

CAVEAT

INDONESIA'S MONTHLY HUMAN RIGHTS ANALYSIS

VOLUME 16/II, SEPTEMBER 2010

SPECIAL REPORT |

License to Worship God?

Though the right to religious freedom was initially one of the most intuitively accepted and respected of human rights, the events of the past few weeks have shown that the fight for religious freedom is still underway.

OPINION |

Maladministration of the Correctional System Leads to Human Rights Violation

A person should only undertake sentences according to what had been sentenced by a judiciary body. No more. Excess of the sentences is obviously violation of rights, in this case is a violation of the right to fair trial.

www.lbh masyarakat.org

CAVEAT:

Let her or him be aware

CONTENT

THE EDITOR'S CUT | 2

SPECIAL REPORT | 3

License to Worship God?

OPINION | 8

Maladministration of the Correctional System Leads to Human Rights Violation

RIGHTS IN ASIA | 10

CAVEAT is published by the Community Legal Aid Institute (LBH Masyarakat), Jakarta, Indonesia. All rights reserved. Neither this publication nor any part of it may be reproduced without prior permission of the LBH Masyarakat.

CAVEAT invites feedback and contributions. If you are interested in contributing a guest editorial piece or article, please contact us: contact@lbhmasyarakat.org

Editorial Board:

Ricky Gunawan, Dhoho Ali Sastro, Andri G. Wibisana, Ajeng Larasati, Alex Argo Hernowo, Answer C. Styannes, Pebri Rosmalina, Antonius Badar, Feri Sahputra, Grandy Nadeak, Vina Fardhoha

Special Adviser:

Maeve Showell, Zack Wundke, Samuel Natale and Michael Kurban

Finance and Circulation:

Zaki Wildan and Rizky Halida

Address:

Tebet Timur Dalam III B, No. 10, Jakarta 12820, INDONESIA

Phone:

+62 21 830 54 50

Fax:

+62 21 829 80 67

E-mail:

contact@lbhmasyarakat.org

Website:

www.lbhmasyarakat.org

LBH Masyarakat welcomes any financial contribution for the development of CAVEAT

Name : Lembaga Bantuan Hukum Masyarakat

Bank : Bank Mandiri

Branch : Tebet Timur, Jakarta, Indonesia

No. Acc. : 1 2 4 - 0 0 0 - 5 0 3 - 6 6 2 0

Swift Code : B E I I I D J A

THE EDITOR'S CUT

September has been a gloomy month for Indonesia, in terms of its history of law and human rights, since 1965. The killing of Munir in 2004, Semanggi II tragedy in 1999, Tanjung Priok tragedy in 1984, and 1965 Massacre all took place in September. All of these human rights abuses are left unresolved, leaving no justice for the victims and perpetrators are unpunished. Put simply: impunity reigns over law and human rights. In early September, when we had our editorial meeting to discuss the ideas for this month's CAVEAT, all of us were agreed to raise the issue of impunity in those so-called past human rights violations. One major incident then occurred and changed our editorial decision, however.

On 12 September 2010, morning, some Christians were walking from their houses towards to their church (HKBP) in Ciketing, Bekasi, West Java. First Brigadier Police (Briptu) Galih Setiawan was there to lead and secure the walkers. While they were walking, there were four unknown men in motorcycle approached Hasian Lumban Toruan Sihombing and stabbed him in stomach. Briptu Galih Setiawan then put Toruan Sihombing in the motorcycle helped by Priest Luspida Simanjuntak. When they were taking Toruan Sihombing to the nearest hospital, the perpetrators attacked Priest Luspida with a wooden block and she was injured in head, back, and forehead.

The above incident clearly was not an ordinary incident or pure criminal offense. Bearing in mind the past history in which Christians in that area was often harassed by Moslem fundamentalist, such attack is believed as a politically-motivated attack on that ground. The attack itself was not just an attack. Stabbing and beating against people who were on their way to place of worship is an attack against religious freedom. Failure to resolve the attack is a betrayal of Indonesian Constitution, as freedom of religion is enshrined in the Constitution. Further, ignorance of such attack will reproduce similar attack in the near future

and give insignia to the perpetrators that their act was accepted by the Indonesian government.

