

Commencement Address of the 52nd Summer School

Fondation René Cassin – Institut International des droits de l’homme

On the Occasion of the International Day in Support of Victims of Torture

Strasbourg, France, 26 June 2023

**“Torture and the History of Evil and Sin”**

Alice Jill Edwards

UN Special Rapporteur on Torture and Other Cruel Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment

*Check against delivery\**

Excellencies, Ladies and gentlemen,

Thank you Mr. Touzé for the kind invitation to be giving the commencement address to this year’s summer school of the International Institute of Human Rights, Rene Cassin. It is a great honour.

Dear students, it is a warm feeling to be back in Strasbourg, where I was – like you – a participant and diploma recipient, and named the top student in the summer of 2005. I have very fond memories of that long hot month spent in this gorgeous French city, of taking picnics with fellow students in the surrounding meadows, of living in the dorm rooms, and having long chats on how to resolve the world’s big challenges, while hanging out of our windows or sitting on the steps of the building.

I encourage you to take the diploma which I found to be one of the most vigorous and challenging tests in my career, at the same time it was immensely rewarding. No matter whether you succeed or not, it will teach you something, build your resilience, and your ability to cope with pressure and even rejection, or success. Regardless, I congratulate you for deciding to spend your summer here in Strasbourg and to be open to learning new knowledge, new skills, and most importantly, to listen to each other’s different points of view, to hear each other’s experiences shaped by different life experiences, find your points of commonality, and remember, everything is arguable! We might like to think that international human rights law is a settled domain, but you will only be able to succeed in this field if you realise that not everyone may think like you, that there are different views, and that does not mean less legitimate ways of thinking, and that arguments are to be formulated.

\*\*\*

I am here today to tell you about my mandate and work as Special Rapporteur on Torture – and the global struggle confronting us

On this day, we mark the moment 39 years ago when the United Nations Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment reached the necessary number of ratifications – twenty – to come into force. 26 June is an annual moment when we can unite to raise our voices in support of the hundreds of thousands of people around the world who have been victims of torture and those who are still being tortured today.

I am really pleased to be spending this important day here at the René Cassin Institute, with you, the next generation of lawyers, scholars and human rights defenders who have a big job ahead of you, just as my generation did. In fact, the number of armed conflicts around the world is the highest it has been since 1945. The Red Cross tells us there are more than 100 conflicts going on right now, which involve more than 60 states and more than 100 non-state armed groups. Stop and think for a moment about that number. *More than 100 conflicts* – our work and our shared ambitions for change have never been more important.

Everywhere we look, we see the harsh reality of the human condition. That could be boiled down to the inevitability of suffering and death, and an understanding of evil and sin. The idea of sin is unique to humans. Animals are incapable of sin.

From the beginning of time, everyone has agreed that unjustifiable killing is intrinsically wrong, and that there is a sanction for unethical behavior.

*But what about torture?*

Today the prohibition of torture is considered to be one of the greatest social contracts of humanity. The obligation not to torture is owed not only by a State to their own citizens, but is considered such an egregious act that it also is considered an *erga omnes* crime, that is a crime committed against not only the direct victim, but to all of humanity.

We are all harmed by a single act of torture against any of our fellow human citizens in this precious planet. Consider that. Whenever a fellow being is subjected to violent and degrading treatment, even when they are miles away, we are all harmed. And we all have a responsibility to stand up against such action.

In my first report as the newly appointed Special Rapporteur on Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment to the General Assembly, delivered in October last year, I emphasized that:

“The prohibition [of torture] underpins who we are as human beings, [and] express[es] our shared, universal aspiration to live in societies free of fear, discrimination, intimidation and oppression.”

Although the prohibition is “absolute and sacrosanct, [-] it is a fragile right, constantly being tested, tolerated or excused.”

“Even a singular incident of torture or inhuman treatment can send ripple effects through society and community, instilling fear and suspicion.” We ignore minor infractions at our peril.

“The act of torture is the ultimate betrayal of a state’s pact with its citizens to govern in their interests, in respect for their human rights, and within constitutionally set limits on governmental authority.”

Importantly, the regular or unaddressed threat or actual use of such violence weakens a country’s own short- and long-term political and economic stability, and can spill over to its neighbors, creating fragile neighborhoods.

