



Amnesty International EU Association Annual Report

May 2005

Amnesty International
EU Office
Rue d'Arlon 39-41
B-1000 Brussels

Tel. +32 2 502 14 99
Fax +32 2 502 56 86
e-mail amnesty@aieu.be

Introduction

The accession of ten new Member States on 1 May 2004 was no doubt the most important EU event of the past period. It marked 2004 as a year of change. Change, and controversy, were also reflected in the adoption of the draft Constitution after bitter wrangling among Member States, elections for the European Parliament (EP) marred again by low turn-out, the installation of a new Commission only after the EP had imposed changes, and the green light for the next wave of enlargement including Turkey.

Directly or indirectly, human rights were a feature in all of this. Most prominently, the Constitution has incorporated the Charter of Fundamental Rights, making it legally binding once the Constitution enters into force. Enlargement extends the "area of freedom, security and justice" that the EU aspires to be, and the decision to open accession negotiations with Turkey, controversial not least because of the human rights dimension, gave greater emphasis to that aspiration. President-elect Barroso marked fundamental rights as a priority for his new Commission when the EP in the autumn threatened to refuse approval of his team when statements by the proposed justice commissioner were deemed discriminatory.

The incident triggered the establishment of a new Group of Commissioners on fundamental rights. It also gave unexpected exposure to the Council decision to set up an EU human rights agency on which consultations were starting at the same time. On the external front, the EP re-established a Subcommittee on Human Rights, and the Council adopted a further set of human rights guidelines, on human rights defenders. In yet another significant development, the Council decided in December to set up a new post of Personal Representative on Human Rights within the office of Javier Solana, the Council's High Representative on the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP).

Was 2004 then a good year for human rights at the EU? In terms of these institutional developments, the answer must be yes. But as always, decisions and intentions have to be put into practice, and this is where the rhetoric too often turns hollow. Human rights within the EU have finally become an item on the political agenda, but incorporation of the Charter into the Constitution in itself is not enough to guarantee their proper protection in practice. This is especially so as Member States still refuse to even acknowledge a measure of EU-level accountability for their own human rights shortcomings. And although the pressure is on to have the Fundamental Rights Agency start in early 2007, signs are that it may be barred from overseeing compliance by Member States.

The development of the internal human rights agenda is set against the complexities of counter-terrorism and the fight against 'illegal immigration'. The train bombings in Madrid on 11 March 2004 carried the brutal message that Europe is vulnerable too, and revived the EU's counter-terrorist drive that had become bogged down since the initial impetus after 11 September 2001. The rhetoric that there can be no security without human rights was also revitalised, but there has been little in the way of concrete steps to give substance to that pledge. Emergency legislation in Member States that led to evident abuses has remained without EU response.

The fact that asylum is principally a human rights issue seems to be lost amid all the discourse surrounding migration management and the political pressures to stop illegal immigrants from reaching the EU. The asylum procedures directive finally agreed by the Council in April was condemned by NGOs and the UN High Commissioner for Refugees alike for breaching international standards of refugee law. After the summer a crisis atmosphere was again allowed to build up, this time about how to stop people from crossing the Mediterranean. Protection obligations became lost in amid the confused discussions about the setting up of camps in North Africa.

On the external front, the tensions that the war in Iraq had caused in EU-US relations but also within the EU itself eased slowly but the security question continued to dominate the international agenda at the expense of human rights. With the 'effective multilateralism' of its European Security Strategy of late 2003, the EU had set a different strategic vision to that of the US, but it failed to confront its transatlantic partner over the abuses of Guantánamo Bay and Abu Ghraib. In efforts to build closer partnerships with the other major powers - Russia and China - human rights were also effectively sidelined. In particular, the persistent drive by Member States throughout 2004 towards lifting the arms embargo against China, imposed after the 1989 Tiananmen Square massacre, showed how easily human rights are outflanked by economic and political interests.