What worse was in this situation that President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono did not step forward and appear in public to condemn such cowardice act. Two days before the incident, President himself gave a speech commenting on the plan of Koran burning by Pastor Terry Jones in the US. People at large were angered as President Yudhoyono voiced out his concern on issue that was far away but neglected such an important issue in his backyard.

The horrendous incident of HKBP and the plan of Koran burning though different have one thing in common, and that is both were triggered by bigotry. And put the debate of religious freedom into the spotlight both in Indonesia and global context. The issue of freedom of religion thus brought us to raise it again in this CAVEAT and made us write that in a Special Report.

Apart from that, as usual, we also put reportage from Asia. In addition, Ajeng Larasati one of our legal researcher write an opinion for this edition CAVEAT with regard to a case of our client in which had to serve imprisonment seven days extra. She argues that maladministration of the judiciary system in which the correctional facility should be held responsible – together with the court and prosecutor office, leads to human rights violation.

Positive feedbacks, as always, are most appreciated.

Thank you for your ongoing support.

The Editor

SPECIAL REPORT

License to Worship God?

INTRODUCTION

Though the right to religious freedom was initially one of the most intuitively accepted and respected of human rights, the events of the past few weeks have shown that the fight for religious freedom is still underway.

France shocked the world this month by banning the 'niqab,' a total face covering worn by some Muslim women, in all public places. In the U.S, this summer marked opposition to the "Ground Zero Mosque," an Islamic community centre two blocks away from the site of the former World Trade Towers. This furore set off a public debate culminating in a radical Christian preacher in Florida threatening to burn the Qur'an, an event which was cancelled after wide public condemnation.

In Indonesia, a similar conflict has emerged in Bekasi, when a group of assailants stabbed the priest of a Christian church. In response to these attacks, under the pretence of protecting the Christian community, the state boarded up the church and told parishioners that they were not allowed to practice their faith in the staunchly Muslim neighbourhood. The church has since, in defiance of police and hardliners, continued their services.

All these examples follow the same dynamic. Regardless of which religious group is being oppressed, the argument to constrain their freedom always comes from the desires of the majority community. The Islamic Defender's Front (FPI) argues in their manifesto that because Muslims comprise the majority of the population, they should have superior 'bargaining power,' and that the state should enforce

their interests. In Switzerland, the banning of minarets came about through similar logic- that the majority, Swiss Christians, should make the rules. Obviously, this logic of the rule of the majority is antithetical to the human rights norms.

But the discussion is less clear about ideas that are deliberately offensive. Most people would agree that stabbing a preacher, or cutting the throat of a cab driver for his religion (an incident that occurred in New York earlier in the month), is neither acceptable, nor should the law allow it to happen. But what about burning a holy book- an act which does no more direct,

Islamic Defender's Front (FPI) argues in their manifesto that because Muslims comprise the majority of the population, they should have superior 'bargaining power,' and that the state should enforce their interests. In Switzerland, the banning of minarets came about through similar logic- that the majority, Swiss Christians, should make the rules. Obviously, this logic of the rule of the majority is antithetical to the human rights norms.

physical harm to a person than does voicing opinions against their faith? And if we say that these kinds of deliberately disrespectful acts are impermissible, can we classify holding a service in a certain neighbourhood, attracting converts, or even building a community centre near 'hallowed ground' as actions that the state is allowed to stop?

The state, and human rights activists, are in a bind. On the one hand, if the state wants to prevent violence and harm, it makes sense to ban religious acts that are likely to provoke a violent response. On the other hand, to ban acts just because extremists might oppose them violently gives radical majority groups an incentive to use violence against religious minorities. Which is more important to protect, the right to practice one's own faith, or the right to not be offended by the faith of another?

Religious freedom stems from two basic understandings. **First**, that the ability to seek answers to fundamental questions

about life, death and morality is intrinsically related to a person's well-being. The ability to speak about those beliefs, to commune with others and operate on those beliefs is key to meaningfully having a religion, and having access to religion is an important component of making a life worth living. **Secondly**, that the state could never enact a single religion that served the spiritual needs of everyone. Indonesia is filled with the monuments of a variety of religions, all of which have served, at one time or another, spiritual needs.