Long term wounds caused by torture are hard to repair, and can entrench hatred, discrimination and prejudice, which can be easily triggered against “the other”, and lead to insurrection, *coups d’etat*, election violence, authorization rule, and even outright war.

Torture is a threat to international peace and security.[[1]](#footnote-1)

But this understanding of torture wasn’t always agreed. And even now - don’t be fooled that everyone agrees with it. States regularly deny its existence, they fail to investigate allegations, or sometimes they attempt to object to how torture is defined, or interpreted. Or they may use euphemisms – such as “enhanced interrogation techniques” – to distort the illegality of their actions. Sometimes they endorse it and brazenly carry it out. The global condemnation of torture must be ongoing – a constant and daily practice.

\*\*\*

At various points in history however, torture was an acceptable practice. It is against this history that we continue to have to fight.

In most ancient, medieval, and early modern societies, torture was legally and morally acceptable. Historically, torture was seen as a reliable way to elicit the truth, a suitable punishment, and deterrence against future offenses.

In Europe around 1215, there was a phenomenon of truth by ordeal which was carried out by either water or fire. In the former case a suspect was thrown into water and observed against a pre-determined judgment that the innocent would sink and the guilty would float. In the latter, the suspect was burned with a heated rod, and was pronounced guilty after three days if the wound had not healed.[[2]](#footnote-2)

European palaces and castles were built with torture in mind – take the Doge’s Palace in Venice. Construction began in 1340 and the home always included a prison. In time there was a Chamber of Torment, as well as detention cells which became flooded at high tide.[[3]](#footnote-3) Famous prisoners included Giacomo Casanova.

Witch trials can be seen in the same light. It wasn’t until the nineteenth century that the practice of ‘ducking’ was outlawed in the United Kingdom. Women – and it nearly always was women – were submerged on a stool. Although the practice was not meant to be fatal, it often was. The victims were mostly women who had been accused of being witches or of ‘scolding’ – speaking ill of another person, generally a man and often their husband.[[4]](#footnote-4)

In all the historic global empires, from the Holy Roman Empire, the Ottoman Empire and the Austro-Hungarian Empire, torture was part of the means by which they subdued the local population to their will, enslaved them and punished transgression. The world’s holy books also have parables and passages permitting torture in certain circumstances. Some of these torturous practices persist in different parts of the world.

In the colonial era, Britain and other colonial powers routinely used torture and other forms of violence to ensure their control over the colonized. In British India the crime was facilitated, systematized, and ultimately sanctioned by the East India Company and then the Raj. Rendering the police a source of terror played a key role in the construction and maintenance of state sovereignty.[[5]](#footnote-5)

Almost everywhere in the world there was a practice of treating certain persons – enemies, the poor, the occupied, the different – in ways that would constitute torture today.

This was in the period before “rational proof” was required in order to determine guilt, and well before the presumption of innocence or the prohibition on extraction of confessions or information by torture. And well before our contemporary understanding that every person, no matter their ethnicity, their economic status, their family links, their sex, their sexual orientation, or their political opinion or religious beliefs, share the same rights.

*\*\*\**

*When was the turning point?*

But there was a turning point in our understanding that such abuses were not ethical or moral, that they were abhorrent, and should be prohibited in all circumstances. That would be inspired by the most inhumane treatment of Jews and others in Nazi Germany and the two world wars that would follow.

In 1945, the world agreed that torture was an outrage upon human dignity, and contrary to fair battlefield tactics.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the General Assembly in 1948, and celebrating its 75th anniversary this year, declared that “No one shall be subjected to torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.” René Cassin himself, seconded to the Commission on Human Rights set up to draft the Universal Declaration, contributed to its drafting, for which he was awarded the Nobel Prize.

The Geneva Conventions, also adopted in 1948, sought to regulate the conduct of parties to armed conflicts and their treatments of civilians, prisoners of war and other *hors de combat*. These war conventions clearly establish that “torture and other outrages upon human dignity” are war crimes, and if committed on a scale that is widespread or systematic, would constitute a crime against humanity.

