

## CENTRAL ASIA IN 2006: INCREASING REPRESSION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

In Central Asia, authoritarian regimes continue to violate international human rights standards. Notwithstanding the presidential and parliamentary elections that have taken place in the five countries comprising the Central Asian region (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan), most of the leaders currently in power have been in these positions since the days of the Soviet Union. Power remains highly centralized within the executive, with weak judiciary and legislative branches, and few democratic mechanisms of accountability.

Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan have totalitarian regimes, which repress any expression of dissidence and violate, on a systematic basis, civil and political as well as social, economic and cultural rights. In 2006 the human rights records of these governments worsened, as few serious commitments and practical measures were undertaken towards establishing more pluralistic and democratic societies. Despite their progress in certain human rights areas, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan continued practices, which violated fundamental freedoms, in particular freedom of expression and association, and the principle of *non-refoulement*.

Central Asia, for the most part, remained a region where democratic reform still has a long way to go before its citizens can fully enjoy their human rights in open and tolerant societies.

### Elections

In the 2005-2007 period all five Central Asian countries will have had presidential elections. Nevertheless, the elections

held by the end of 2006 did not (with the arguable exception of Kyrgyzstan) translate into the establishment of democratic leadership in the region. What is more, none of these elections fully complied with international standards, in particular with regard to freedom of association, and access to media, and were characterized by a lack of meaningful choice and voting irregularities.

In *Kazakhstan*, President Nazarbayev was re-elected in December 2005, officially receiving more than 91% of the vote, in an election that observers judged as falling short of international standards for free, fair and democratic elections.<sup>1</sup> In November 2006 the long-serving President Rakhmonov of *Tajikistan* was re-elected for the third time in elections described by the OSCE as lacking "genuine choice and meaningful pluralism."<sup>2</sup> On a more positive note, according to the OSCE, the presidential elections in *Kyrgyzstan* in July "were marked by tangible progress [...] towards meeting OSCE commitments, as well as other international standards for democratic elections," although problems still remained.<sup>3</sup>

Following the death of President Niyazov of *Turkmenistan* in December 2006, new presidential elections were scheduled for 11 February 2007. All six candidates nominated for the post were hand-picked by the *nomenklatura*, and the frontrunner, acting President Gurbanguly Berdymukhammedov, was publicly backed by the chairman of the Central Election Commission. No members of the opposition (including those in exile) were allowed to register as candidates. Berdymukhammedov was sworn in on 14 February having won 89% of the vote.<sup>4</sup>

---

This chapter does not aim to provide a detailed account of the human rights situation in each of the five Central Asian countries; please see individual country chapters in part one of this report to this end. Instead, this chapter intends to take a more comparative approach to recent human rights developments in Central Asia – an IHF priority region – and seek to identify common and diverging trends.

Presidential elections in Uzbekistan are due to take place in December 2007.

### Human rights defenders and freedom of association

Although the approach towards human rights defenders varied in each country, the overall attitude of Central Asian governments towards local human rights defenders was one of deep mistrust and hostility. State policies throughout the region often aimed at discrediting the human rights movement and publicly smearing individual human rights defenders.<sup>5</sup>

By far, the governments of *Turkmenistan* and *Uzbekistan* were those that took the most repressive stance against human rights defenders. In these countries, human rights defenders (and their families) suffered systematic harassment and persecution by the authorities, and were often jailed in order to be silenced.

The government of Uzbekistan further consolidated its clampdown on civil society. The Karimov regime continued to use the Andijan massacre in May 2005 and the so-called war on terror as a smokescreen to cover up the serious human rights violations being perpetrated. Academics, opposition members, human rights defenders, journalists, and all those expressing independent thought were particularly targeted in this crackdown, as were those who sought to clarify what had occurred in Andijan.

The Uzbek authorities generally perceived human rights defenders to be carrying out subversive activities, and treated them accordingly. Requests to register independent NGOs were regularly rejected on formal grounds, resulting in human rights defenders carrying out legitimate, yet illegal work. Human rights defenders were often prosecuted on false charges and, following unfair trials, often convicted to prison sentences. In late 2006, at least 17 human rights defenders were in prison.<sup>6</sup> Other tools for repressing them include

mob attacks, threats, arbitrary detention, ill-treatment and torture while in custody, harassment of their families and constant surveillance by the authorities. Many Uzbek human rights defenders were thus forced into exile.