Based on these principles, a state that allows people to practice religion in whatever way they choose is a much better one to live in. When religions conflict, the state must defer to the action which will affirm and allow for the most basic considerations of religious well-being. In nearly every case, a ban on some sort of religious expression would have the greatest effect on the individual. For even a hard line zealot, seeing someone pray to another god is not fundamentally limiting or harmful. But a restriction on the ability to pray, demonstrate one's faith and congregate would be impacting someone's life in a fundamental way. Unless the harm of a given practice causes physical or fundamental harm to a third party, the state has no right to oppose it.

This view isn't always easy. Protecting religious freedom means allowing views that might be hateful, practices that might be sexist, and acts that may be repugnant to the majority of the population. But the role of human rights is not to stop small harms, like being offended, but to stop major ones, like being forbidden to pray. So whether someone needs to express their beliefs by burning a symbol or the wearing a garment, the state must allow people to make those choices, and must protect them from the violence of whomever they offend. If the trend of violent public opposition to minority religious groups continues, standing against that violence is likely to get a lot harder.

INDONESIA'S SHAKEABLE RULES ON RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Despite the slogan "Bhinneka Tunggal Ika" or 'unity in diversity' which the state has always proudly claimed, religious intolerance remains as an unresolved issue in Indonesia. The recent attacks on the leaders of the Batak Protestant Church (HKBP) Ciketing, East Bekasi, prove this. Several unidentified men stabbed the Elder of HKBP Ciketing, Asian Lumbuan Sihombing on his way to a mass service and HKBP Ciketing Pastor Luspida Simanjuntak was beaten, suffering severe head injuries.¹ The police have named 10 suspects and one of them was the Bekasi chairman of Islam Defenders Front (FPI). It is alleged that the attack was related to the dispute between HKBP Ciketing and local residents who are objected to the presence of the church in their territory.

Oversight over the establishment of places of worship in Indonesia falls under the Joint Regulation of Minister of Religious Affair and Minister of Interior Number 9 and 8/2006. According to Article 14 of the Joint Regulation, there are three general requirements for establishing places of worship: administrative, technical, and particular requirement. Whereas the administrative and technical requirement shall be applied for any kind of buildings, the latest one is called as 'particular' for it shall be applied only to places of worship.

The particular requirement is written in the article 14 para (2) of the Joint Regulation and stipulates that there should be at least 90 people who will use the place of worship. The existence of these 90 people shall be proved by their copy of identity cards. Moreover, consent of 60 local residents at the minimum is also required as well as written recommendation from the Head of Regency/Municipality Religious Affair Office

¹ Police: Attack on HKBP leaders premeditated, The Jakarta Post Friday 17 September, 2010. <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2010/09/17/police-attack-hkbp-leaders-premeditated.html>. Accessed on 22 September 2010.

and Interfaith Communication Forum (FKUB).

Except mentioning the general requirements and that the request to establish places of worship should be addressed to the Regent or Major, the Joint Regulation does not provide any specific procedure on the establishment of places of worship. The mandate to determine more specific procedure is on the Regent or the Major that the procedure may vary in regency to another.

One of the debates on the Joint Regulation which emerge is whether it is a proper form to regulate the requirements in establishing places of worship. There are at least two questions in relation to this debate. **First**, whether the Joint Ministerial Decree is a valid legal instrument, considering that Article 7 para (1) of Law No. 10/2004 does not mention it in the Indonesian hierarchy of regulations. **Second**, even though it is a valid one, the requirements in establishing places of worship shall be regulated by legal instrument which is not lower than law.

According to Article 7 para (1) of Law No. 10/2004, the hierarchy of regulations in Indonesia consists of 1945 Constitution, Laws/Government Regulation In-Lieu of Laws (Perppu), Government Regulations, Presidential Regulations, and Local Regulations. If we merely look at this article then we may conclude that Ministerial Regulation is not recognised as a valid regulation for it is not included in the hierarchy. However, the elucidation of the law stipulates that Ministers are amongst the authorities to issue regulations which might publicly bind. Opinion which refuses the validity of the Joint Regulation on this basis, therefore, is easily refuted.