The Nuremberg trials, which started in November 1945 and concluded in 1946 involved 24 defendants for a range of crimes committed by defeated Nazi Germany. Although the main focus was on the crime of aggression (at that stage it was called “crime against the peace”), the International Military Tribunal’s Charter also included lists of war crimes and crimes against humanity in which torture was reflected. The Charter also established that there was no defence of superior orders (a provision that was later inserted in the Convention against Torture).

Not far from Strasbourg, is one of these concentration camps – the Natzweiler-Strughof, the only such place on French soil and the first concentration camp to be discovered by the Allies. Opened in 1941, 52,000 prisoners were forced to work in the pink granite quarry nearby for the construction projects of the Reich. It is estimated that 22,000 people perished. From 1941-44, pseudo-scientific medical experiments were carried out on inmates, and there was an attempt to compile an anatomical collection of Jewish skeletons, to reinforce the Nazi views of the “Aryan race” and the inferiority of the Jews. They also carried out experiments on sulphonamides, war gases (such as mustard gas) and on typhus. On the site an experimental gas chamber was also constructed.

The terrible scientific and biological experimentations carried out by the Nazis on Jews, Roma and homosexuals were later explicitly prohibited in the torture prohibition (article 7) in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, of 1966. There is a second (often forgotten) sentence that reads: “In particular, no one shall be subjected without his free consent to medical or scientific experimentation.”

The relics of the Nazis should remind us always of the potential depravity of human nature. I would encourage you to visit this historic site while you are studying here, as I did. It is incredibly chilling taking the train to the site, and walking the somber path to the nearly hidden site nestled in the woods.

*The birth of modern human rights*

Two other early post-World War II treaties elaborated in the early days of the United Nations are worth mentioning:

First, the 1948 Genocide Convention, and second, the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees. The Genocide Convention categorically outlaws attempts to eradicate, in whole or part, groups from societies, and explicitly refers to torture as a form of genocide.

The Refugee Convention, also a post-World-War-II instrument, provides sanctuary in the form of asylum to persons in fear of “being persecuted” by their own governments. It is estimated that thirty-forty percent of refugees are victims of torture or are at risk of torture by their own governments.

Until the mid-1960s, the international community concentrated most of their efforts on elaborating the two International Covenants – of which for our purposes, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the ICCRP is the most relevant. As already mentioned, torture was included as one of the key prohibitions, carrying over the terminology of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It is surrounded by related provisions, articles 9 and 10 dealing with the right to liberty and security of person, and the prohibition of inhumane treatment when detained; and other provisions such as non-discrimination, as well a right to free assembly and association, speech and opinion, and to a fair trial.

The ICCPR did not enter into force until 1977. So that means when I was born, in 1972, these treaties, which today have more than 170 States parties each, were merely aspirational. And although I am sure I seem old .. that really wasn’t that long ago ..

Imagine that, being born into a world in which human rights were so embryonic that there was a serious question whether States could agree to what we accept today as binding international standards. When one puts the world into this context, we have come a long way ….

There was a long pause between these early instruments until the 1970s and 1980s when the international community returned to the question of torture (although torture or similar treatment are referred to in both the 1965 convention against racial discrimination, and the 1974 convention against apartheid).

*Latin America and the evolution of the global anti-torture framework*

Although clearly there were many situations of torture being perpetrated in many different contexts in these intervening years, not least colonial-era brutalities, it was the dictatorships in Latin America which prompted the question of torture to be put back on the top of the diplomatic agenda.

Latin America was the world’s torture hotspot in the 1970s and 1980s. The experiences of Argentina and Chile are important case studies, not only because they show what can happen when a state has an unbridled power, but also because they are a reminder of what can be done when the international community is committed enough. Let me explain.

The global response to one of the darkest periods in their history led to the current system of rules and mechanisms geared to curtailing the risks of torture and responding to such egregious acts for future generations.

First came the 1975 Declaration of the General Assembly on the Protection of All Persons from Being Subjected to Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, which elaborated the first definition of torture, which was largely mirrored in the later Convention.

This Declaration stated that torture is an aggravated and deliberate form of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment (art. 1); and further that torture is against the purposes of the UN Charter (art 2).

