

‘Quakers and human rights’ by Michael Bartlett

A testimony on times and seasons gives Quakers a reticence about celebrating anniversaries. Nevertheless the sixtieth anniversary of the UDHR is a significant opportunity for reflecting both on the success of the human rights project, and on the fact that a Quakers commitment to Human Rights predates that Declaration by over 300 years. But so much written about 'rights' recently, that what is said is in real danger of losing any force.

In responding to human needs, Quakers value personal spontaneous approaches. Perhaps this stems from the call in the Sermon on the Mount ‘to go the second mile’ or the parable of the Good Samaritan. It is not something you can legislate for. This may lead some Quakers to feel that the apparatus of human rights is closer to the ‘letter that killeth’ than the spirit that gives life. I hope my lecture confronts this in suggesting both that Quakers have something particular say about the development of human rights and in considering whether a commitment to defending human rights against genocide may challenge the peace testimony, at least in its absolutist stance.

I start from the perspective of a pragmatist. To bring any legal and practical benefit human rights require a state to apply them and a judiciary to enforce them. We are facing a paradox, while the language of human rights is increasingly recognised as offering the only universal language for the twenty first century, human rights standards are threatened in many parts of the world (Gaza, Burma, Zimbabwe, Korea, Sudan and many parts of Africa).

For Quakers, “rights” are a secular counterpart to a religious recognition of ‘that of God in everyone.’ The Reformation recognition of equality before God, initially deferred to the life to come, led to a democratic recognition of equality. The early vision of Friends remains a revolutionary principle, recognising the divinity of everyone implies an existential equality, and from that insight flows a recognition of universal civil and political rights. It prefigures

the prophetic insight of Dostoevsky in ‘The Brothers Karamazov’, the benefit of one cannot be bought at the price of another’s suffering. In BK, the youngest brother, the Holy Aloysha, when asked whether he would be willing to torture to death one creature and on “its unavenged tears” to build a utopian edifice, quietly and resolutely refuses. What good ‘salvation’ unless all are saved? Utilitarian considerations cannot extend to foundational human rights.

The significance of the UDHR is as a foundational international human rights document – “an international *Magna Carta*” in Eleanor Roosevelt’s words. Its significance is rooted both in its political context and in its pragmatic development to include, via protocols, both individual civil and political and economic and social rights. It represents an artful compromise, between the demands and expectations of western democracies, (civil and political) and the Communist states of Eastern Europe (economic and social). The UDHR shares its political context with the UN Charter. This is significant in that the UN Charter provides the essential *means* for achieving the desired *ends* of the UDHR. A proper understanding of rights requires a consideration of the relationship between ends and means. To will the ends without willing the means is a sign of either intellectual bad faith or philosophical inconsistency. Justice, however hard to achieve, implies proportionality between means and ends.

Since the UDHR, rather like rings to a growing tree, the trunk of human rights has seen numerous accretions, or generations. (Civil and political, followed by economic and social and now environmental rights.) There is a danger that human rights may become reified or extracted from their political context. Without adequate roots in a functioning polity, the end of human rights lacks the means for implementation. If claims of rights outstrip the capacity to realise them they risk devaluation or at worst the rottenness of bankruptcy. There is no right, properly considered, without a remedy. The right to work implies an employer of last

resort able to take on willing Labour. The right to a pension implies a state or employer willing to pay one. The right to adequate health care requires an affordable health service with the resources to provide that care. A functioning state is a necessary precondition of human rights and that is as true as the positive right to life, which the state has a responsibility to guarantee, as of any other right.

What do Quakers have to bring to the table? Primarily, I think it is our commitment to pragmatic political engagement rooted in a commitment to the vulnerable and poor. We are part of a Christian tradition recognising a responsibility to our neighbour, unlimited by geography or culture. At the same time, we seek to express this as a radical movement that encourages personal integrity and consistency of vision.

The essence of human rights is not merely contractual. Rights and responsibilities don't balance at an individual level. A child does not earn a right to fair treatment. Nor does dementia lose an adult's right to respect. A defendant is entitled to a fair trial whatever their criminal record. Convicted terrorists still need to be treated with dignity or respect. Neither torture nor death penalty can be justified by utilitarian considerations. A disabled person is still entitled to dignity because they are worthwhile in themselves. The unconditional nature of this worth is both at odds with a contractual understanding of entitlement and in a very real sense is redemptive. There is something unconditional about the regard owed to an individual simply on account of their humanity. It encourages both the will and capacity to change for the better. Perhaps we first need to reflect a little more on what it means to be human if we are to have a full understanding of human rights.