Yet, the fact that Law No. 10/2004 grants Ministers the jurisdiction to issue regulations does not mean that the Joint Regulation is a proper legal instrument to impose requirements on the establishment of places of worship. The requirements are human rights limitations, and it should not be regulated in any legal instrument which is lower than law. As points out by a House

of Representatives Member (DPR) from Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDI-P), Sidarto Danusubroto, the Joint Regulation has to be substituted by a law. He believes that doing so will legitimize the restriction and conform with the regulations hierarchy in Indonesia.²

Such opinion is in accordance with Article 28J para (2) of the 1945 Constitution which mentions that limitations on human rights are permissible as long as it is conducted by law and purposed

...the discussion on the Joint Regulation shall go beyond the question of the Joint Regulation's propriety. It is also necessary to question the substance of the regulation –whether it is in conformity with human rights principles.

for specific reasons. Article 18 para (3) of International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) which has been ratified by Indonesia also clearly stipulates so that 'freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs may be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law and are necessary to protect public safety, order, health, or morals or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others.'

The Siracusa Principles on the Limitation and Derogation Provisions in the ICCPR explains that 'prescribed by law' does not merely mean that limitation on rights shall be conducted by law but furthermore, law which 'is consistent with the Covenant'.³ Therefore, the discussion on the Joint Regulation shall go beyond the question of the Joint Regulation's propriety. It is also necessary to question the substance of the regulation –whether it is in conformity with human rights principles.

² PDIP minta cabut peraturan pendirian rumah ibadah, Metro TV News Wednesday 15 September, 2010.

<http://metrotvnews.com/index.php/metromain/news/2010/09/15/28961/PDIP-Minta-Cabut-Peraturan-Pendirian-Rumah-Ibadah/>. Accessed on 22 September 2010.

³ UN Economic and Social Council, Principle 15 of Siracusa Principles on the Limitation and Derogation Provisions in the International Covenant and Civil and Political Rights.

FREEDOM TO MANIFEST RELIGION AS HUMAN RIGHT

In the perspective of international human rights instruments, there are two rights which are directly related to religion. The first one is the freedom of religion and the other one is the right to manifest religion.⁴ Even though these two are closely related to each other –in fact, freedom to manifest religion is part of freedom of religion in its broader sense- there are several differences which are worthy noted.

The relation between freedom of religion and freedom to manifest religion is more or less like the relation between freedom of thought and the right to hold opinions as well as the right to freedom of expression. Whereas freedom of religion deals more with the right to believe in something, the freedom to manifest religion deals with the right to express one's belief – for instance, the display of religious symbol. Sometimes freedom of religion is also called the '*forum internum*' or internal conviction, while the freedom to manifest religion is called '*forum externum*'.⁵

Their limitation possibility is a significant difference between these two rights, as can be seen in the ICCPR's provisions. No limitation shall be made on the freedom of religion, while the freedom to manifest religion is possible to be limited so long as the limitation itself is in accordance with the human rights framework. As previously mentioned the limitation shall be prescribed by law and purposed to protect public safety, order, health, or morals or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others.

⁴ See Human Rights Committee, ICCPR General Comment 22 (48th Session, 1993), para 3.

⁵ Commission on Human Rights, Civil and Political Rights, Including the Question of Religious Intolerance, Report of the Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Religion or Belief, Asma Jahangir, 9 January 2006 (E/CN.4/2006/5), para 40.

The ICCPR General Comment No. 22 states that building of places of worship falls in the scope of freedom to manifest religion.⁶ This means the building of places of worship might be limited under certain circumstances. Yet it is important to emphasize that the limitation 'must be established by law and must not be applied in a manner that would vitiate the rights guaranteed in article 18'. Furthermore, the General Comment stresses that the limitation on freedom to manifest religion under Article 18 para (3) of the ICCPR may be limited only for purposes mentioned in the article as well as 'proportionate to the specific need on which they are predicated.'

RETHINKING THE LIMITATIONS

The Joint Regulation has unequivocally infringed the freedom to manifest religion. Yet the question left remains as to whether the limitation is permissible and in conformity with human rights. Extra concern shall be given to the provisions which require the existence of minimum 90 members and also the consent of 60 local residents at the least.