Human rights defenders in *Turkmenistan* experienced many of the same hardships as their Uzbek colleagues. Human rights organisations were also systematically denied registration by the authorities and were hence obliged to work illegally. Human rights activists and journalists were convicted for a wide array of politically motivated charges, including "subversive activities," "treason," "gathering slanderous information to spread public discontent" and "illegal weapons possession."

Imprisoned activists reported torture and ill-treatment in custody; the death of journalist and human rights activist Ogulshapar Muradova in custody, although officially explained as due to natural causes, was a poignant example. As in Uzbekistan, the forcible detention of activists in psychiatric hospitals was a common tool to silence



Women at an Ashgabat market, Turkmenistan  
© Alexander Vinnikov

dissidents. Human rights defenders also faced severe restrictions in their freedom of movement: hundreds of dissidents were included on blacklists which prevented them from leaving the country. Families of those activists who had left the country were forcibly sent into internal exile to distant places, without permission to leave.

As a general rule, human rights defenders in *Tajikistan*, *Kazakhstan* and *Kyrgyzstan* did not suffer the same treatment as described above, but experienced more subtle obstacles to their work. Common examples were economic or legislative hurdles put in place by the authorities, and lesser forms of harassment.

Despite the already stringent regulations in place, 2006 saw new attempts by these three countries to tighten their legislation concerning freedom of association. Some explained this as a broader regional trend in reaction to the “colour revolutions” in the neighbourhood, or an attempt to replicate the Russian Federation’s new NGO legislation. Foreign-funded NGOs became the particular targets of these draft legislations.

While it was no surprise that Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan had highly restrictive legislation concerning freedom of association, there was much concern that Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan would follow suit, when in 2005 and 2006 draft legislation obstructing freedom of association was tabled. In Kyrgyzstan, an announcement by the minister of justice ordering the investigation of all foreign-funded NGOs for national security reasons was condemned by the national and international human rights community, and its implementation subsequently suspended. In 2005, Kazakhstan’s Constitutional Council dismissed draft legislation – primarily aimed at restricting the actions of international NGOs in the country and curbing the influx of foreign funding to domestic NGOs – as being incompatible with the country’s constitution. In late 2005, the Tajik government presented

a new draft law on NGOs which was to strengthen control over NGOs, in particular those receiving funding from abroad. At the time of writing, discussions on this draft bill have been suspended.<sup>7</sup>

### Right to life: death penalty

Worldwide the number of countries abolishing the death penalty is on the increase. Central Asia is not foreign to this trend; in December 2006 *Kyrgyzstan* abolished the death penalty at a constitutional level. In past years, moratoria on executions have been put in place (and extended) in *Kazakhstan*, *Kyrgyzstan* and *Tajikistan*. The death penalty was abolished in *Turkmenistan* in 2000, while in *Uzbekistan* the president decreed to abolish capital punishment by January 2008.

Notwithstanding these developments, the situation regarding the death penalty in the region remained challenging.

Death sentences continued to be pronounced in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan (before the constitutional abolition in December) and Uzbekistan. They were usually the result of unfair trials, and in certain cases confessions were extracted under torture. As of February 2007, the number of prisoners on death row was estimated to be around 30 in Kazakhstan, 170 in Kyrgyzstan and an unknown number in Uzbekistan<sup>8</sup> (estimated as the highest in the region).

Prison conditions in Central Asia, particularly on death row, remained abysmal, with overcrowding, lack of sanitation, rampant abuse by prison officials and a high incidence of tuberculosis.<sup>9</sup> International standards regarding the treatment of prisoners were regularly violated. Once all death sentences are commuted into fixed-term sentences, the countries’ penitentiary systems will face the challenge of ensuring that those serving long sentences are not serving *de facto* death sentences.

A common element shared by all Central Asian countries regarding the death

penalty was the secrecy which surrounded it. No official information existed regarding the number of executions, places of burial and dates of executions. Notwithstanding the moratoria in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan, in 2006 their respective authorities continued to refuse the release of information regarding past executions (including the places of burial of the executed).