So how does this translate itself into central work at Friends House. Firstly Britain Yearly Meeting recognises human rights as a basic tenet of Quaker Faith and Practice (see QFP 8.02, the others being spirituality and peace.) Secondly, they provide a way of prioritising and understanding the connections between different aspects of this work. I will give two practical examples of the present scope of human rights, from my own work, both involving young people: The treatment of young people in the armed forces and the rights of asylum seekers.

Young people in the army

Everyone of goodwill unequivocally rejects the forced recruitment of children envisaged in the Convention against the use of child soldiers (Optional Protocol, to the Convention on the Rights of the Child, on the use of Children in Armed Conflict). But OPAC requires a state to apply it and a judiciary to enforce it – a problem when state recruitment may be the violation or lack of a functioning judiciary permits rebel groups to recruit with impunity. Maybe in the UK we need to start closer to home.

The UK is currently the only European country to recruit at the age of 16. Not only does the army enlist 16 year olds, but in doing so it requires them to commit themselves for six years, (four years beyond their 18th birthday). Sixteen year olds are considered too young to have a contract enforced against them; too immature to drive a car; to be allowed to gamble; to order a drink in a pub; or to marry without their parents consent but they are nevertheless permitted to join the army and, after an initial cooling off period of a month, can be compelled to remain for nearly six years, with no right to leave on their 18th birthday. In most areas of life we respect the provisional nature of young people`s decisions. That is part of growing up. Many at the age of 16 are not sure what university course they will do, let alone what work they will take when they leave. Yet young people entering the army are a different situation.

I have brought with me a petition that asks Parliament to remedy this by raising the age of enlistment into the armed forces to 18, in line with government proposals to raise the school leaving age. This is a practical proposal and I hope, some of you, will feel able to sign the petition. Early Day Motion 50, currently in the House of Commons, is expressed in similar terms and those of you in contact with your MP might ask them to support this EDM.

The United Kingdom is a signatory to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child. This is expressed in domestic law (e.g. in the Children Act 2004) in recognising a requirement to consider the 'best interests of a child' in decisions that affect them. On ratifying the Convention on the Rights of the Child in 1991, the UK entered a reservation relating to 'the entry into, stay in and departure from the UK'. For a long time the Government described it as necessary to allow the UK to maintain control over who comes here and is allowed to stay. In response to a changed political context and the lobbying of many organisations, including Friends, the UK withdrew that reservation on December 4th 2008. Without the reservation the best interests of the child must be a primary consideration for those making decisions that affect children. What this means in practice is that if a decision affecting a child is challenged in court, as well as considering the human rights implications of an immigration decision (e.g. detention or removal) the court will now be obliged to consider the best interests of the child. The removal of the Reservation is a practical example of how international human rights instruments impinge directly on domestic administrative decisions.

Humanitarian Intervention

How does the question of ends and means apply to the redress of human rights violations in the most extreme circumstances where States deny the foundational human rights standards?

Firstly human rights instruments via the UDHR provide a gold standard of intention and leverage for disciplining the exercise of political power. A remarkable aspect of international

law is that it is so largely honoured in the observance. There are mechanisms via the human rights committee of the United Nations to scrutinise violations and question states parties. There are many forms of intervention short of the use of military force. There is a primary responsibility to prevent violations. The international community has economic levers, including sanctions short of military force for persuading recalcitrant States` Parties. Responsible reporting can be effective in highlighting and thereby limiting abuses – no person or country likes to be shamed. The OSCE has unarmed monitors and the UN has an increasingly consensual peace keeping role.

But what about the eventual use of force The commitment to human rights and to pacifism offer two seemingly opposed absolutes admitting of no compromise. What happens when the immovable principle of pacifism meet the irresistible humanitarian imperative of responsibility to protect? The example of Kosovo demonstrates the danger of the unintended consequences even of politically benign interventions. Intervention may perpetrate greater violence than it seeks to redress. The Iraq war is a terrible example of more mixed motives. But the Universal Declaration of Human Rights includes as article 3:

“Everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.”