The minimum member requirement is a minority-insensitive provision. For religious groups whose members are more than 90, such requirement might not be an issue. Yet for the religious minority groups, this provision has impeded their right to manifest their religion. Due to this requirement, it is impossible for them to build their own places of worship legally. Their only options are first, to ignore the requirements imposed by the Joint Regulation or second, to use a non-religious purposed buildings (for example, their own private houses) as their places of worship. Whichever option they take, both are illegal under the Indonesian laws. If it is not illegal then at least it is too costly; they will have to spend a lot of money on renting commercial rooms or buildings such as malls and hotels.

⁶ Human Rights Committee, ICCPR General Comment 22 (48th Session, 1993), para 4.

Government may argue that religious groups whose members number less than 90 have the option to conduct their religious practice individually. Yet this argument is contrary to human rights for in the human rights perspective. The freedom to manifest religion -including the right to build places of worship- may be exercised 'either individually or in community with others in public or private.'

Another thing which should be criticised with regard to the minimum member requirement is that the membership shall be proved by the national identity cards (KTP) of the members. In Indonesia, KTP is owned only by those who are at least 17-year old. Therefore, by requiring KTP as proof of the membership, the Joint Regulation does not count children as members of religious groups. It is contradictory to the Article 6 of the Law No. 23/2002 on Children Protection which states that children have the right to manifest their religion or belief.

The requirement on consent of at least 60 local residents is just as problematic as the minimum member requirement. Since the Joint Regulation does not mention anything about what are the acceptable reasons for the local residents not to give their consent, they can refuse to give their consent on any basis. The refusal, therefore, might be based on weak or even arbitrary reasons such as hatred against certain religious groups.

Our experience has shown that the resistance of local residents usually based on reason that the presence of particular places of worships in their territory has disrupted public order. Indeed, if we look at the provision under the ICCPR, 'public order' is one of the limitation clauses on the freedom to manifest religion. However, how 'public order' is defined here? Are traffic jam and noise -two are the most favourite reasons used- considered as disruptions to public order that it is acceptable to limit a

community's right to manifest their religion or belief based on such reasons?

No international or national instruments which clearly describe what public order is. Yet the general rule in the limitation of human rights is that such limitation should be proportionate and the most lenient one. If the existence of a place of worship has caused noise or traffic jam, then closing or banning the place of worship will be an overkill solution.

REVISION URGENTLY REQUIRED

As a part of freedom to manifest religion, the building of places of worship is a right which can be limited. However, the limitations shall be prescribed by law and not by regulation which is lower than that. Choosing Joint Regulation as a legal instrument to impose requirements on the building of places of worship, therefore, is not the right thing to do.

However, the discussion shall go beyond the propriety of the legal instrument. Merely changing the title from 'Joint Regulation' into 'Law' will not solve the human rights issue for the substance of the Joint Regulation itself is also problematic. If Indonesia do believe in tolerance and unity in diversity as it has always claimed, then in the law which will impose requirement on the establishment of places of worship the minimum member requirement has to be abolished. Local residents shall not be asked for their consent either, yet they shall always have the right to express their opinion on the plan of the building of the places of worship in their territory.

--

However, how 'public order' is defined here? Are traffic jam and noise -two are the most favourite reasons used- considered as disruptions to public order that it is acceptable to limit a community's right to manifest their religion or belief based on such reasons?

OPINION

Maladministration of the Correctional System Leads to Human Rights Violation

By: Ajeng Larasati

March 3, 2009, was a dreadful day for Zaenal Abidin and his family. Zaenal, 21 year-old, was arrested by police just across from his house and witnessed by his parents. Zaenal was charged under the Article 62 of Psychotropic Law number 5 year 1997. At that time, he was caught possessing 0.02 gram of amphetamine drugs, equivalent to IDR 100,000, which he had already bought the night before. At least these are the details that were written in the Letter of Indictment.

Lembaga Bantuan Hukum Masyarakat (LBH Masyarakat), acting as Zaenal's lawyer, found that the chronology was fabricated. Zaenal was arrested while he was standing in front of the drug dealer's house with IDR 200,000 in his hand which was supposed to be used to buy the drugs. The dealer's house, which was located across Zaenal's house, was already empty by that time. No one responded while Zaenal was knocking at the door. Just seconds later, two police officers came after Zaenal, pointed to drugs near his foot and ordered him to pick them up by his mouth as his hands were handcuffed. Zaenal said that the police took him in a car and tortured him inside the car while they were on their way to the police office. As we all know, the torture was conducted to get his confession of possession of the drugs near his foot.