In 2006, several Central Asian states extradited persons to countries where they risked facing execution.

◆ In May, Kazakhstan extradited two Uigur refugees, Yusuf Kadir Tohti and Abdukadir Sidik, to China. The charges brought against them by the Chinese authorities were separatism and protest against the government. They are reportedly being held in *incommunicado* detention in China and were at serious risk of being executed.<sup>10</sup>

◆ In June, Huseyin Celil, a Canadian citizen of Uigur origin, was arrested in Uzbekistan and extradited to China where he had been sentenced to death (*in absentia*) for his human rights work in defence of the Uigur people.<sup>11</sup>

Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan have also extradited persons to Uzbekistan where they risked being executed.

Despite the progress achieved in 2006 in the region with regard to the death penalty, some activists feared that some of the accomplished achievements could be revoked by the strong presidential regimes in several of the countries, especially in those with fragile civil societies. The most serious concern remains Uzbekistan and the unknown number of persons that will be executed in 2007, before the death penalty is abolished in 2008.

### **Torture, anti-terrorism measures and refugees<sup>12</sup>**

During the past decade, the *Uzbek* government has waged a persistent campaign of harassment against independent

Muslims, who practice their religion outside of state-controlled institutions. In this campaign, which has been described as being part of the global “war on terrorism,” the Uzbek authorities have imprisoned thousands of Muslims without making any distinction between those who advocate violent methods and those who peacefully express their convictions. Torture and other forms of ill-treatment have been routinely used to extract “confessions” and such statements have frequently been accepted as evidence and used as the basis for conviction.<sup>13</sup>

New arrests and abuses targeting religious (Muslim) opponents followed the May 2005 Andijan events. In a series of trials related to the Andijan massacre, which took place in late 2005 and early 2006, more than 200 defendants (charged with crimes such as “terrorism” or attempting to overthrow the constitutional order) were sentenced to lengthy prison terms in seriously flawed processes, mostly conducted behind closed doors. Most of the defendants were held in *incommunicado* detention for prolonged periods of time, both prior to and after their conviction, and there were concerns that many of them may have been subjected to torture and ill-treatment.<sup>14</sup> The government tried to use these trials to support its claim that the Andijan violence was linked to “religious extremism” and to justify its longstanding campaign against independent Muslims.<sup>15</sup> In addition to those charged with crimes related to the Andijan violence, dozens of others were arrested or convicted on charges related to religious extremism in 2006.<sup>16</sup>

Western governments have long been criticised for allowing security and other concerns to take precedence over human rights concerns in their counter-terrorism co-operation with the Uzbek government. During the year, a former British Ambassador to Uzbekistan, appearing before the temporary European Parliament commit-

tee examining the participation of European governments in CIA activities, asserted that the CIA and the British intelligence service, MI6, accepted and used information extracted through torture by Uzbek authorities. He further indicated that other European governments may have also used such intelligence.<sup>17</sup>

### **Uzbek refugees<sup>12</sup>**

As in 2005, the Uzbek government aggressively pursued the forced return of Uzbek refugees who fled the country after the Andijan events, accusing them of membership in illegal religious groups and "extremist" activities. In a number of cases, Andijan refugees were forcibly sent back to Uzbekistan despite an apparent risk that they may be subjected to torture and ill-treatment upon return. These returns, which sometimes were implemented outside of formal extradition procedures, were in apparent violation of the *non-refoulement* principle. Only limited information was available about the fate of those forcibly returned to Uzbekistan after the Andijan events, but serious concerns for their safety remain at the beginning of 2007.<sup>18</sup>

In August, the *Kyrgyz* authorities extradited five Uzbeks who had been detained shortly after seeking protection in *Kyrgyzstan* following the Andijan events. Four of these men had already been recognised as refugees by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, which also had identified permanent resettlement sites for them.<sup>19</sup> The Uzbek government reportedly offered the *Kyrgyz* government assurances that the men would not be subjected to torture upon return, but such assurances do not provide adequate protection against abuse.<sup>20</sup> Several Uzbek asylum seekers also disappeared in *Kyrgyzstan*, raising concern that they may have been forcibly returned to Uzbekistan.<sup>21</sup>