Pressure thus remained as important as ever to hold the EU to its promises. The scope for human rights advocacy at the EU is vast, and while considerable attention goes to the issues that capture the headlines, underneath there is a continuous effort to provide information and exert pressure on a wide range of countries, cases and issues. Often this less visible effort has more impact than is possible on the headline issues. Human rights NGOs are seen as an indispensable counterpart to the system by the EU institutions themselves, even though they regularly expose the double standards that are to some extent inherent in that system.

Amnesty International continued to play an active and in some respects prominent role in this context. Much of that effort, especially in the area of external relations, is in partnership with or complementary to other NGOs operating in Brussels. In that domain AI increasingly seeks to link up with other networks, such as on development, trade and conflict prevention. When it comes to working on asylum and immigration issues, there are markedly fewer NGOs active at EU level, while none deal as extensively with the internal human rights angle.

Significant media coverage continued to enhance the impact of AI's activity at EU level, and reinforced the prominent profile of the EU office as the face of the organisation in Brussels and as an authoritative source of information, analysis and advice. Its resource function was particularly sought in the complex and politically highly sensitive areas of asylum and immigration, and judicial cooperation and fundamental rights in the context of counter-terrorism.

Unlike most of its partners, AI is also able to draw on its extensive network of national sections and structures capable of exerting influence in other capitals. That ability to put pressure on Member States' governments at home gives AI a clear strategic advantage. In this context it was important that AI was able to start a Warsaw-based project at the end of 2004 to help AI branches in the new Member States, initially for two years, to develop effective EU lobby work.

Human rights in Europe

The Hague Programme adopted by the European Council at the end of 2004 set the policy framework for "strengthening the area of freedom, security and justice in the EU" over the next five years, mainly dealing with asylum and immigration, and judicial cooperation. Fundamental rights featured prominently, but in a comprehensive analysis in September AI expressed concern at the lack of coherence in terms of the instruments, structures and resources needed to safeguard fundamental rights in practice. Earlier, in June, AI had given a critical assessment of the results of the previous five-year agenda, known as the Tampere Programme.

While the Tampere agenda was best known for mapping out the process of harmonisation in the field of asylum and immigration with a welcome emphasis on refugee protection, much less attention went to the other main objective - the development of judicial cooperation within the EU. What had been a slow and laborious process transformed after 11 September 2001 into a major part of the EU's counter-terrorist drive, leading to the quick adoption of several instruments including the European Arrest Warrant designed to speed up the surrender of criminal suspects.

The promise at the time however that increased judicial cooperation would be balanced with adequate procedural safeguards has yet to be fulfilled. The Commission, strongly pushed by AI, took until mid-2004 to present its proposal for a framework decision on certain procedural rights for suspects and defendants in criminal proceedings. AI welcomed the proposal in principle but expressed concern at the limited nature of the rights included in the proposal. Especially problematic was the possibility that the application of rights may be removed in cases of serious and complex forms of crime, notably terrorism – a U-turn from the 2001 promise. This would undermine the credibility of the EU in ensuring that the protection of rights is an integral part of providing security in the fight against terrorism. Another object of concern in 2004 was the lack of judicial accountability and the absence of an effective remedy with regard to the inclusion of individuals on the EU terrorist lists.

Before long, however, the post-September 11 drive slowed down considerably, bogged down in reluctance from a number of Member States to transpose the instruments into national law, and difficulties in sharing information and intelligence. The atrocities in Madrid on 11 March 2004 provided new impulses including the appointment by the Council of an EU Counter-Terrorism Coordinator. AI continued to follow developments closely, in particular the Council's negotiations on procedural rights which were expected to run well into 2005. In early 2005 the EU office started preparations for a more comprehensive report on counter-terrorism in the EU.

The controversy surrounding the approval of the new Commission brought President Barroso to mark fundamental rights as a priority for his Commission with the establishment of a Commissioners Group on Fundamental Rights, Anti-discrimination and Equal Opportunities. It also served to highlight and speed up the setting up of the EU Fundamental Rights Agency, another major feature of the domestic human rights agenda in 2004 that followed from the surprise decision of the Council end 2003 to turn the existing European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia in Vienna into a human rights agency.

AI issued a paper in April with its preliminary observations on the geographical and substantive remit for such an agency, and a further contribution in December following the Commission paper that started the formal consultation phase. The EU office director also delivered a keynote presentation to the final hearing in January 2005. AI's main concern was to clarify the purpose of the agency, and to argue that it should serve as an effective monitoring and correction mechanism not only for the EU as an institution but also for compliance by Member States. It became rapidly clear however that there would be a strong push by vested interests towards a minimalist conception of the agency, to ensure that something may be put in place quickly that would fit existing structures and not offend political sensitivities.

During 2004 AI repeatedly called on the Council to resume negotiations on the proposed framework decision on combating racism and xenophobia and to push for harmonisation of substantive criminal law on racism. Prospects looked mixed for 2005. AI also lobbied the EU in connection with several Council of Europe initiatives, notably its draft conventions on trafficking in human beings and on terrorism.

The slogan "human rights begin at home" of AI's presentation to the incoming Irish Presidency at the beginning of 2004, and taken further with a petition addressed to the next Dutch Presidency, has finally begun to take hold as we see human rights in the EU now featuring on the political agenda. However, abuses within and by Member States remained taboo as ever, and the Council did not respond to the Commission's 2003 communication on the possible use of Article 7 TEU which provides for action in the case of a (risk of a) serious breach of the EU's fundamental principles of democracy, human rights and the rule of law. Similarly, the Council failed to act on AI's call to establish a Council working group on human rights in the EU, comparable to the one for human rights in CFSP.

This lack of capacity to engage in critical self-reflection and peer review continues to affect the EU's credibility as a human rights advocate in external relations. In 2004 there was increasing evidence of third countries becoming aware of the EU's vulnerability in this respect.

Asylum and immigration

In setting political guidance for the first phase of harmonisation in the area of asylum and immigration, the Tampere Council in 1999 had declared that the Common European Asylum System (CEAS) should be based on the "full and inclusive application of the Geneva Convention". However, AI's assessment, after the five years of negotiations that resulted in agreement of a series of minimum standards, was rather negative. In fact, the last and most controversial of these instruments, on asylum procedures, led AI with other NGOs in March to the unprecedented move to call on the Commission to withdraw its proposed directive because it clearly eroded the individual right to seek asylum and could lead to breaches of international human rights and refugee law.

The Council did not budge notwithstanding the fact that the UN High Commissioner for Refugees also expressed strong reservations. Having failed to persuade the Commission and, most importantly, the Council of its views, AI's next step was to inform the European Parliament of its concerns. Prospects were that the EP would take the issue seriously, although it did not yet have co-decision; it could even consider the possibility of taking the matter to the European Court of Justice.

The Hague Programme is to complete the development of the CEAS through its second phase by 2010, including the commitment to a single asylum procedure. AI expressed its concern that a common system will be based on the low standards agreed during the first harmonisation phase. Other aspects were commented on more positively, such as systems to jointly deal with country of origin information and to address particular pressures on national asylum systems, including those in some of the new Member States.

With first-phase legislation completed and work on the internal asylum system temporarily at a low point, 2004 saw increasing activity in the sphere of the so-called external dimension of asylum and immigration. While welcoming intentions to enhance protection of refugees in their regions of origin, and to provide assistance for capacity building, AI consistently expressed concern that the growing importance of the external dimension is propelled by the overarching drive to fight "illegal immigration". Where the Hague Programme marks a decisive shift to take that fight into the domain of external relations, AI considered it may impact negatively on the protection of human rights in general and refugee rights in particular.

The second half of 2004 saw confused and fraught discussions over 'camps' and 'reception facilities' in neighbouring countries in particular in North Africa. Although no decisions were taken, it was clear that while the EU might not be able to commit to quick action, individual Member States like Italy were prone to take matters into their own hands and engage with countries like Libya. Such cooperation appeared not only aimed at controlling borders but it also involved returning people even at the risk of *refoulement* to countries of origin where they might risk detention, torture or death.

AI's protests that such partnerships with third countries concluded at national or EU level may run counter to Member States' national and international obligations with regard to refugees, and in particular the principle of *non-refoulement*, received considerable attention but did not deflect the Commission's and Council's determination to pursue the new policy orientation. Insofar as that

orientation focused in particular on Libya, AI was able to draw on its mission to that country in early 2004 to press its human rights and refugee concerns throughout the year. It did so publicly at the occasion of Libyan leader Khaddafi's visit to Brussels in April, and privately in briefing the Commission and Council regarding an orientation visit to the country at the end of the year.

Enlargement

In the year that saw ten new Member States join the European Union simultaneously, major new steps were taken towards further enlargement in the foreseeable future. Bulgaria and Romania were given the final go-ahead to join in 2007, although extra safeguard clauses with reinforced monitoring were imposed, allowing for postponement in case of insufficient application of the *acquis*. Croatia was given the green light in June to open accession negotiations in 2006, and most significantly, the same was decided for Turkey in December. That last decision was momentous if only for the amount of effort and political manoeuvring that went into its final preparations.

Human rights were a major feature in the process leading up to it, and AI remained active throughout in providing its information and assessment of the human rights situation in Turkey. While acknowledging the importance of the pre-accession process in bringing about major legislative reform in a relatively short period of time, AI remained concerned about implementation in practice given the continued prevalence of torture and restrictions on freedom of expression and association. Secretary General Irene Khan met with Commission President Prodi in April following AI's high level mission to Turkey.

In the case of both Croatia and Turkey, too, a special safeguard clause will apply, allowing for suspension of negotiations in case of serious and persistent breaches of the principles of liberty, democracy, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. By imposing this conditionality, human rights should remain a central focus.

Throughout the year, AI continued to make its information available to the EU on the remaining countries of the Western Balkans for which the Stabilisation and Association process is the framework for their relations with the EU. Macedonia filed its application for EU membership in 2004.

In conjunction with its actual enlargement the EU is in the process of drawing up a coherent policy framework for relations with its new neighbours in the East and South. Originally developed under the term 'Wider Europe', the Commission in 2004 launched the new European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP), which aims at enhancing cooperation in the political field as well as in security matters and social-economic development. AI considers that the ENP has the potential to strengthen democracy and promote human rights in a number of countries where serious problems of systematic abuse persist, but it has advocated that to create such opportunities will require similar constructive conditionality as applied in the enlargement process.

Human rights in the world: country work

The mainstay of AI's work was as always the constant supply of information combined with lobby, publicity and campaigning in Brussels and in the sections about human rights in the many countries with which the EU has relations. This activity always included countries that AI prioritised for action by the world-wide movement, such as crisis response situations.

AI's work at the EU included a long list of countries, some of them regular features for many years.

- In **Africa**: Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Liberia, Nigeria, Sudan, Togo and Zimbabwe, as well as approaches to the West African sub-regional body ECOWAS.
- In the **Americas**: Brazil, Colombia, Guatemala, Mexico, Peru and the USA.
- In **Asia**: Afghanistan, Burma, China, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Nepal, Philippines and Singapore, as well as the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM).

- In the ***Middle East and North Africa***: Algeria, Iran, Iraq, Israel/Occupied Territories, Lebanon, Libya, Syria and Tunisia, as well as the sub-regional framework of the Gulf Cooperation Council and the Euro-Mediterranean partnership.
- In ***Europe and Central Asia***: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Russia, Turkey and Uzbekistan.

It is not practical in the context of this annual report to give an account of all these activities, but more detailed information on country work can be made available on request.

Major initiatives were taken in relation to several countries that have been regular features of AI's human rights advocacy at the EU. The annual China and US and bi-annual Russia summits were targeted, as was the ongoing EU involvement with Colombia in terms of assistance and political dialogue. The official human rights dialogues with China and Iran were closely monitored, and AI contributed extensively and critically to the EU's evaluation of both under the Dutch Presidency. As already described above, work on Turkey was intensive in the enlargement context. More of an incidental nature but high-profiled was AI's release of its Libya mission report at the occasion of Khaddafi's visit to Brussels in April.

The country that has more than any other been in the spotlight for AI was China, in connection with the EU's growing determination throughout 2004 to lift the arms embargo it had imposed in 1989 in response to the Tiananmen Square massacre. AI's regular briefings on aspects of the human rights situation in the country, combined with its substantial contribution to the review of the EU Code of Conduct on Arms Exports which the EU projected as a convenient substitute, created a constant demand for expertise, public presentations and media contacts continuing well into 2005.

As always, the UN Commission on Human Rights meeting in Geneva in the spring provided an overarching priority for EU lobbying as a vital part of AI's and the international human rights movement's aim to get and keep offending countries and thematic concerns on the agenda. Intensive lobbying in Brussels and through the capitals, directed at the EU as the actor carrying the majority of initiatives in Geneva, were key to AI's overall effort. The results of the 2004 session were again very disappointing.

At the same time there was the opening of the more fundamental debate on the UN's role in providing security, fighting poverty and promoting human rights in the world, with the report of the high level panel set up by UN Secretary General Kofi Annan. The performance of the UN's human rights machinery came in for particular criticism. The EU was expected to respond positively to the main findings and recommendations, drawing on its recently adopted European Security Strategy with preventive engagement and effective multilateralism as its key orientations.

On a positive note, AI was gratified at the Council's positive response to the call for establishing a special high level human rights position linked directly to the EU's High Representative for the CFSP. AI had promoted such a move, for the sake of enhancing the continuity and consistency of the EU's external human rights policies. With a significant effort also from the Dutch Presidency, the Council decided in December to establish the new post of Personal Representative on Human Rights of Javier Solana.

Thematic concerns

In June 2004 the Council managed to adopt yet another set of human rights guidelines, this time on human rights defenders. Though positive in principle, it underlined the increasingly obvious irony of a human rights policy that has plenty of tools but fails significantly when it comes to using them. The Council itself had come to recognise that problem at the same time as it approved the previous guidelines in December 2003, on children and armed conflict. Only the oldest guidelines, on the death penalty, were regarded as operating more or less adequately. Against this background the Dutch Presidency's ambition to focus the Human Rights Forum in December on implementation of the new human rights defenders guidelines was very welcome. AI was part of a special Brussels NGO coalition

that pressed the presidency to move to a plan of action on the guidelines for children and armed conflict.

The EU's 1998 Code of Conduct on Arms Exports was due for review in 2004. AI actively sought improvements, placing the review of the code in the broader context of its world-wide Control Arms campaign. In May an AI report was issued that analysed the practices of EU Member States, and in September it was part of a coalition of 55 European NGOs that presented a detailed critique of the code. The EU office director at the time addressed the EP's newly established Subcommittee on Security and Defence arguing that the EU should move to binding controls on arms exports. Throughout the year it used its critical analysis to contrast the EU's positive expectations of the code in the context of the debate on the lifting of the China arms embargo. Because of that continuing controversy the review of the code could not be completed in 2004.

Another instrument that continued to suffer long delays was the so-called torture trade regulation, which is to control the export of goods that can be used for torture or capital punishment. It has been in discussion in the Council since it was proposed by the Commission in 2002, but despite active campaigning by NGOs no presidency has considered it a priority to push for negotiations to be completed.

In connection with AI's newest major campaign launched in March 2004 to stop violence against women, the scope for EU-level action was limited because of the lack of community competence to regulate in this area. On the other hand, much activity was already generated and funded by the Commission in the sphere of prevention, through information exchange and awareness raising. The EP responded in a number of ways to the campaign to assist exposure of the problem. In the domain of external relations AI consistently addressed the EU over its responsibility for the conduct of EU forces to ensure a zero-tolerance policy towards violence against women, trafficking and other abuse.

In June 2004 a two-year process of dialogue on corporate social responsibility (CSR) came to conclusion. AI had participated actively in the EU Multi-Stakeholder Forum set up by the Commission in 2002 bringing together the business sector, trade unions and NGOs to exchange experiences and to explore "the appropriateness of establishing common guiding principles for CSR practices and instruments". The differences could not be bridged, with the business sector rejecting any kind of regulatory action and the NGOs and unions insisting that the debate should move from responsibility accepted by some companies to accountability imposed on all. Together with the other NGOs from different sectors AI expressed its disappointment that the forum had not moved beyond yet another dialogue exercise and failed to realise the initial ambition to develop an EU framework for CSR.

EU institutional developments

The major institutional developments were already indicated in the introduction: the enlargement of the EU to 25 Member States, the adoption of the new Constitution, and the start of a new legislature with European Parliament elections and a new Commission.

Together with many other NGOs in the human rights field as well as in a broad range of different sectors AI had contributed actively to the work of the Convention that drew up the draft Constitution in 2002-2003, and the subsequent negotiations in the Inter-Governmental Conference of Member States. In particular, AI had pushed for specific human rights provisions, notably incorporation of the Charter of Fundamental Rights and the Union's accession to the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). In the final text adopted in June and signed in November by heads of state and government both these objectives were included. But with ratification required by all 25 Member States, a new period of uncertainty began as to whether the Constitution would finally enter into force as planned at the end of 2006.

AI's overall assessment of the Constitution has been relatively positive, in that it takes a number of major steps forward in placing human rights at the heart of the EU. Accession to the ECHR will serve to fill gaps in accountability, and recognition of the Charter is important, but not enough to guarantee a

proper protection of human rights throughout the territory of the EU. The Constitution itself does not address the issue of enforceability adequately, and in conjunction with its position on the fundamental rights agency, AI argued that ensuring such protection in practice would require a mechanism of monitoring and correction.

In the new European Parliament a special Subcommittee on Human Rights of the Foreign Affairs Committee was re-established. AI had campaigned actively for this result, and with the network of human rights NGOs it had addressed all the newly elected MEPs about the concerns and expectations of the new parliament in the field of human rights. The EU office director gave presentations to the two new Subcommittees on Human Rights and on Defence, as well as to the Committee on Development.

Throughout the year close contacts were maintained with the 2004 EU presidencies of Ireland and The Netherlands. The latter was instrumental in establishing the new post of Javier Solana's Personal Representative on Human Rights. In preparing for the 2005 Luxembourg presidency AI focused in particular on the question of resources for human rights, of which this new position was a significant new development. The fundamental rights agency, notwithstanding concerns over limitations to its mandate, was another. The overall question of funding for human rights was also addressed in connection with the discussions that started in earnest in 2004 over the EU's next Financial Perspective 2007-2013.

Media and outreach

The EU office media program continued to be a crucial asset for AI's advocacy at the EU. Major initiatives such as on the China arms embargo, the Khaddafi visit and the Hague Programme, not only generated public pressure in support of lobby efforts, but also served to strengthen the high public profile for AI at the EU as a serious actor and as a reliable resource. This in turn helps to keep AI on the media's radar screen for the less prominent issues as well.

The key to the successful program remained careful selection to avoid overload, properly timed connection to the EU agenda, succinct messages with sharp quotes, and good coordination between the different AI components (EU office, International Secretariat and national sections). In addition, availability of staff to provide background and specialist briefings, proved again to be an excellent way of meeting journalists' needs, in particular on more complex and sensitive dossiers like asylum and counter-terrorism. A feature article on human rights in an enlarged EU helped sections and structures - especially in new Member States - gain publicity in April and May around accession day.

As has been indicated throughout this report, outreach in the broader sense, and in particular cooperation with other NGOs, is indispensable for AI's work at the EU. Such cooperation takes place continuously on an ad hoc basis in different alliances, while at the same time broader networks provide platforms for exchange of information and for coordination of activities that benefit from a joint approach. AI continued to play an active role in the general network of human rights and democracy NGOs and in the special network on asylum and migration issues. At the end of 2004 it also helped establish a new network dealing with migrant workers' rights.

Since 2002 AI participated in shaping a successful inter-sectoral NGO alliance to ensure an effective civil society contribution to the work of the Convention drafting the new Constitution. That cooperation continued with other NGO families such as in the development, conflict prevention and social fields, on issues of common interest ranging from the future Financial Perspective to CSR to elaborating the concept of participatory democracy. A corollary of AI's active role in all these circuits is the constant demand on EU office staff and especially the director for speaking engagements on a wide range of relevant issues.

Membership involvement

Amnesty International's EU work is not only done in Brussels, but it is a joint effort with the AI sections and structures in the Member States, reflecting AI's strategic objective to influence EU decision making also through direct pressure on the Member States at the national level. With the enlargement from 15 to 25 AI is unfortunately no longer in a position to do so in all Member States, for in only five of the ten new EU countries - Slovenia, Poland, Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary - does AI have national branches capable of such activity. Even so, it was felt necessary to provide extra support for these new partners in EU lobbying, through the establishment of a special two-year project based in Warsaw that started in November 2004 to help capacity building in this area.

All EU sections and structures participate to a larger or lesser extent in the many actions that are generated. Cooperation is especially close each time with the presidency sections, in 2004 the Irish and Dutch sections. The tradition was continued of presenting a detailed memorandum to the incoming presidency, outlining AI's assessment of the effectiveness of the EU's human rights effort and making concrete recommendations tailored to the period ahead. By its complex and often unpredictable nature EU advocacy does not lend itself very easily to a broader involvement of AI membership, but in 2004 the presidency sections again organised public campaigning calling on their respective governments to strengthen the human rights dimension in the conduct of their presidency.

EU Office 2004 selected documents (available on www.amnesty-eu.org)

- Human rights begin at home: Amnesty International assessment of EU human rights policy; recommendations to the Irish Presidency (January 2004)
- Respect for human rights as a key to effective judicial cooperation: presentation to OSCE conference (March 2004)
- Iraq: open letter to Irish Presidency (March 2004)
- Refugee and human rights organisations across Europe call on EU to scrap key asylum proposal (March 2004)
- A vision for human rights in the European Union: Amnesty International observations on an EU human rights agency (April 2004)
- EU-China and human rights since Tiananmen: Amnesty International briefing paper (April 2004)
- Human rights in an enlarged EU: what can people expect now? Feature article (April 2004)
- The European Union – now more free, secure and just? Amnesty International’s human rights assessment of the Tampere agenda (June 2004)
- Threatening refugee protection: Amnesty International’s overall assessment of the Tampere asylum agenda (June 2004)
- Closing the gap between rhetoric and practice: Amnesty International’s recommendations to the Dutch Presidency (June 2004)
- The human rights challenge for the new European Parliament: presentations to EP Development Committee and EP Subcommittee on Human Rights (July 2004)
- The EU must move to binding controls on arms exports: presentation to EP Subcommittee on Security and Defence (September 2004)
- More justice and freedom to balance security: Amnesty International’s recommendations to the EU on the future of the “area of freedom, security and justice” (September 2004)
- Human rights assessment of the EU Constitution (November 2004)
- Contribution to the Commission consultation on the establishment of an EU Fundamental Rights Agency (December 2004)
- Launch of EU military operation in Bosnia-Herzegovina (Operation ‘Althea’ – EUFOR) (December 2004)
- More resources for human rights: a ten-point program for the Luxembourg Presidency of the EU (December 2004)