On July 14, 2009, Central Jakarta District Court found him guilty of drugs possession. He was sentenced to sixteen months of imprisonment and two millions rupiah of fine or two months in prison as an alternative if he could not afford to pay the fine. Later, he was transferred from Salemba Detention Centre to Cipinang Correctional Institute for Drug Offences. Based on the verdict, he was supposed to be released on early September 2010. Until the end of

August, there was no sign for him to be released soon. Because of this uncertain condition, Zaenal came to the registration unit to inquire for further information. To his surprise, the registration officer told Zaenal that his status was still as a detainee! They assumed that Zaenal was a detainee because of the absence of his verdict on their database. When we heard about the news, we were all puzzled. As his lawyer, we already received his verdict several weeks after the trial.

On Tuesday, September 7, 2010, we came to the correctional institute and gave a copy of Zaenal's verdict to Mr. Asep, Head of Registration Unit. When we asked about the date that Zaenal should be released, without further comment, he counted on his calendar and put circle on date 31 of August 2010. He said nothing after that, but looked very busy taking care of administration stuffs. Less than two hours, Zaenal was released.

Zaenal's release came seven days late. He lost his rights due to the absence of his verdict.

The above case clearly demonstrates violation of Zaenal's rights. A person should only undertake sentences according to what had been sentenced by a judiciary body. No more. Excess of the sentences is obviously violation of rights, in this case is a violation of the right to fair trial. One can see that this violation was because of maladministration of the correctional system. It was unclear who should be held responsible, but it was crystal clear that his right is violated.

After the court passed verdict, the registrar should deliver the copy of verdict to prosecutor, as written in Article 270 of Indonesia Criminal Procedure Law.

Afterwards, prosecutor, as an executor, has to make the Minutes of Implementation of the Verdict which is signed by the prosecutor himself, the convict, and Head of Correctional Institute to be sent to the court (Art. 278). This activity should be done collectively with a delivery of the copy of verdict to those parties. After receiving such verdict, of course, the correctional institute has to file it. By filing the verdict, defendant's status changes to a convict. Consequently, convict will have the following rights such as remission, applying for conditional discharge, and so forth. The court should also appoint a judge to be responsible for supervising the implementation of every verdict.

In this case, the above scheme was missing. It can be identified that at least three parties should be held responsible. The court, as a party who issues the verdict, has responsibility to deliver the copy of verdict to prosecutor and supervising the implementation of it. The prosecutor, as an executor in every case, has to make Minutes of the Implementation of Verdict and deliver the verdict to the correctional institute. Last, but not least, both the detention centre and correctional institute, as parties who should undertake guidance of the convict.

Salemba Detention Centre, where Zaenal was detained, should know that Zaenal had been undergoing the trial. Therefore, when they transferred him to Cipinang Correctional Institute for Drug Offense, they should be aware the absence of his verdict and inform the institute. Otherwise, if the fact was that they already had it, they should be aware to not forget it and convey the information to the institute. Meanwhile, the correctional institute officer should have done something regarding the absence of the verdict rather than just sit and wait for the verdict to come by itself. They could have asked the detention centre, or directly ask the court and the prosecutor. Zaenal was not the only one whose verdict was not in place. There are 419 convicts more in the correctional institute who have not yet received their verdicts.

The above predicament should be seen in the context of a dysfunctional correctional system. In a shorter-term those three parties should be able to undertake self-identification in investigating where loopholes subsist; error took place, and punish those who are responsible for this problem. In a longer term, government should establish an internal and external mechanism to monitor the fulfilment of convicted's rights. It has to be transparent and accessible by convicts and/or their families. Also, it should be undertaken effectively to ensure that no more convict will undergo extra time of their sentences. More stories like Zaenal's in the future means more citizens being robbed of their access to justice.