One of the most concrete legacies from this period was the adoption of the United Nations Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, which was negotiated from 1977 until 1984. It entered into force on this day - 26 June 1987- 39 years ago - with the requisite 20 States parties. The Convention has almost achieved universal ratification with 173 States parties!

*Framework of the five “Ps” against torture*

The Convention gives us the framework of the five “Ps” as I refer to them, which underpin and guide all our actions on torture:

* PREVENTION – an overarching obligation (art. 2) on States to take effective legislative, administrative, judicial or other measures to prevent acts of torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment (art. 16) in any territory under its jurisdiction. One could also classify three additional obligations under the P of Prevention, namely not to expel or extradite any person to another State where there are substantial risks of torture to prevent their harm upon return (art. 3), that education and information will be included in training of law enforcement personnel, civil or military, medical personnel, public officials and others involved in arrest, custody and interrogation (art. 10), and that rules, instructions, methods and practices relating to interrogation and custody will be kept under systematic review (art. 11)
* PROHIBITION – the absolute prohibition against torture is not explicitly included in the Convention, as it was considered at the time of drafting that it was already accepted as established in both the Universal Declaration and the ICCPR, however it is reinforced by the Convention via the definition of torture (art.1), the non-derogability clause that does not allow any exceptions or deviations, even in times of war or other exceptional circumstances (art. 2(2)), that there are no excuses for torture, such that orders of a public authority or a superior can justify the use of torture (art. 2(3)), and finally, that no statement obtained as a result of torture is admissible in any legal proceedings (art. 15).
* PROSECUTION – there is a heavy emphasis in the Convention on the desire to end impunity for torture. From articles 4 through 9 the Convention contains provisions requiring States to criminalise torture in national laws and establish jurisdiction over such crimes, investigate and prosecute them, or if one cannot extradite an alleged offender then to prosecute them. Mutual legal assistance is also recognized calling on States to cooperate to the greatest extent and to supply all evidence to the prosecuting State.
* PUNISHMENT – The Convention states that perpetrators shall be sentenced in accordance with the highest penalties (art. 4(2)). The Convention did not specify what would be an appropriate penalty. This is a major gap in the treaty, in which deference was given to national legal systems; however, this has resulted in little global consistency in the penalties being applied for crimes of torture.
* PROTECTION AND PARTICIPATION AND REMEDIES of victims and witnesses: The second last article – article 14 – provides that victims of torture shall obtain redress and have an enforceable right to compensation, including as full rehabilitation as possible. Complainants and witnesses shall also be protected against ill-treatment or intimation as a consequence of having made a complaint (art. 13).

Although there remain major challenges in the implementation of the Convention, the drafters were prescient in their knowledge of what was required to prevent and prohibit torture and other ill-treatment. The Convention remains a relevant and robust set of rules that, *if followed*, would reduce significantly the extent to which torture is perpetrated - and tolerated - today.

UN Member States at the time knew that the Convention would take some time to enter into force and gain worldwide universality, and so the position of **UN Special Rapporteur on Torture** was born in March 1985, with an initial one-year term, later extended to 3 years, and the mandate of which has been renewed without interruption. The Special Rapporteur is appointed by the States of the Human Rights Council, the ultimate human rights body within the UN system.

The mandate of the Special Rapporteur on Torture will turn 40 in 2025. I am the seventh person – and first woman – to occupy the position. Before telling you about my mandate, let me mention two further anti-torture institutions that you need to know as part of the UN architecture.

The **UN Fund for Victims of Torture** was established in 1981 as the successor entity to the UN Fund to support victims of the Chilean dictatorship. The Fund supports local entities to carry out important rehabilitation services. Recovering from torture is possible, however it requires prompt and specialized programmes, and can take a life time. The victim’s path from horror to healing relies on the expertise and dedication of doctors, lawyers, therapists and social workers. And healing is important not only for the individual, but also their families, communities and when it is large-scale, society as a whole.

The **Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture**, the OPCAT, was adopted as a supplement to the Convention in 2002. The OPCAT is based on the premise that as torture routinely takes place where there is no oversight and regularly in places where persons are deprived of their liberty – out of sight, out of mind - when you open up detention to independent inspectors who can visit such places whenever they choose and without prior announcement, the risk of torture and other ill-treatment or punishment diminishes, and improvements in the treatment and conditions of detention can be identified and set into action. The OPCAT established a global Sub-Committee on the Prevention of Torture that can visit countries, and also requires States to establish or designate their own national visiting bodies, called National Preventive Mechanisms, which carry out visits to all places of detention as well as comment on national legislation.