Also in August, *Russian* authorities decided to extradite to Uzbekistan 12 Uzbeks

and one *Kyrgyz* charged with funding and organizing the uprising in Andijan. The men, who had been held in detention since June 2005, had been granted UN refugee status. The Uzbek government had reportedly provided written assurances that the men would not be tortured or sentenced to death upon return.<sup>22</sup> The extradition was, however, suspended after the European Court of Human Rights requested that it be halted while it considers the case.<sup>23</sup> In another case, in October, an Uzbek asylum seeker was forcibly returned from Russia to Uzbekistan although the European Court of Human Rights had asked the Russian authorities to suspend the return pending its examination of the case. The man was first arrested in February 2006 on the request of the Uzbek government, which accused him of membership in a banned religious group and involvement in the Andijan events. The extradition request was rejected by a Russian court in early October, after which the man was released. However, only days later, he was rearrested on charges of violating Russian immigration legislation and ordered to be deported.<sup>24</sup>

Ten Uzbeks accused of involvement in the Andijan events were sent back from *Ukraine* to Uzbekistan in February. The men, who had all registered as asylum seekers or were in the process of doing so, had been arrested on the basis of an extradition request from the Uzbek authorities.<sup>25</sup> They were charged with terrorism, membership in extremist organization and anti-constitutional activities upon return.<sup>26</sup>

The Uzbek Embassy in Washington, D.C., co-ordinated a return flight for a group of Uzbek refugees in the *United States* who had "expressed their desire" to return. In most of these cases, however, the refugees' families or relatives in Uzbekistan had reportedly been threatened, and the pressure on the refugees to return was considerable.

### Torture in Turkmenistan and Tajikistan

Under the regime of President Niyazov dissidents in *Turkmenistan* were ill-treated and tortured while in custody<sup>27</sup>; there were also credible allegations that psychotropic drugs had been administered to some dissidents to force them to confess to subversive activities.<sup>28</sup>

In November the United Nations Committee Against Torture (CAT) examined the report submitted by *Tajikistan*. It expressed concern about “numerous allegations” of the “widespread” practice of torture by law enforcement officials, as well as of the use of statements obtained under torture as evidence in legal proceedings. It pointed out that the absence of legislation expressly prohibiting the admission of evidence extracted under torture facilitated the continued use of such evidence.<sup>29</sup>

### Freedom of the media

2006 was a dark year for freedom of the media in Central Asia, with a journalist dying in custody in *Turkmenistan* (most probably after being tortured), *Kazakhstan* introducing new restrictive legislation, *Tajikistan* seriously curtailing information in the pre-election period, and *Uzbekistan* attempting to ban all independent media from the country.

Since the Andijan massacre, independent media, national and foreign, have almost completely phased out their work in Uzbekistan due to the severe restrictions imposed by the Karimov regime to ensure that all available information toes the government line. Uzbek journalists were front-line targets of the crackdown, with some of them sentenced to prison terms or detained in psychiatric hospitals against their will. Internet users were also targeted; since November 2005 all local service



Children at Hissar Fortress, outside Dushanbe, Tajikistan. July 2006 © IHF



providers have been forced to use the state-controlled telecom operator, which enables the regime to compile blacklists.<sup>30</sup>

There was no freedom of expression in Turkmenistan in 2006 and thus no independent media in the country. The few independent journalists that continued working did so at a very high risk as they were often harassed, arrested, or disappeared.

◆ Ogulsapar Muradova, a journalist and human rights activist associated with the Bulgaria-based Turkmen Helsinki Foundation (THF), was sentenced to six years in prison for alleged illegal weapons possession and other charges. Muradova died a month after the sentence was pronounced. No official investigation has been conducted into her death, but eyewitness reports of injuries to her body point towards torture in custody.

In Kazakhstan a restrictive media bill was adopted in July which, *inter alia*, makes registration for licenses mandatory for all media outlets; provides for unilateral grounds to deny registration; and prohibits a media outlet from using more air-time to broadcast in a language other than the state language (i.e. Kazakh). Re-registering is required for minor administrative changes.

The Kazakh regime continued to target the opposition press, including through the use of criminal libel charges for violating "the honour and dignity of the president." Several independent journalists were physically attacked by unknown persons. A French free-lance journalist was murdered in as yet unclarified circumstances. The government routinely censored opposition websites by blocking access through two major internet providers.