--

Ajeng Larasati is Assistant Manager on Legal Aid and Human Rights at LBH Masyarakat. She focuses her work on drugs-related offence and drugs policy as well as handles the organization's program development. Ajeng is also one of the JusticeMakers Fellows 2010 of the organization International Bridges to Justice.

RIGHTS IN ASIA

Information contained in this column is provided by the Asian Human Rights Commission (AHRC).

Sri Lanka: 18th Amendment moving the country further into dictatorship

On September 8th, 2010, the 18th Amendment to the Constitution was railroad through Parliament, disallowing the filing of objections with the Supreme Court or public debate through a referendum. This unconstitutional Amendment removes the two-term limit on the incumbent Executive President, granting him total immunity, while changes to the 17th Amendment bring all public institutions under his direct control. It abolishes the Constitutional Council, allowing the President to control all public appointments. It removes key powers from the Elections Commission, eliminating future free and fair elections. It greatly damages the independence of the judiciary and clearly spells the end of any pretence of liberal democracy in the country. It is expected that corruption will now flourish, key freedoms will be greatly restricted and grave human rights violations will increase further, with even less prospect for justice to be served or impunity prevented.

Burma: Human rights violations continue after failures to intervene internationally

In a recent dossier submitted to the to a group of United Nations human rights experts, several recent cases of extreme, prolonged torture by police officers in Burma were highlighted. Neither the UN Human Rights Council, nor the General Assembly has so far been able to address the serious conditions in Burma. Initiatives from the international level need to be based on the understanding that Burma has neither a normative framework for human rights in its constitution or legislation, nor has it any institutional framework that could protect rights in any way. The policing and judicial system is rather to implement directives and orders by the executive

making a separation of power elusive. Several states support a UN commission of inquiry for Burma but such a measure remains a motion by some states in the UN.

Philippines: Authorities blame frightened witnesses while witness protection remains illusive.

In the Philippines, a key witness concerning the high-profile Maguindanao massacre was killed on June 14, 2010. Despite pledges made during the UN's Universal Periodical Review and repeated recommendations by UN experts and NGOs, the government has failed to reform the Witness Protection, Security and Benefit Act to provide a trustworthy, well-resourced, and independent protection mechanism. Officials instead simply blame frightened witnesses for the lack of credible investigations and prosecutions of hundreds of extra-judicial killings by the State. 57 people including journalists and lawyers were killed in the Maguindanao massacre in the Philippines in November 2009. The country was struck by hundreds of extra-judicial killings and disappearances in the last years.

ABOUT US

Born from the idea that all members of society have the potential to actively participate in forging a just and democratic nation, a group of human rights lawyers, scholars and democrats established a non-profit civil society organization named the Community Legal Aid Institute (LBH Masyarakat)

LBH Masyarakat is an open-membership organisation seeking to recruit those wanting to play a key role in contributing to the empowerment of society. The members of LBH Masyarakat believe in the values of democracy and ethical human rights principals that strive against discrimination, corruption and violence against women, among others.

LBH Masyarakat aims for a future where everyone in society has access to legal assistance through participating in and defending *probono* legal aid, upholding justice and fulfilling human rights. Additionally, LBH Masyarakat strives to empower people to independently run a legal aid movement as well as build social awareness about the rights of an individual within, from and for their society.

LBH Masyarakat runs a number of programs, the main three of which are as follows: (1) Community legal empowerment through legal counselling, legal education, legal clinics, human rights education, awareness building in regard to basic rights, and providing legal information and legal aid for social programs; (2) Public case and public policy advocacy; (3) Conducting research concerning public predicaments, international human rights campaigns and advocacy.

These programs are conducted entirely in cooperation with society itself. LBH Masyarakat strongly believes that by enhancing legal and human rights awareness among social groups, an independent advocacy approach can be adopted by individuals within their local areas.

By providing a wide range of opportunities, LBH Masyarakat is able to join forces with those concerned about upholding justice and human rights to collectively participate and contribute to the overall improvement of human rights in Indonesia.

Lembaga Bantuan Hukum Masyarakat

Tebet Timur Dalam III B, No. 10
Jakarta 12820
INDONESIA

P. +62 21 830 54 50

F. +62 21 829 80 67

E. contact@lbhmasyarakat.org

W. <http://www.lbhmasyarakat.org>