence lawyers.²⁷ These restrictions on access to legal counsel provide for the unequal treatment of terror suspects, when it is very likely that the latter would greatly benefit from the defence of more than one lawyer. Such provisions further violate the principle of equality of arms.

- The right of detainees to have access to family members is restricted. If the purpose of an investigation is under risk, a public prosecutor may order that only one member of the detainee's family is to be informed of his or her detention, or the extension of the detention period.²⁸
- Limits on the maximum length of the sentence that can be given to an individual are removed, so that prison sentences can now be indefinite.²⁹
- Security forces are authorised to use a gun "without hesitation" against an armed suspect who does

²³ The principle of equality of arms is enshrined in Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

²⁴ Article 10/e, Anti-Terror Law.

²⁵ This right is enshrined in principles 8 and 22 of UN Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers.

²⁶ Article 10/c, Anti-Terror Law.

²⁷ Article 15, Anti-Terror Law.

²⁸ Article 10/a, Anti-Terror Law. ²⁹ Article 5, Anti-Terror Law.

not obey the "stop" command.³⁰ This broad provision for the use of deadly force affords a wide discretion to armed security personnel and creates the potential for the use of disproportionate force. It is also contrary to Turkey's international legal obligation to respect the right to life.³¹

In practice, a recent KHRP fact-finding mission heard evidence that detainees remained uninformed of the accusation and legal basis of their detention for periods of up to nine months.³²

THE INFLUENCE OF LAWS IN OTHER JURISDICTIONS

Of course, Turkey is not alone in enacting draconian anti-terror legislation. In fact, the amended Turkish Anti-Terror Law is lent a false sense of legitimacy by laws in other jurisdictions which include similarly questionable provisions. Since the

the US - have introduced laws which also violate international human rights obligations and which have been widely criticised by international and domestic society courts, civil and nongovernmental organisations (NGOs), amongst others. The case of British antiterror legislation will be dealt with in more detail below. This report will also Spanish discuss the example of counterterrorism measures and parallel concerns that exist in this context.

terrorist attacks of September 2001, a

number of states - including the UK and

UK Anti-Terror Laws

The UK has experienced serious terrorist attacks since the 1970s in connection with the Northern Ireland conflict and has long had legislation in place to address issues arising from such threats. However, since 2001, the UK has enacted a further swathe of counter-terror laws. This includes the Terrorism Act 2000, the Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001, the Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005, and the Terrorism Act 2006. Further legislation is currently being debated by parliament.

³⁰ Article 2, Anti-Terror Law.

³¹ See, for example, Article 2 of the European Convention on Human Rights and Article 5 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

³² KHRP FFM, Reform and Regression: Freedom of the Media in Turkey (KHRP, London, October 2007), 37.

In common with Turkey, UK legislation maintains an inappropriately definition of terrorism.³³ Terrorism is defined as the use or threat of action designed to influence the government or to intimidate the public or a section of the public for the purpose of advancing a political, religious or ideological cause, "terrorism-related whilst activity" includes the commission, preparation, or instigation of acts of terrorism, facilitating such acts, encouraging such acts, and supporting or assisting those who are engaged in such acts.

UK legislation also threatens freedom of expression by providing for the vague offence of "encouragement terrorism".34 This covers statements "likely to be understood... as a direct or indirect encouragement or other inducement the commission. to... preparation or instigation of acts of terrorism", including any statement that "glorifies the commission or preparation (whether in the past, the future or generally) of such acts". Yet it is virtually impossible to prove what a third party is likely to understand by a particular statement. Therefore the breadth of this offence means it is unlikely to be necessary and proportionate to the aim, or to comply with the principles of legal certainty.³⁵

Similarly, Section 2 of the Terrorism Act 2006 makes it a crime to "disseminate terrorist material". As with Turkey's laws, the interaction of this section with that on the encouragement of terrorism could have draconian consequences and violate the right to freedom of expression.

Spanish Anti-Terror Laws

Unlike the UK, the US and Turkey, Spain has not introduced new legislation since the terrorist attacks of September 2001, the Madrid attacks of 11 March 2004 or the attacks in London in July 2005.³⁶ Rather, anti-terrorism measures in Spain have historically been shaped mainly by

³³ See the Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005 and Terrorism Act 2006.

³⁴ Section 1, Terrorism Act 2006.

³⁵ Articles 7 and 10, European Convention on Human Rights.

³⁶ Although tougher controls have been introduced on the use and transportation of explosives.

the activities of the Euskadi Ta Askatasuna (ETA) organisation.

There are no specific anti-terrorism laws in Spain. Instead, terrorism is dealt with almost exclusively through existing criminal justice legislation. The Criminal Code (*Código Penal*, CP) sets out terrorism-related offences and the Code of Criminal Procedure (*Ley de Enjuiciamiento Criminal*, LEC) deals with the relevant procedural provisions.

In common with the UK and Turkey, Spanish legislation provides a very broad definition of terrorism. The Criminal Code defines terrorists those as "belonging, acting in the service of or collaborating with armed groups, organisations or groups whose objective is to subvert the constitutional order or seriously alter public peace".37 There is a notable parallel here with Article 1 of Turkey's Anti-Terror law, which provides a wide definition of terrorism that non-violent criminalises potentially activities. Article 1 of the Turkish law defines terrorism based on its purpose or aims rather than referring to specific criminal acts, and is formulated vaguely and in very broad terms.

A main concern in relation to Spain's counterterrorism measures, however, is of quasi-incommunicado the use detention, which has been widely criticised by NGOs and international bodies. Spain's Code of Criminal Procedure allows for a maximum of thirteen days of quasi-incommunicado detention. Initially, detainees may be held in police custody for five days before being brought before a judge. A judge may then issue an order for a further five days on remand in pre-trial detention. In addition, a final period of three days may follow either consecutively or imposed at a later date.38

Serious restrictions are placed on detainees durina this quasidetention incommunicado period. Detainees have the right to be assisted by a duty lawyer but not a lawyer of their choosing, and are not permitted to speak in private with the lawyer appointed on

³⁷ Article 571, Criminal Code.

³⁸ Article 509, Code of Criminal Procedure.

their behalf. The European Committee for the Prevention of Torture has described this as "most unusual" and has said that "under such circumstances it is difficult to speak of an effective right of access to legal assistance; the officially appointed lawyer can best be described as an observer".³⁹ In addition, the detainee's family or other parties are not informed of the detention or the place of the detention.

These restrictions bear comparison with provisions of the Turkish Anti-Terror law discussed previously in this paper, including those which: restrict access of detainees to family members⁴⁰; limit the suspect's access to legal council⁴¹; provide for the prevention of the detainee's lawyer from examining his or her file and obtaining copies of relevant documents⁴²; and provide for officials to monitor meetings between the detainee and his or

her lawyer, and examine documents passed between them⁴³.

Such restrictive detention regimes lack measures to protect detainees torture or ill-treatment and can increase the risk of ill-treatment. The United Nations Special Rapporteur on Torture has stated that "prolonged incommunicado detention may facilitate the perpetration of torture and could in itself amount to a form of cruel, inhuman degrading treatment." 44 **Amnesty** International has documented several reported cases of torture and ill-treatment in police custody in Spain.45 Furthermore, the measures in place in Spain also fail to protect the Spanish authorities from false allegations of abuse.

_

³⁹ "Report to the Spanish Government on the visit to Spain carried out by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CPT) from 22 to 26 July 2001", 13 March 2003, (CPT/Inf (2003)22), para 51. Available at http://www.cpt.coe.int/documents/esp/2003-22-inf-eng.htm (last accessed 5 August 2008)

⁴⁰ Article 10/a, Anti-Terror Law.

⁴¹ Articles 10/b and 10/c, Anti-Terror Law.

⁴² Article 10/d, Anti-Terror Law.

⁴³ Article 10/e, Anti-Terror Law.

⁴⁴ Civil and Political Rights, Including the Question of Torture and Detention. Report of the Special Rapporteur on the question of torture, Theo van Boven. Addendum visit to Spain. E/CN.4/2004/56/Add.2, 6 February 2004, para 34.

⁴⁵ Amnesty International, "Spain. Adding insult to injury: the effective impunity of police officers in cases of torture and other ill-treatment", Doc EUR 41/006/007, November 2007.