\*\*\*

*Special Rapporteur on Torture*

Let me return to my mandate as the Special Rapporteur on Torture and highlight briefly the three main functions given to me by the Human Rights Council.

First is the “communications” procedure, in which I am able to intervene on behalf of victim-survivors with their own governments. This was an innovation of the first Special Rapporteur, Mr. Peter Kooijmans of The Netherlands, who communicated with States on allegations he became aware of, and appealed for their urgent action.

I intervene directly with Governments on allegations of torture through letters which include urgent appeals and other communications. These interventions can relate to a human rights violation that has already occurred, is ongoing, or which has a high risk of occurring.

In practice this involves sending a letter to the concerned State identifying the information at hand concerning the case, applicable international human rights norms and standards, the concerns and questions I have as the mandate holder, and a request for follow-up action.[[6]](#footnote-6) A degree of verification and triangulation on submitted information is carried out, and the consent of the victim-survivor must be provided.

It may also involve face-to-face meetings with the concerned government, and in rare cases, visits to persons being detained.

My mandate experiences a variety of reactions to these letters. Most States do not like to receive these letters, but how they approach their responses is what matters. Many States reject the content, either by providing contrary information, or through silence. Last year for example, of the 72 submissions made by my mandate, they were submitted to 44 different governments.

For me, these communications should be seen as a way to be in touch with governments, to raise specific cases, to ring the alarm on evolving situations, and to operationalize the five “Ps”.

Additionally, they are a way that I can be a witness and establish a record for later actions, notwithstanding that I do not take a view as to the accuracy or culpability of the allegations.

The second function of my position that I wanted to mention today is the country fact-finding visits. These country visits are part inspection, part recommendatory. They involve meeting with government officials, the judiciary, parliamentarians and other national institutions, civil society organisations as well as victim-survivors and their representatives.

These visits also entail unfettered access to any place of detention without surveillance, and to meet in confidential settings with detainees, amid assurances that they will be protected from reprisals or intimidation or any other negative consequences. Of course, that cannot always be assured and it is a complex task and onerous burden to protect individuals from possible reprisals. Being upfront with them about the risks, and letting them decide about whether they wish to engage with me, is an important first step. So too carrying out such interviews out of the earshot of prison officials and with as many prisoners as possible so that no single piece of information can be traced back.

My view is that these visits are best conducted with a view to supporting the governments I visit to change and adjust their practices, where needed, drawing on best international practice and standards.

The third function of the position of Special Rapporteur on Torture is to “study questions of torture” and contribute to the international debates, and to make recommendations to States. This involves reporting to the General Assembly in New York and the Human Rights Council in Geneva annually, usually on selected thematic topics.

\*\*\*

*Developments of 20th and 21st centuries*

Torture has regrettably accompanied every major decade in the 20th and 21st centuries; and we are not free of its curse yet.

I do not however want to leave you with an outlook that is not real. Many countries and many public authorities are engaging in positive changes everyday. We have to be careful that when we focus only on the negatives, we do not overlook the good practices.

So let me end this part of the lecture with **some good developments and promising practices**:

* 173 States have voluntarily accepted to be bound by the provisions of the Convention against Torture. That ranks with almost equivalent membership of the ICCPR. The States that have yet to do so – 22 in total – are predominantly small island developing states in the Pacific and the Caribbean, plus India, Iran, Malaysia, Myanmar, Singapore, Tanzania and Zimbabwe.
* 108 countries have established explicit and autonomous crimes of torture in their national criminal codes, paving the way for investigations and prosecutions.
* A number of States have made it clear that rape and sexual abuse are part of the category of acts amounting to torture (e.g. Kenya, Nigeria, and Uganda), while other countries make the perpetration of rape or sexual violence an aggravating factor in the offence of torture (e.g. Morocco and South Africa). Torture committed by non-State or wholly private actors has also been included in criminal statutes, especially in Latin America and Africa, to reflect their specific challenges (e.g. internal insurgencies, armed conflict, terrorist activities, other emergency situations) and the desire to achieve justice for all victims of torture. These trends are to be welcomed.
* 92 States have ratified the Optional Protocol, with 78% of those States having established national preventive mechanisms. 14 States have been blacklisted on the Sub-Committee’s list of non-compliant states, for failing to establish their NPM in time.
* We have a whole range of soft law instruments to help guide implementation starting with the Nelson Mandela Rules on treatment in detention, and the Istanbul Protocol on the investigation and documentation of torture. We have basic rules for the rights of victims and survivors of abuse of power.
* International and hybrid tribunals and courts have been established for Bosnia and Rwanda, plus hybrid or mixed tribunals – such as those for Cambodia, Kosovo, Sierra Leone, Senegal, Timor-Leste and recently announced in The Gambia – where I find more of the benefits associated with national prosecutions: catalysing domestic legislative reforms; enhancing local legal capacity; peace building through putting justice outcomes in the hands of those most affected.
* In recent years, a growing number of States are showing solidarity by using universal jurisdiction to try foreign perpetrators accused of torture committed against foreign victims in faraway places, who would otherwise be free.
* Canada and The Netherlands last week applied to open proceedings against Syria before the International Court of Justice via article 30(1) of UNCAT. This article is an under-utilized way to hold perpetrators accountable, permitting states to take disputes over the interpretation or implementation of the Convention against Torture to The Hague. I think is only the second time it has ever been used, after Habre Hissane case in which Belgium took Senegal to the ICJ for its delays in prosecuting former president of Chad.
* Finally, the Mutual Legal Assistance (MLA) Convention for the Investigation and Prosecution of the Crime of Genocide, Crimes against Humanity, War Crimes and other International Crimes, was adopted in Ljubljana on 26 May 2023, which aims at strengthening cooperation between States on the extradition for prosecution of the most serious international crimes.

*The road ahead and advice for the next generation*

As we confront the world’s failings, sins and problems, we must not be passive players. The United Nations has accepted its responsibility for standing by and letting 800,000 Tutsis and moderate Hutus in Rwanda in 1994 be slaughtered by machete knives, previously used to cut the wheat in the fields, by their fellow citizens. That period was such a terrible indictment on the UN.

The United Nations itself is far from perfect, and sometimes it can be part of the problem. Today, sixty Tanzanian peacekeepers in the Central African Republic stand accused of rape and sexual assaults against the local people and they have been confined to barracks; and are being sent home.

When the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1991 erupted, we talked about it as the first war in Europe since the Second World War. It’s noteworthy that we are again talking about war in Europe, although it is false to think that there are no other wars going on in Europe, or for which Europe is engaged.

Russia’s attack against Ukraine is an existential crisis for Ukraine and its people, but it is also a crisis of conscience for the United Nations. It is having reverberations far beyond its borders and shows us the risks we face as a much more inter-connected world when we cannot resolve conflict. It is causing commodity price hikes in Africa and rising inflation everywhere, making ordinary peoples’ lives far more difficult. Nearly six million Ukrainians have left the country for sanctuary elsewhere, making them the world’s second largest refugee group, behind those Syrians who fled the brutality of their own government, at nearly 7 million.

For the United Nations, it is an existential crisis of proportions unlike any other conflict going on right now. We might criticise the media for their determined focus on Ukraine, but don’t be fooled to think this is any ordinary war. A country that has the power of veto in the Security Council has broken the cardinal rule of the UN Charter – that of state sovereignty and non-interference in the internal affairs of another state. The last time this happened, in Iraq, led to long-term consequences for which Iraq is still recovering, and so too the reputation of the United States.

The impotence of the United Nations in the face of the Russia-Ukraine war, and frankly in many others including the Democratic Republic of Congo, Syria and Sudan, is deeply worrying to me. We seem to have lost the world’s peacemakers and along with them, the art of peace brokering.

Dear students, I’m looking out at you all, and am encouraging you to make this your life’s mission: to see yourselves and to become the peacemakers that the world so desperately needs.

I wish you all the best in your studies and in your future human rights endeavours.

END

\*this is a shortened version of the speech
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