During the campaign leading up to the November presidential elections in Tajikistan, state-controlled TV-stations provided strong backing to President Rakhmonov, while devoting only limited coverage to his nominal opponents.<sup>31</sup> Access to a number

of independent news websites was blocked, allegedly because these contained information that "undermines state media policy."<sup>32</sup> Following pressure from NGOs and the international community access was restored.

In February the Tajik government announced a plan to establish a single government-controlled communications centre to which all existing internet and mobile phone providers must be connected. In October the authorities blocked access to a further five websites, claiming they were "a threat to information security." The five sites affected had frequently carried articles critical of the government. After protest for this move, the sites were unblocked in October.<sup>33</sup>

Only a few independent newspapers with small circulation continued to be published in the country.<sup>34</sup>

### Freedom of religion

While the degree of media freedom varied considerably among the five countries of Central Asia, there appeared to be a region-wide aversion to fully respecting religious freedom.<sup>35</sup> Throughout the region discriminatory legislation and practices abounded while religious minorities struggled to practice their faiths.

*Uzbekistan* had the most repressive legislation on religious organizations, banning the activity of any religious organisation that was not registered. Unregistered religious activity was punishable under both the criminal and administrative codes, providing even for prison sentences. Moreover, in practice it was virtually impossible for a religious community to be registered in Uzbekistan. State officials refused believers' registration on nominal pretexts; for instance, the Jehovah's Witness community in Tashkent has been refused registration eight times.<sup>36</sup>

At the beginning of 2006, the *Tajik* government put forward a draft law on reli-

gion which – if adopted – would place even harsher restrictions on believers' rights than does existing legislation in Uzbekistan. The draft bill introduced compulsory registration for all religious groups, established high thresholds for the number of community members required to qualify for registration, prohibited proselytism, restricted the number of mosques allowed and banned foreigners from leading religious communities in the country.<sup>37</sup> Following criticism from different religious communities as well as international organisations, the Tajik government suspended the consideration of the new law.

In *Kazakhstan* the authorities – on the basis of new legislation to combat extremism – increased their control of religious organisations and introduced new requirements on compulsory state registration. Harassment was reported against minority religious groups such as the Evangelical Christians and the Hare Krishna.

◆ Since April, the court of the Karasai district of the Almaty region ordered the demolition of the houses of members of the Religious Organisation Society for Krishna Consciousness. Evictions, confiscations and demolitions – sometimes only with a few hours' notification – continued throughout the year, on the official grounds that the owners had not officially privatised their plots of land, and were unable to produce the necessary property documentation for their homes. Residents had repeatedly approached the local government with the aim of regulating their ownership, but their applications had been rejected.<sup>38</sup>

In *Turkmenistan* several new religious groups and confessions have been registered, despite the very strict limitations on religious freedom. The activities of unregistered religious organisations remain banned.<sup>39</sup> Conscientious objection to military service (including on religious grounds) remained a criminal offence, punishable by imprisonment.

## Reaction by relevant international bodies

The reaction of the international community regarding the human rights abuses being committed in Central Asia, and in particular in Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, has been fragmented. Nevertheless, it is worth noting several mechanisms in place:

### a) United Nations (UN)

In 2006 the UN General Assembly (GA) did not adopt resolutions neither on Uzbekistan nor on Turkmenistan, unlike the previous year when the GA had expressed its concern about the human rights situation in both countries.

The newly-established Human Rights Council discussed the human rights situation in Uzbekistan within a confidential procedure, but failed to upgrade its concern by allowing a public discussion to take place.

During the year, only one special rapporteur of the Human Rights Council (on independence of judges and lawyers) visited Central Asia (Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan). Other rapporteurs sought visits, especially to Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan, but their requests were not granted by the authorities.

2006 saw a considerable number of reports presented to the treaty bodies, in particular from Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan. Uzbekistan was examined by the Committee Against Torture (CAT), Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC), Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) and the Committee on Social, Cultural and Economic Rights (CESCR). Turkmenistan was examined by CEDAW and CRC, while Tajikistan presented its report to the CAT.<sup>40</sup> Notwithstanding the numerous recommendations issued by these bodies, the challenge remains in their implementation.