In a recent visit to Spain⁴⁶ the Special Rapporteur highlighted the "Garzon protocol", which provides for detainees to select a doctor of their own choice for a medical examination, for detainees to receive visits by family members, and for the constant video-surveillance of interrogation rooms and police detention facilities. Although not systematically implemented and used by only some Audiencia Nacional judges and on a case-by-case basis, the protocol is a positive development in Spain's counterterrorism measures.

Summary

In this context, it is concerning to see that Turkey appears to be following the standards set by British and Spanish antiterror others, laws. among which themselves do not with comply international legal human rights Terrorism is an issue that obligations. affects not only Turkey and the UK but also the wider international community. This community therefore needs to work together and universally commit to

⁴⁶ The United Nations Special Rapporteur conducted an eight-day mission to Spain from 7 to 14 May 2008.

preventing acts of terrorism and securing citizens from random acts of violence, whilst also meeting international human rights obligations. In this way, the appropriate balance can be found between defending a nation's security and defending the human rights of all people within its borders.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF TURKEY, THE EUROPEAN UNION AND THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

Turkey must fundamentally change the way in which it views the fight against terrorism.

In this context, Turkey should urgently amend the current Anti-Terror Law so that it is no longer so open to abuse. This process should take place in consultation with human rights defenders, NGOs, inter-governmental organisations (IGOs) and other interested parties, and should include:

 Bringing all anti-terror laws into line with international human rights principles;

- Reforming the language of the new Anti-Terror Law to make it more specific and targeted at overt acts of terrorism as opposed to general types of behaviour or acts that are generally not criminal;
- Ensuring that any definitions of terrorism or terrorists acts exclude legitimate criticism of state institutions;
- Ending "chain liability" for publishers and other parties who are not responsible for authoring supposedly offensive materials;
- Removing or amending all sections of the law that allow for the closure of publications or any type of criminal liability for statements published or broadcast;
- Abolishing provisions in current anti-terror legislation which criminalise the wearing of particular types of clothing, the carrying of particular banners and leaflets, and the shouting or broadcasting of particular slogans, with these provisions to replaced with new provisions

- making explicit reference to incitement to violence:
- Removing provisions criminalising conscientious objection;
- Amending provisions restricting assembly, association, protests and the funding of "terrorist organisations" so that they do not allow for arbitrary and inconsistent application;
- Removing the provision in Article
 9 denying a detainee access to a lawyer within the first 24 hours of detention;
- Removing scope for any interference in privileged communications between defendants and their lawyers.

The Government of Turkey must also take steps to ensure that the amended legislation is applied consistently, fairly and with a view to upholding the country's international legal obligations to respect the human rights of all people within its borders. This should include:

 Initiating a training programme for all members of the judiciary and law enforcement services, outlining Turkey's international legal obligation to uphold human rights even as it seeks to prosecute crime and prevent acts of terrorism;

- Working with other states to create a coordinated effort to deal with international terrorism;
- Engaging in dialogue with IGOS, NGOs and human rights defenders on security issues and consulting with them on ways to augment national security without failing to respect Turkey's international legal commitments.

In addition, this paper calls upon the governments of the European Union and the Council of Europe, as well as the EU and CoE themselves, to help ensure the rights of all Turkish citizens by:

- Placing human rights issues –
 including concerns surrounding
 the Anti-Terror Law at the
 forefront of assessments of
 Turkey's compliance with the
 Copenhagen Criteria for EU
 accession.
- Continuing criticism of the Anti-Terror Law and calling on Turkey

- to amend the law in line with the Council of Europe Convention for the Prevention of Terrorism.
- Closely monitoring the trials and detention conditions of those charged in Turkey under the Anti-Terror Law.



11 Guilford Street London WC1N 1DH Tel: +44 (0)207 4053835 Fax: +44 (0)207 4049088 Email:khrp@khrp.org

The Kurdish Human Rights Project (KHRP) is an independent, non-political, non-governmental human rights organisation founded and based in London, England. KHRP is a registered charity and is committed to the promotion and protection of the human rights of all persons living within the Kurdish regions of Turkey, Iraq, Iran, Syria and elsewhere, irrespective of race, religion, sex, political persuasion or other belief or opinion. Its supporters include both Kurdish and non-Kurdish people.