The Genocide Convention, which came into force on 12 January 1951, Article 1 provides:

“The contracting parties confirm that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and punish.”

The International criminal Court, to which the UK government is committed, has universal jurisdiction to try crimes of genocide.

In his book, 'The Audacity of Hope', Barrack Obama says: **“there are few examples in history in which the freedom that men and women crave is delivered through outside intervention. In almost every successful social movement of the last century, from Gandhi's campaign against British rule to the Solidarity movement in Poland to the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa, democracy was the result of local awakening.”**

I hope that the President elect will live up to that mantra in office but we need to consider whether the single exception to this may be in cases of Genocide. Where a population is threatened with annihilation, can any unintended consequences be worse than that horror? Does the international community, where prevention has failed, have a responsibility to intervene? 'Responsibility to Protect,' if it is to work, requires support for all its parts. R2P relies on a threat of coercion to hold open spaces for developing less coercive alternatives. You cannot consistently or convincingly make a threat without a willingness, to carry it out. If Friends do not object to the use of police in public protection, where the use of force is proportionate, should we object to the use of peace-keeping forces, as essentially a policing activity, on behalf of the international community? While this goes further than the doctrine of aid to a civil power because it envisages a situation where essentially a state has lost its attributes of sovereignty, may be compelling humanitarian create not just a responsibility but a duty on the international community to intervene. Clearly if the UN is to become the sole legitimate authority for the use of military force it will require greater democratic scrutiny and control to ensure that it acts with consistency in the interests of a just peace, but here as in the other situations can we responsibly will the ends without willing the means?

The political context of 2009 offers very different challenges to that of sixty years ago. How do we respond to the situation where we have come to the boundaries of what is sustainable environmentally? The biosphere requires protection from people as much as people need

protection from each other. To return to the Declaration of the Rights of Man, Article 4 states, “liberty consists in the right to do everything that injures no-one else.” Today avoiding injuries requires an awareness of collective as much as individual rights. Restricting our use of carbon necessarily restricts our economic liberty. Limitations on air travel or projects such as road pricing may require from the generation, now growing up, a level of legitimate restriction of liberty (for instance to travel by car) which would not have been accepted by our parents` generation while for the generation of our grandparents the right to travel long distances by air was for the majority rather like the right to dine at the Ritz or to play the Casino at Montecarlo.

How we respond to the situation requires political negotiation. While rights and responsibilities may not be reciprocal on an individual level, at a collective level they need to balance, our rights imply a responsibility of a functioning state to implement them and that in turn requires active political engagement. Can we expect a state to guarantee our rights, if we are unwilling to contribute to its life ? Quaker Faith and Practice reminds us (1.02), “**to remember our responsibilities as a citizen for the conduct of local, national, and international affairs. Do not shrink from the time and effort your involvement may demand.**” Without a functioning state including an effective judiciary, human rights are no more than aspirations. So in thinking about rights perhaps one of the things that friends need to include is our own responsibility for democratic and political engagement.

There is a need for greater education and understanding of the principles of human rights. They do not exist in a vacuum. While some rights are absolute, for instance, the right to life and freedom from tortured, not be punished without due process, others are qualified in the sense that they need to be balanced against each other. Freedom of expression can be legitimately limited both to protect another`s privacy. Freedom of assembly, in the case of violent protests, may need to be curtailed in the interests of preserving a right to life.

Protection of a citizen's right to life may require the preventive detention of the clinically insane. A right to manifest freedom of religion cannot include acts that would be detrimental to the young, nor can it interfere with the rights of those who do not share your faith. There are borderline areas. How far should a Muslim teacher's right to freedom of religious expression be qualified by the right of an agnostic pupil, to be educated in a secular environment? They are not always easy questions.

We need to adapt to new situations. While environmental concerns may require limits to our consumption of carbon, that limitation needs to be proportionate, legitimate and have a rational connection with the end to be fulfilled. It cannot for instance extend to limiting rights to marry, found a family, or associate freely.

That is why it is so important to maintain the inner core of rights that are embedded in the UDHR and ECHR. In balancing other rights we need to remember that at the heart of human rights is a vision of the value of each individual human being and the capacity of human beings to relate to each other in love and respect. The recognition of the humanity of each of us is what makes them "human rights." In working out the human rights settlement for the 21st century, means and ends need to be carefully calibrated. We may need to balance the right of the individual with our collective economic, social, and environmental rights. Above all we need to remember the prophetic insight, and here Dostoevsky is at one with Friends, that the denial of the rights of one diminishes the humanity of us all.