### b) European Union (EU)

Following the Andijan massacre and the lack of an independent investigation by



the Uzbek authorities, the EU imposed sanctions on Uzbekistan consisting of an arms embargo and a travel ban for high-ranking officials. In November, EU foreign ministers agreed to partly renew the sanctions and carry out a review of the sanctions during the spring of 2007. Within this framework, an EU expert group visited Uzbekistan in December and conducted meetings with Uzbek officials, including on Andijan.

In October the European Parliament adopted a resolution to suspend consideration of an interim trade agreement with Turkmenistan.

#### **c) Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE)**

Kazakhstan maintains its bid to chair the OSCE in 2009, despite the opposition

of some participating states, led by the US, due to the country's poor human rights and democracy record. A decision on the chairmanship was expected to be taken in December 2006, but had to be postponed to 2007 for lack of consensus.

#### **d) Shanghai Co-operation Organization (SCO)**

The Shanghai Co-operation Organization now includes all five Central Asian states and is a reflection of the closer friendship of these countries with China and Russia. At a SCO Summit in June, the leaders of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Russia and China agreed to intensify the fight against terrorism, separatism, and extremism within the framework of the SCO. The SCO does not have human rights priorities.

### **Endnotes**

- <sup>1</sup> See IHF, *Human Rights in the OSCE Region: Europe, Central Asia and North America, Report 2006 (Events of 2005)*, at [www.osce.org/documents/odihr-el/2005/12/17585\\_en.pdf](http://www.osce.org/documents/odihr-el/2005/12/17585_en.pdf).
- <sup>2</sup> OSCE Election Observation Mission, *Statement on Preliminary Findings and Conclusions on Presidential Elections, Republic of Tajikistan*, 6 November 2006, at [www.osce.org/documents/odihr/2006/11/21981\\_en.pdf](http://www.osce.org/documents/odihr/2006/11/21981_en.pdf).
- <sup>3</sup> OSCE/ODIHR Election Observation Mission Final Report, at [www.osce.org/documents/odihr-el/2005/12/17585\\_en.pdf](http://www.osce.org/documents/odihr-el/2005/12/17585_en.pdf).
- <sup>4</sup> BBC, "New Turkmen leader is inaugurated," 14 February 2007, at <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/6359569.stm>.
- <sup>5</sup> Front Line, *Central Asia, Threats, Attacks, Arrests and Harassment of Human Rights Defenders*, 16 June 2006, at [www.frontlinedefenders.org/pdfs/3044\\_Front%20Line%20Central%20Asia.pdf](http://www.frontlinedefenders.org/pdfs/3044_Front%20Line%20Central%20Asia.pdf).
- <sup>6</sup> See Human Rights Watch World Report 2007 on Uzbekistan, at [hrw.org/englishwr2k7/docs/2007/01/11/uzbeki14836.htm](http://hrw.org/englishwr2k7/docs/2007/01/11/uzbeki14836.htm)
- <sup>7</sup> IHF, *Central Asia: Human Rights Groups Facing Increasingly Restrictive Legislation*, February 2006, at [www.ihf-hr.org/documents/doc\\_summary.php?sec\\_id=58&d\\_id=4193](http://www.ihf-hr.org/documents/doc_summary.php?sec_id=58&d_id=4193).
- <sup>8</sup> IHF, *Central Asia, Closer To Becoming A Death Penalty-Free Region?*, February 2007, at [www.ihf-hr.org/documents/doc\\_summary.php?sec\\_id=3&d\\_id=4368](http://www.ihf-hr.org/documents/doc_summary.php?sec_id=3&d_id=4368).
- <sup>9</sup> Amnesty International, health professional action, Tuberculosis in prison: case of Iskandar Khudaiberganov, Uzbekistan, 28 April 2006, at <http://web.amnesty.org/library/index/engEUR620092006?open&of=eng-392>.

- <sup>10</sup> IHF, report *Central Asia, Closer To Becoming A Death Penalty-Free Region?*
- <sup>11</sup> Amnesty International Canada, "Husein Celil: Fear of Imminent Execution," 10 August 2006, at [www.amnesty.ca/resource\\_centre/news/view.php?load=arcview&article=3657&c=Resource+Centre+News](http://www.amnesty.ca/resource_centre/news/view.php?load=arcview&article=3657&c=Resource+Centre+News)
- <sup>12</sup> This section is largely based on the chapter on Counter-terrorism Measures and the Ban on Torture, below.
- <sup>13</sup> For more information, see the chapter on human rights abuses in Chechnya and Central Asia in IHF, *Anti-terrorism Measures, Security and Human Rights*, April 2003 and the chapters on Uzbekistan in the IHF "annual reports" published in 1998-2006, at [www.ihf-hr.org/documents/index.php?s\\_doctype=4&sec\\_id=71](http://www.ihf-hr.org/documents/index.php?s_doctype=4&sec_id=71).
- <sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*; Amnesty International, *Andizhan – Impunity Must Not Prevail*, 11 May 2006, at <http://web.amnesty.org/library/index/engeur620102006>.
- <sup>15</sup> Human Rights Watch, *The Andijan Massacre: One Year Later, Still No Justice*, May 2006, at <http://hrw.org/english/docs/2006/05/11/uzbeki13336.htm>
- <sup>16</sup> Human Rights Watch, "Myths and Reality," October 2006, at <http://hrw.org/backgrounder/eca/uzbekistan1006/>
- <sup>17</sup> See European Parliament press release, "Former British ambassador says CIA and MI6 use testimony obtained under torture," 21 April 2006, at [www.europarl.europa.eu/news/expert/infopress\\_page/017-7417-110-04-16-902-20060411IPRO7238-20-04-2006-2006-false/default\\_en.htm](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/news/expert/infopress_page/017-7417-110-04-16-902-20060411IPRO7238-20-04-2006-2006-false/default_en.htm)
- <sup>18</sup> Human Rights Watch, *The Andijan Massacre – One Year Later, Still No Justice*, 11 May 2006.
- <sup>19</sup> See IHF, "Open Letter to the President of the Kyrgyz Republic," 11 August 2006, at [www.ihf-hr.org/documents/doc\\_summary.php?sec\\_id=58&d\\_id=4283](http://www.ihf-hr.org/documents/doc_summary.php?sec_id=58&d_id=4283).
- <sup>20</sup> Human Rights Watch, "Do Not Trade Refugees for Empty Promises," 12 January 2006, at [hrw.org/english/docs/2006/01/12/kyrgyz12404.htm](http://hrw.org/english/docs/2006/01/12/kyrgyz12404.htm). See also and IHF, "Kyrgyzstan: Denying Asylum to Uzbek Refugees in Violation of International Human Rights Standards," 14 June 2006, at [www.ihf-hr.org/documents/doc\\_summary.php?sec\\_id=3&d\\_id=4263](http://www.ihf-hr.org/documents/doc_summary.php?sec_id=3&d_id=4263).
- <sup>21</sup> See IHF, "Kyrgyzstan: IHF Concerned about Safety of Missing Uzbek Asylum Seekers," 28 August 2006, at [www.ihf-hr.org/documents/doc\\_summary.php?sec\\_id=58&d\\_id=4288](http://www.ihf-hr.org/documents/doc_summary.php?sec_id=58&d_id=4288).
- <sup>22</sup> *Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty*, Gulnoza Saidazimova, "Uzbekistan: Russian Prosecutors Order Extradition of Andijon Refugees," 4 August 2006, at [www.rferl.org/featuresarticle/2006/08/bb024f08-7b25-452a-8cd3-b752d49f0f80.html](http://www.rferl.org/featuresarticle/2006/08/bb024f08-7b25-452a-8cd3-b752d49f0f80.html); *Inter Press Service News Agency*, "Groups Fight Uzbek Extradition," August 2006, at <http://ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=34360>.
- <sup>23</sup> *Ferghana.ru information agency*, "Russia suspends extradition of 13 people to Uzbekistan," 15 August 2006, at <http://enews.ferghana.ru/article.php?id=1553>.
- <sup>24</sup> See IHF and Moscow Helsinki Group, "Russian Federation: Uzbek Asylum Seeker Forcibly Returned to Uzbekistan despite Intervention by European Court of Human Rights," 25 October 2006, at [www.ihf-hr.org/documents/doc\\_summary.php?sec\\_id=3&d\\_id=4332](http://www.ihf-hr.org/documents/doc_summary.php?sec_id=3&d_id=4332).
- <sup>25</sup> UNHCR, "UNHCR extremely concerned over the fate of 11 Uzbek asylum seekers deported from Ukraine," 24 February 2006, at [www.unhcr.org/news/NEWS/43feea312f.html](http://www.unhcr.org/news/NEWS/43feea312f.html); Amnesty International, "Ukraine: Ten asylum-seekers forcibly returned to Uzbekistan," 20 February 2006.
- <sup>26</sup> Human Rights Watch, *The Andijan Massacre – One Year Later, Still No Justice*, 11 May 2006.

- <sup>27</sup> Amnesty International, "Turkmenistan: New president must end torture and repression," February 2007, at [amnesty.org.uk/news\\_details.asp?NewsID=17263](http://amnesty.org.uk/news_details.asp?NewsID=17263).
- <sup>28</sup> IHF, Human Rights Watch, and others, "Turkmenistan: Open Letter From a Coalition of Human Rights Organizations," 18 July 2006, at [www.ihf-hr.org/documents/doc\\_summary.php?sec\\_id=58&d\\_id=4280](http://www.ihf-hr.org/documents/doc_summary.php?sec_id=58&d_id=4280).
- <sup>29</sup> *Conclusions and Recommendations of the Committee against Torture: Tajikistan*, 20 November 2006, par. 6 and 19, at [www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cat/docs/AdvanceVersions/CAT.C.TJK.CO.1-new.pdf](http://www.ohchr.org/english/bodies/cat/docs/AdvanceVersions/CAT.C.TJK.CO.1-new.pdf).
- <sup>30</sup> Reporters without Borders, *2007 World Report*, at [www.rsf.org/IMG/pdf/rapport\\_en\\_bd-4.pdf](http://www.rsf.org/IMG/pdf/rapport_en_bd-4.pdf).
- <sup>31</sup> Committee to Protect Journalists, "Government controls on news compromise vote in Tajikistan," 3 November 2006, at [www.cpj.org/news/2006/europe/tajik03nov06na.html](http://www.cpj.org/news/2006/europe/tajik03nov06na.html).
- <sup>32</sup> International Freedom of Expression Exchange (IFEX), "Government orders blocking of various websites," 10 October 2006, at [www.ifex.org/da/layout/set/print/content/view/full/78143/](http://www.ifex.org/da/layout/set/print/content/view/full/78143/).
- <sup>33</sup> *Human Rights Watch World Report 2007* on Tajikistan.
- <sup>34</sup> Committee to Protect Journalists, "Government controls on news compromise vote in Tajikistan," 3 November 2006.
- <sup>35</sup> Reporters without Borders, "Central Asia: Internet Fills Void Left By Media On Religious Freedom Issues," 7 March 2006, at [www.rferl.org/featuresarticle/2006/3/51E658FB-FE-DB-485D-89CD-572D7BAA4ECE.html](http://www.rferl.org/featuresarticle/2006/3/51E658FB-FE-DB-485D-89CD-572D7BAA4ECE.html).
- <sup>36</sup> Forum 18, *Central Asia: Religious Intolerance in Central Asia*, 18 July 2006, at [www.forum18.org/Archive.php?article\\_id=815](http://www.forum18.org/Archive.php?article_id=815).
- <sup>37</sup> Forum 18, "Most repressive religion law in Central Asia drafted," 22 March 2006, at [www.forum18.org/Archive.php?article\\_id=749](http://www.forum18.org/Archive.php?article_id=749); Zoya Pylenko, Central Asia – Caucasus Institute, "Tajikistan Mulls New NGO, Religious Laws," 19 April 2006, at [www.cacianalyst.org/view\\_article.php?articleid=4174&SMSESSION=NO](http://www.cacianalyst.org/view_article.php?articleid=4174&SMSESSION=NO).
- <sup>38</sup> Information from the Religious Organization Society for Krishna Consciousness, April 2006.
- <sup>39</sup> *Human Rights Watch World Report 2007* on Turkmenistan.
- <sup>40</sup> All concluding observations of the treaty bodies can be found at [www.ohchr.org](http://www.ohchr.org).