MB

Challenges of Our Time Lecture – Quaker Human Rights Work

Laurel Townhead

Laurel Townhead is Policy and Campaigns Manager for Women in Prison. She worked in Geneva for the Quaker United Nations Office from September 2005 to February 2007. She has continued her involvement with the women in prison project, completing work on a Commentary on the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners in June 2008, and speaking about this and other aspects of the project's work at various events.

Introduction

I am going to speak about the how the concepts that Michael has spoken about are put into practice in Quaker human rights work. I currently work for Women in Prison a small charity working with women offenders across the UK. But I will speak tonight largely from my experience of working for the Quaker United Nations Office in Geneva where I have worked on, and continue to contribute to, a joint Quaker project on women in prison. And it is the example of this project that I will use tonight to illustrate how some Quaker human rights work is done.

Why Focus on Women in Prison?

Why focus on women in prison? Because they are so frequently ignored and their rights are so frequently violated. Women make up no more than 6% of the prison population in most countries. They are imprisoned in systems designed by and designed for men. Their comparatively small numbers mean that regimes, education programmes, and support services are not designed for them and do not take account of the way in which their life experiences and resultant needs differ from those of male prisoners.

Most women in prison are mothers of dependent children.

Most women in prison have experienced sexual abuse or domestic violence.

Most have mental health problems.

Most are convicted of non-violent offences.

Most serve short sentences.¹

These are characteristics shared by women in prison around the world. These life experiences may impact on women's offending. They certainly impact on the way they experience imprisonment. And their imprisonment certainly impacts upon their children – whether they live in prison with them or are separated from them.

What is needed to respond to their offending, to provide the support and woman-centred rehabilitation programmes required to reduce reoffending is not further adaptation of a system designed for male prisoners but an entirely new system, designed specifically for them. For those of you who are interested in what such a system might consist of I recommend reading the review of women in the criminal justice system by Jean Corston, a Labour member of the House of Lords.²

The Quaker women in prison project was started as a result of a concern raised by Friends from around the world who were working in prisons and who were seeing a rapid increase in the rate of women's imprisonment but no corollary increase in the attention given to their needs and rights. The project that responded to this concern and continues to take this concern forward is a joint project between Quaker Peace and Social Witness, the Quaker Council for European Affairs, the Friends World Committee for Consultation representatives at the UN Crime Commission and the Quaker United Nations Office Geneva. I will speak later about what the project, and specifically the Quaker United Nations Office has done.

What is Human Rights Work?

¹ For statistics from the UK see the Prison Reform Trust's *Bromley Briefings*
<http://www.prisonreformtrust.org.uk/temp/FactfilesDecembersp2008.pdf>

² The Corston Report: a review of women with particular vulnerabilities in the criminal justice system,
<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/documents/corston-report/>

But first I should also explain what I mean by “human rights work” – I believe that all of us do human rights work when we act to protect others from need, persecution or abuse. Whether our motivation be faith, empathy or something else. When a meeting gives support to asylum seekers in need – whether in the form of food, money, or welcome – they are doing human rights work. Or when a meeting house opens its doors as an overflow homeless shelter – they are doing human rights work. It does not matter if you cannot list which rights you are upholding nor does it matter if you do not know the text designed to protect those rights – such actions are human rights work. In truth there are many Quakers, and others, out there doing human rights work whether they would call it that or not.

The Frontline and the Framework

Elizabeth Fry, renowned Quaker prison reformer, would not have described her work with women prisoners as human rights work, she would not have defined the injustice she saw as human rights violations, she would not have seen herself as a champion on human rights. But that is what she did, what she saw and what she was. The principles at the heart of human rights have been valued and acted upon for many hundreds of years. But human rights are not just new words used to describe old principles, human rights today are defined and protected by a legal framework. And human rights work involves support and protection on an individual level and the development, strengthening and oversight of the legal protections of rights. The work on frontline and work on the framework are both required.

Elizabeth Fry’s work was frontline. Her direct work with women in Newgate prison – such as providing clothes, establishing a school – was vital to restore their sense of human worth and improve their chances of a breaking their cycle of offending. But face-to face work can only ever reach a limited number of women. By working for systemic change we seek to protect the human rights of greater numbers of women in prison – in fact of all women in prison.

The work I did in Geneva was not frontline work such as Elizabeth Fry did, but it benefitted from a grounding in her work and was informed by the experience of frontline workers around the world, Quaker and otherwise. But it was at a different coalface that we are working – the coalface of international human rights law.

Elizabeth Fry believed that there is a “sphere of usefulness open to us all” and Quakers today are engaged in many spheres of usefulness in relation to women in prison. For some their sphere of usefulness is in the frontline work, for others their sphere is in working for systemic change. The Quaker United Nations Office’s human rights work and the sphere in which we exercise our usefulness is in developing international law that protects the human rights of women in prison.

A Human Rights Approach

Crucially, the Quaker women in prison project has taken a human rights approach to women’s imprisonment. Penal reform is an area of work such as those mentioned above that may not be called human rights work and may not be thought of such but is nonetheless a form of human rights work. By taking a human rights approach to a penal reform issue we remember to think not only in terms of prison management and reoffending rates. We remember that every woman in prison is an individual who bears rights and that an individualised approach will be needed ensure those rights are upheld. The project has sought to ensure that the human rights impact of women’s imprisonment is understood and that those rights are realised.

And what rights are affected by imprisonment – not just the most obvious ones such as freedom from torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or the right to a fair trial. All rights are impacted upon in the total environment of prison – the right to health, the right to housing (both in terms of conditions in detention and access to housing on release), the right to food, the right to education, freedom of religion, the right to family life and so on.

So if the human rights framework is already there and the international laws protecting rights are already written – what role is there for the Quaker United Nations Office in progressing the protection

of the rights of women in prison? What was – and still is – needed is clarification of what these rights mean in practice for women in prison and guidance on how to implement them.

For example the right to health – or as it is formally defined in international law “the right to the highest attainable standard of healthcare” – what does that mean for a woman in prison? It means she should have access to medical staff. It means she should have the same level of access to medical staff and medical treatment that she would have outside of prison. What does that mean for a pregnant woman in prison? It means she should have access to medical staff as and when she needs it. It means she should not have to rely on medically unqualified prison staff to make decisions about whether or not she should be taken to see a midwife or whether or not a midwife should be brought to see her. This is an area where guidance is vital, and where sharing good practice is useful. So in one of our reports, we give an example of how this right was implemented for pregnant women in Holloway by support from the Holloway Birthing Companions and a system whereby pregnant women were given a mobile phone that dialled directly (and only) to a midwife so that each woman could explain what was happening and what she was feeling and a trained health professional could make that decision as to what should be done next.³

Human Rights Work in Practice

So what exactly does human rights work with the United Nations in Geneva consist of? As I was preparing for this lecture I reread a quotation from the memoir of Elizabeth Fry by two of her daughters in *Quaker Faith and Practice* which states that within the female prison population “*a crying need existed for influence, for instruction, reproof and encouragement*”.⁴ It struck me that the work we do with diplomats and staff and representatives of international organisations could be broken down as a response to these needs not only for women prisoners but also for policy makers. Our work on the project has sought to influence, to instruct, to reproach and to encourage.

To Instruct

Instruction has come from research done into the situation of women in prison and children of imprisoned mothers around the world. This research has been done through desk research, questionnaires to prisons, prisoners, and those working with prisoners and through contact with some of the many, many projects that work as Elizabeth Fry did trying to alleviate the suffering of individual women in prison around the world. Our reports have covered – a general examination of issues faced by women in prison around the world, research specifically on the situation of women in pre-trial detention, impact of parental imprisonment on children, the situation of children held in prisons with their mothers. Our research has been written up and used in the work we have done to try and influence those in a position to push the development and interpretation of international standards forward.

To Influence

Influence has been sought through formal and informal channels. We have submitted information to a number of studies conducted by experts appointed by the UN – for example on violence against women and another on violence against children. The information provided by us, may have a greater audience and wider influence once incorporated into such UN reports.

We also work directly with decisions makers and those developing policy – providing them with information that may influence their work and suggesting how they could take our concerns forward. As the word lobbying suggests – much of this takes place in the lobbies and hallways of the large UN buildings. But in the case of the Quakers it also takes place in the dining room of the villa that the office based in. One of QUNO’s means of working, once described to me as “dinner table

³ *Women in Prison: A Commentary on the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners* (QUNO, 2008) <http://www.quno.org/geneva/pdf/humanrights/women-in-prison/WiP-CommentarySMRs200806-English.pdf>

⁴ *Quaker Faith & Practice* (2nd ed.), 18.08

diplomacy” is to bring diplomats and others together over a meal to find a way through a deadlock or to answer questions that cannot or cannot easily be asked openly. It is a remarkable way of working both in its simplicity and the effectiveness. It also means that I now know that making pancakes for 15 can be a form of human rights work!

To Reproach

Reproach is used widely as a means of campaigning on human rights issues – it is a staple of the work of Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch for example. It is not used much by the Quaker United Nations Office. We specifically work on thematic human rights issues rather than country-specific ones because our approach is based on dialogue – what Rufus Jones called “small circles and quiet processes” – and it is easier to keep people coming into those circles and keep those processes quiet if our style is not one of finger pointing. So within this sphere of usefulness there are certainly different approaches to how to be useful.

The reproach, therefore, comes not from us. There are committees of independent experts whose role it is to oversee implementation of the various legal instruments that define human rights. States which have signed up to a human rights treaty will report regularly to its committee on what they are doing to make sure that the rights in that treaty are upheld. For example there is a UN Convention on the Rights of the Child the implementation of which is overseen by the Committee on the Rights of the Child. The UK has ratified this convention and it reported to the Committee last year, as some of you may know.

The Quaker United Nations Office has worked with individual experts who sit on this Committee to inform them about the human rights violations faced by children of imprisoned mothers – both children who live in prisons with their mothers and those who are separated by maternal imprisonment. And we have suggested to the Committee what questions it may be good to ask of countries and what recommendations they could make. This Committee has been very receptive to this project and continues to ask questions and make recommendations without further briefing from us.

To Encouragement

The encouragement we have provided is encouragement to governments to make progressive reforms by highlighting good practice where we see it (such as the example given above). And by reporting on the on progress made so far – everybody likes to be praised! Reporting on positive developments – such as the Committee on the Rights of the Child’s regular recommendations on children of imprisoned mothers – also helps to encourage progress in other bodies – both Geneva-based as elsewhere. This is one of the real benefits of undertaking this work as a joint project. It is surprising how little communication there is between different parts of the apparently monolithic UN. So the Friends World Committee for Consultation representatives to the UN’s Crime Commission were able to take a report on progress made in Geneva to the Crime Commission in Vienna and successfully use it to encourage that body to take a greater interest in women in prison.

Similarly, we were able to use work done by the Quaker Council for European Affairs on the development of the Council of Europe’s new Prison Rules to suggest language to be included in new prison standards being drafted by the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights.

Positive Impact

These four elements of the approach to our work on women in prison have had an impact – although it is hard to judge to what extent something you have done has caused something to happen in this environment. In Geneva the committees I mentioned – the treaty bodies as they are known – are regularly addressing recommendations to States on how to improve the situation of women in prison, the Human Rights Council – the UN’s principle human rights body – has passed resolutions that commit States to better protecting the rights of women in prison. In Vienna where the UN Crime Commission meets the UN’s Office on Drugs and Crime has produced a handbook on women in prison.

In Strasbourg the Council of Europe developed new European Prison Rules that contained significant advances in terms of provision for women in prison.

The leap of faith with this type of framework-focussed human rights work comes in believing that it will have an impact on the lives of individual women. Just as our project has gained from the insights and examples of those doing frontline work with women in prison, those doing frontline work gain tools from the framework we are helping to develop. The human rights law that the Quaker Women in Prison Project is seeking to advance is a tool to persuade governments to uphold the value of every individual woman in prison and to treat them with the worth and dignity that they deserve and have a right to regardless of their crime. In this way our spheres overlap and positive changes in the treatment of women in prison and children of imprisoned mothers can be made – and our work on human rights work can be successful.

-- --

Quaker Women in Prison Project Partners:

Quaker Peace and Social Witness
Quaker Council for European Affairs
Friends World Committee for Consultation representatives to the UN Crime Commission
Quaker United Nations Office, Geneva

All reports by QCEA and QUNO are available online from their websites above.

A jointly prepared briefing for Friends is available from QPSW: