

UPDATES FROM THE REGIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS SYSTEMS

AFRICA

THE AFRICAN HUMAN RIGHTS System began to take shape under the Organization of African Unity (OAU), which was founded in 1963. The African Union (AU) replaced the OAU in July 2001 following the ratification of the AU's Constitutive Act. The AU has dominion over three mechanisms responsible for enforcing human rights treaties signed by member states. The African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights (entered into force in 1986) established the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, which is responsible for hearing cases brought against States Parties to the treaty. The African Charter on the Rights and Welfare of the Child (entered into force in 1999) created the African Committee on the Rights and the Welfare of the Child to enforce compliance of that treaty. Finally, the Protocol on the Establishment of an African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights (entered into force in January 2004) established a court for enforcement of the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights. At the time of publication, the African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights was not yet operational (see below). Other treaties governing human rights issues in Africa are the Convention on Specific Aspects of the Refugee problem in Africa (entered into force in 1974) and the Protocol on the Rights of Women, which is currently under consideration.

AFRICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN AND PEOPLES' RIGHTS

The 36th Ordinary Session of the African Commission took place in Dakar, Senegal, from November 23 to December 7, 2004. At the time of writing, the Commission had not yet published an official communiqué or details of any resolutions adopted. According to an editorial by Nigerian attorney and session attendee Jude Igbanoi, published in Nigeria's *This Day* newspaper, the participants discussed issues including the abolition of the death penalty, the human rights conditions in prisons throughout Africa, and armed conflicts in Darfur, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and Cote d'Ivoire.

Delegates also aired views on the proposed merger of the African Court of Human and Peoples' Rights and the African Court of Justice. In July 2004, the Assembly of Heads of State and Government of the AU adopted a resolution calling for the two courts to be integrated into one. Some advocates of the measure say it is a beneficial cost-cutting move. Many international NGOs, however, fear the merger could cause delays in adjudicating human rights cases because the courts are at different stages of development. The AU is currently accepting nominations for judges to the African Court of Human and Peoples' Rights, and States Parties have until the AU's next session, scheduled for July 2005, to submit candidates.

Critics of the merger also worry that the two courts are too dissimilar to be easily combined into a single institution. The Protocol establishing the African Court for Human and Peoples' Rights gave it jurisdiction over interpretation of the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights as well as "other relevant human rights instruments ratified by the states concerned." The Protocol also gives individuals and NGOs the right to initiate actions against member states in that court. The African Court of Justice's jurisdiction is very different. The Court of Justice is designed to hear only disputes initiated by member states or other AU organs and has jurisdiction to interpret the Constitutive Act of the AU, not just human rights issues.

EQUATORIAL GUINEA

International legal observers are calling the trial of 19 men accused of attempting a coup in Equatorial Guinea "grossly unfair," saying it violated international and domestic laws. The defendants were accused of being an advance team of mercenaries hired by the exiled opposition and foreign governments seeking to gain control of the tiny oil-rich nation. The Zimbabwean government arrested 70 men, mostly South Africans, in March 2004, claiming they were members of the main mercenary force

on their way to Equatorial Guinea. Mark Thatcher, the son of former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, pleaded guilty to violating anti-mercenary laws in South Africa on January 12, 2005, admitting he helped finance a helicopter that he knew was to be used for mercenary activities. Thatcher was fined 3 million South African rand (approximately \$500,000) and given a four-year suspended jail term.

The 19 men convicted in the Equatorial Guinea trial were accused of plotting a coup to overthrow the country's president, Teodoro Obiang Nguema, in March 2004. The trial ended on November 26, 2004, with five South Africans and six Armenians receiving sentences from between 14 and 34 years in jail. Two Equatorial Guineans were sentenced to 16-month prison terms. Three South Africans and three Equatorial Guineans were acquitted. The leader of Equatorial Guinea's opposition party, Severo Moto, who is currently in exile in Spain, received a 63-year sentence. Prosecutors sought the death penalty for some of the accused, but no such sentences were handed down.

The International Bar Association (IBA) and Amnesty International, both of which had observers at the trial, say the proceedings were plagued with violations of international trial standards. The IBA stated the Court's failure to address allegations that officials used torture to obtain confessions signed by the accused constituted a violation of international law. The prisoners claim a German national detained with the group was tortured to death shortly after their arrest. Government officials maintain he died of cerebral malaria. In addition to allegations of physical abuse, the defendants had allegedly been held in shackles for 24 hours a day since their arrests in March 2004 and had continually been denied medical treatment and contact with their families. Amnesty International says the defendants were also denied access to attorneys until three days prior to the start of their trial.

Legal observers say the lack of translation provided to the defendants throughout the

investigation and trial made it difficult for them to participate in their defense. All proceedings were conducted in Equatorial Guinea's official language of Spanish. IBA's trial observer pointed out that several of the defendants did not speak any Spanish and, at times, had to rely on co-defendants to translate for them. The observer also maintains Equatorial Guinea broke its own procedural rules by trying several of its own citizens even though they were not present.

SENEGAL

Senegal became the twelfth African state to abolish the death penalty. The country's Parliament voted in an overwhelming majority to abolish the practice for all crimes on December 10, 2004. Although the last execution in Senegal took place in 1967, the country's courts continued to hand down death sentences until as recently as July 2004. At the time the measure passed, four men were in prison awaiting execution. Observers expect that Senegal's President Abdoulaye Wade will commute their sentences to life in prison.

Amnesty International has hailed the move as an example for other countries to follow. There are indications that Sierra Leone and Nigeria will soon tackle similar issues in their respective governments. In its October 2004 report, the Sierra Leone Truth and Reconciliation Commission called the abolition of that country's death penalty an "imperative" that the government should implement "without delay." Nigeria's National Study Group on the Death Penalty also presented a report to its government in October 2004 calling for a moratorium on all executions and a repeal of the practice. Nigeria's President Olusegun Obasanjo, an opponent of the death penalty, had launched a national debate on the issue in 2003.

The following African countries have abolished the death penalty: Angola, Cape Verde, Cote d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Guinea-Bissau, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, São Tomé & Príncipe, Senegal, Seychelles, and South Africa.

SUDAN

The Government of Sudan and leaders of the country's main southern rebel movement signed a peace deal on January 9, 2005, ending over 21 years of civil war. Some interna-

tional aid workers, however, fear it will have little effect on the continuing crisis in the western Darfur region.

The Naivasha Protocols, the peace treaty between the government and the southern-based Sudanese People's Liberation Movement (SPLM), provide for changing Sudan's constitution to ensure that Shari'a, or Islamic law, is not applied to non-Muslims anywhere in the country. The Protocols also make provisions for creating a system of power-sharing in the legislature and sharing the country's oil wealth evenly between the North and the South.

Former U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell, who attended the treaty's signing, said he hoped the treaty would serve as a model for a future agreement in the Darfur conflict. Some humanitarian groups warn, however, that the treaty does not address the basic human rights issues affecting all of Sudan's conflicts. On January 10, 2005, CARE International released a statement on behalf of six international NGOs operating in Sudan, asserting that while they welcome the North-South peace deal, "the crisis of governance, the lack of respect for human rights and the marginalization of ordinary citizens" that contributed to that crisis have not been addressed. The groups maintain that these same issues are contributing to the ongoing crisis in Darfur.

The U.S. State Department estimates the 21 years of civil war between the government and the SPLM left over 2.2 million people dead and over 4 million displaced. It estimates that some 1.7 million people have been displaced as a result of the Darfur crisis.

EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

THE EUROPEAN COURT of Human Rights (Court) was established in 1959 by the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (Convention). Enforcing the obligations entered into by the Council of Europe's Contracting States, the Court is composed of the number of judges equal to that of the Contracting States. Any Contracting State or individual claiming to be a victim of a violation of the Convention may lodge a complaint with the Court. In its decisions, the Court takes into account the various legal systems of the Contracting States.

ABDÜLSAMET YAMAN V. TURKEY

On November 2, 2004, the Court delivered its judgment in the case of *Abdülsamet Yaman v. Turkey* (Application No. 32446/96). Abdülsamet Yaman, a provincial leader of the HADEP (People's Democracy Party), a Kurdish party in the Adana region of Turkey, alleged that he was tortured while in police custody for assisting individuals in bringing torture claims before the European Commission on Human Rights. In a unanimous holding, the judges found violations of Article 3, 5, and 13 of the Convention. The Court found no violations of Articles 14 and 18. The Court recognized that Mr. Yaman suffered non-pecuniary damage, such as distress from his detention without the opportunity for a hearing, which cannot be sufficiently compensated by the finding of a violation. The Court therefore awarded EUR 17,700 in non-pecuniary damages, as well as EUR 7,930 in costs and expenses to Mr. Yaman.

On July 3, 1995, police officers from the Adana Security Directorate took Mr. Yaman into custody. Mr. Yaman alleged that the police blindfolded him, put him in a car, beat and interrogated him, and threatened to kill him if he failed to answer their questions. The police then brought him to the Adana Security Directorate, where they detained and interrogated him for nine days. Mr. Yaman also said that the police stripped him naked and forced him into cold water. The interrogators attached electric cables to his body, principally to his genitals, and administered electric shocks. They also suspended him by the arms from pipes hanging from the ceiling. Mr. Yaman said that he was interrogated about his political activities, his connections to the Secessionist Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK), and his assistance to torture victims in appealing to the European Commission of Human Rights (ECHR).

Following the initial detention, Mr. Yaman was examined by a medical expert and brought before a prosecutor, where he denied statements elicited during his interrogation. Mr. Yaman alleged that, when he returned to prison, policemen used rifle butts, boots, and truncheons to beat him. Following the advice of the prison physician, Mr. Yaman repeatedly requested medical treatment and the report of the medical expert, but the authorities took no action to accommodate his needs. A physician from

the Turkish Human Rights Foundation was also denied access to Mr. Yaman. While Mr. Yaman remained imprisoned, the prosecutor transferred his case to a different jurisdiction where criminal proceedings were initiated against him and 27 others.

On September 19, 1995, Mr. Yaman appeared for his first hearing before a judge in the new jurisdiction. At the hearing, Mr. Yaman denied all charges against him, refuted his statements taken by the police, claimed that he was tortured, and again requested the report of the medical examiner as evidence. Some time after that hearing, the case was again transferred, this time to the Adana State Security Court. Mr. Yaman was finally released from prison in 1997 pending his trial. Since his release, he has been examined by several physicians from various human rights organizations in Turkey, as well as physicians abroad, whose reports could not exclude torture as a cause of his poor physical and mental health. In 1999, the Adana State Security Court convicted Mr. Yaman for aiding and abetting the members of the PKK and sentenced him to 38 months in prison. The Court of Cassation upheld this judgment.

Mr. Yaman filed a complaint with the prosecutor against the police officers who interrogated him, claiming that he was tortured. After initially failing to instigate proceedings, the Adana public prosecutor filed a bill of indictment on March 25, 1999, against six police officers for the torture of Mr. Yaman. Criminal proceedings against the police officers were discontinued, however, on the ground that prosecution was time-barred because the court was not able to locate Mr. Yaman to submit evidence.

Mr. Yaman initiated the proceedings before the European Court of Human Rights by introducing his application against Turkey on January 3, 1996. Three years later, on December 14, 1999, the Court issued its first decision in the case, declaring inadmissible Mr. Yaman's complaints as to the lawfulness of his arrest, the failure of authorities to inform him about the reasons of his arrest, interference with his right to freedom of expression and association, and the alleged hindrance of the effective exercise of his individual application. The Court retained the remainder of the application.

In its final decision, the Court emphasized that, in situations where an individual is taken into custody in good health but found to be injured at the time of the release, the government has the burden of proof to provide a satisfactory and convincing explanation to disprove claims of torture, especially if the claims are backed by medical documentation. In the case at hand, the Court held that Turkey failed to provide a plausible explanation for Mr. Yaman's injuries. The Court also found that actions by government officials constituted torture and violated Mr. Yaman's rights under Article 3 of the Convention.

Article 13 of the Convention requires that national authorities provide "effective remedy" for victims of torture. Examples of effective remedies include compensation and effective investigation and punishment of those responsible. The Court noted that, especially in situations where those accused are state agents, it is of the utmost importance that criminal proceedings and sentencing are not time-barred and that the granting of amnesty or pardon is not permitted. Consequently, the Court found that the proceedings against police officers for the torture of Mr. Yaman were dismissed mainly because of substantial delays throughout the trial, thereby depriving Mr. Yaman of a "thorough and effective" remedy, as required under the Article 13 of the Convention.

In addition to his Article 13 claims, Mr. Yaman further alleged that Turkey violated his rights under Sections 3 (prompt appearance before a judge), 4 (speedy trial), and 5 (right to compensation) of Article 5 (right to liberty and security), as well as Articles 14 (prohibition of discrimination) and 18 (limitations on use of restrictions on rights) of the Convention.

The Court emphasized that, even in the problematic investigations of terrorist offenses, the government does not have the authority to evade the control of domestic courts and the Convention's supervisory institutions. The Court referred to *Brogans and Others*, in which it held that four days and six hours of detention exceeded the time limit allowed under Article 5 of the Convention, even when the detainee was the subject of an investigation of terrorist acts. Under this standard, the Court held that Turkey violated Article 5, Section 3, and

that the Turkish law imposing a 15-day statutory limitation on detentions for investigations of offenses relating to the security of the state exceeded the time limits allowed under the Convention.

Amnesty International has issued numerous public statements and public appeals to the Turkish government publicizing torture claims and urging reforms in the penal code. These appeals highlight two important legal safeguards necessary to ensure the protection of the human rights of prisoners and detainees. One of the measures suggested is a reduction of the length of time that detainees can be held by the police without charge. The other measure focuses on ensuring sufficient and adequate judicial remedies for victims of torture, namely, through prosecution and punishment of those responsible. According to Amnesty International, even though the government has enacted a "zero tolerance for torture" policy, the courts "appear unable or unwilling to bring appropriate sanctions against torturers."

The Presidency of the Council of Europe welcomed and encouraged Turkish legislative reforms in its Presidency Conclusions issued in December 2004. The Presidency reiterated, however, that sustained efforts will be necessary to ensure further compliance with European human rights instruments. The Presidency Conclusions specifically expressed the need for effective measures to strengthen the independence and functioning of the judiciary branch. They also recommended that these measures should be implemented along with legislative reforms to create an overall legislative framework protecting individuals' exercise of fundamental freedoms of association, expression, and religion.

INTER-AMERICAN SYSTEM

THE INTER-AMERICAN Human Rights System was created with the adoption of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man (Declaration) in 1948. In 1959, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (Commission) was established as an independent organ of the Organization of the American States (OAS) and it held its first session one year later. In 1969, the American Convention on Human Rights (Convention) was adopted. The Convention further defined the role of the

Commission and created the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (Inter-American Court). According to the Convention, once the Commission determines the case is admissible and meritorious, it will make recommendations and, in some cases, present the case to the Court for adjudication. The Court hears these cases, determines responsibility under relevant regional treaties and agreements, and assesses and awards damages and other forms of reparation to victims of human rights violations.

In November 2004, the Inter-American Court decided two landmark cases regarding the detention, investigation, and trial of alleged terrorists. *Lori Berenson Mejía v. Perú* and *De La Cruz Flores v. Perú* involved challenges to the terrorism laws of Peru. The government of former president Alberto Fujimori enacted these stringent laws in response to the sharp increase in domestic terrorism beginning in 1980 and spanning into the mid-1990s. In May 1992, the Peruvian government promulgated Decree No. 25.475, which classified crimes constituting terrorism and collaboration with terrorism, and established procedural rules for their investigation and adjudication. Decree No. 25.475 granted investigatory and juridical power to the military courts in cases regarding acts of treason. It also permitted limitations on the participation of defense attorneys; prohibition of witness testimony that contradicted police affidavits; adjudication before masked, anonymous judges; and continuous solitary confinement for the first year of a prison sentence.

In 2000, President Fujimori faced strong criticism for his authoritarian practices, fled to Japan, and was later impeached by the Peruvian Congress. Current president Alejandro Toledo promoted reform of the trial system in accordance with the provisions of the Convention. On February 19, 2003, Congress passed Legislative Decree No. 926, which modified Decree No. 25.475 and outlawed the use of anonymous judges in the National Terrorism Court.

In *Lori Berenson Mejía v. Perú* and *De La Cruz Flores v. Perú*, the Inter-American Court challenged the validity of Decree No. 25.475 and found that trials before masked judges compromised impartial sentencing. The Inter-American Court's rulings on these cases reinforced its commitment to terrorism

laws that respect human dignity and refrain from inhumane treatment toward those accused of terrorism.

LORI BERENSON MEJÍA V. PERÚ

Peruvian police detained U.S. citizen Lori Berenson Mejía for her suspected involvement with the Tupac Amaru Revolutionary Movement (MRTA) in its plan to take over the Peruvian Congress and exchange captured congressmen for political prisoners. The state charged Berenson as a member of the MRTA who participated in subversive acts, including impersonating a journalist to enter government buildings and planning the attack on Congress.

The police detained Berenson on November 30, 1995, in Lima, Peru, and tried her in accordance with domestic terrorism laws. Berenson was denied family visitation rights during the first days of her detention and did not have access to a lawyer for eight days following her detention. Berenson was imprisoned at Yanamayo prison from January 1996 until October 1998, where she was subjected to inhumane conditions of detention.

On March 12, 1996, a military tribunal condemned Berenson to life in prison for treason. In accordance with Decree No. 25.475, the trial took place before masked judges. On August 18, 2000, the Supreme Council of Military Justice annulled the sentence in favor of a criminal trial before a civilian court. On August 28, 2000, Berenson began a new trial in which the court found her guilty of collaboration with terrorists and sentenced her to 20 years in prison. The Supreme Court of Justice of Peru confirmed that sentence on February 13, 2002.

In its claim on behalf of Berenson, the Commission alleged violations of Article 5 (Right to Humane Treatment), Article 8 (Right to a Fair Trial), and Article 9 (Freedom from Ex Post Facto Laws) of the Convention. Additionally, the Commission alleged that the judicial process in both the military and civil trials, as well as the inhumane conditions of detention in Yanamayo, violated international law.

Article 5 of the Convention states that no person shall be subject to torture or cruel, inhumane, or degrading treatment. Further, all persons deprived of liberty shall be treated with respect toward their inherent human

dignity. The Court found explicit violations of Article 5, such as continuous solitary confinement in a small cell without ventilation, natural light, or heat; malnutrition; and deficient sanitary measures. During Berenson's first year of detention, the prison severely limited her right to receive visitors and provided substandard medical attention for her numerous health conditions.

Article 8 provides for a competent, independent, and impartial judge; the presumption of innocence; adequate opportunity to prepare a defense; the right to interrogate witnesses; the right to appeal; and public process. The Court concluded that the military trial violated Article 8 on all of these counts, but that the criminal trial in civilian court did not.

Article 9 of the Convention establishes that no person can be condemned for a crime that was not a crime at the time it was committed, nor can a penalty be imposed that is more severe at the time of trial than it was at the time of the commission of the crime. The Court concluded that Berenson's military trial, in particular, and the use of Decree No. 25.475, in general, violated Article 9 because military trials are composed of masked judges who make cursory rulings. Moreover, military trials exhibit reduced procedural guaranties and potentially result in life sentences. The Court concluded that Berenson's criminal trial in the civilian court, however, did not violate Article 9.

The Court ultimately ruled that Berenson's trial in civilian court did not violate any Articles of the Convention, but ruled that Peru had treated the petitioner inhumanely during her two-year, eight-month stay in Yanamayo. In its decision on damages, the Court ordered Peru to immediately modify its antiterrorism legislation; to pay \$2,000,000 to a fund designed to benefit the mistreated, poor, and excluded of Peru; and to waive all fines imposed on Ms. Berenson. Ms. Berenson remains in prison based on her criminal conviction in the civilian court.

DE LA CRUZ FLORES V. PERÚ

Police detained Dr. Maria Teresa De La Cruz Flores and charged her with illicit association with terrorists. Witnesses saw De La Cruz's patient, Rolando Estrada Yarleque, posting stickers of the subversive group

Sendero Luminoso (Shining Path) on the bathroom walls of the Chinchá Clinic. De La Cruz acknowledged that Estrada was her patient and that he possessed a package that belonged to her. The police later detained De La Cruz on separate charges for her association with the Shining Path under the alias “Eliana.” The police declared her “clearly identified” as Eliana based on the contradictory testimony of two witnesses.

A court comprised of masked judges tried and sentenced De La Cruz to 20 years in prison on November 21, 1996, in accordance with Decree No. 25.475. The Special Criminal Court of Peru’s Supreme Court of Justice affirmed the sentence on June 8, 1998. As previously mentioned, however, the Constitutional Tribunal of Peru declared Decree No. 25.475 unconstitutional on January 3, 2003, and enacted Legislative Decree No. 926, eliminating trials before masked judges.

The Inter-American Commission brought a claim against Peru for violating Article 7 (Right to Personal Liberty), Article 8 (Right to a Fair Trial), Article 9 (Freedom from Ex Post Facto Laws), and Article 24 (Right to Equal Protection) of the Convention. The Inter-American Court ruled that Peru violated Articles 7, 8, and 9 due, in part, to: the failure to inform the victim of the charges against her at the time of her arrest; trial by masked judges, followed by a trial by identifiable judges that failed to correct the potential prejudice of the first trial; lack of a public trial; lack of proof of facts; and disparate sentences for similar offenses. The Court found it did not have jurisdiction over the question of whether Peru violated Article 24.

The Court found Peru guilty of violating Articles 7, 8, and 9 of the Convention and ordered a new trial for De La Cruz. The Court ordered that De La Cruz’s new trial conform to the Convention by making two changes. First, the trial should not be conducted before anonymous judges and, second, De La Cruz should be guaranteed adequate legal representation. Additionally, the Court ordered that reparations of \$80,000 be paid to De La Cruz and a total of \$60,000 be paid to her family members for their hardship and mental anguish. The Court granted psychological and medical treatment, as well as De La Cruz’s reincorporation into the medical activities she engaged in prior to her

detention, which will be facilitated through classes funded by the government.

In a time of worldwide concern regarding terrorism, the cases of *Lori Berenson Mejía v. Perú* and *De La Cruz Flores v. Perú* demonstrate abuses committed by the state in the name of combating terrorism. Berenson was treated inhumanely when she was held at Yanamayo prison, which the state justified by her status as a convicted terrorist. Although Berenson was convicted on terrorism charges, the Inter-American Court upheld her right to be treated humanely during her detention. De La Cruz experienced unfair trial procedures such as inadequate legal representation and a trial before

masked judges. The Court ruled that anonymous judges greatly diminish the opportunity for a fair trial. The Court’s rulings in these cases represent an important step toward mitigating unfair treatment of criminal defendants in terrorism cases that could resonate throughout the Americas. **HRB**

Tim Curry, a J.D. candidate at the Washington College of Law, covers Africa for the Human Rights Brief.

Nerina Cevra, a J.D. candidate at the Washington College of Law, covers the European Court of Human Rights for the Human Rights Brief.

Erin Palmer, a J.D. candidate at the Washington College of Law, covers the Inter-American System for the Human Rights Brief.

On THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 2005, the WASHINGTON COLLEGE of LAW’s INTERNATIONAL LAW REVIEW will host its annual conference. Entitled “THE GENEVA CONVENTION AND THE RULES OF WAR IN THE POST-9/11 AND IRAQ WORLD,” the one-day conference will include panels dedicated to the following topics:

- Classification of Non-state Fighters
- The Role of Private Contractors in 21st Century War
- Treatment/Detainment of Suspected Terrorists/Insurgents
- Weaponry Technology and its Implications on the Rules of War

Confirmed speakers include:

Anthony Arend, Professor, Georgetown University; Director, International Law and Politics Department

James Cockayne, Doctoral Candidate and Hauser Scholar, New York University School of Law; former Director of Transnational Crime Unit, Office of the Attorney General, Commonwealth of Australia

Robert K. Goldman, Professor of Law and Louis C. James Scholar, WCL; Member, Inter-American Commission on Human Rights

Elisa Massimino, Human Rights First, Director of the Washington, D.C. Office

W. Hays Parks, Professor of Law, WCL; Special Assistant to the Judge Advocate General of the Army, Department of Army

Dr. Gary Solis, Visiting Professor of Law, Department of Law, U.S. Military Academy; Colonel, United States Marine Corps (Ret.)

Will Taft, Legal Counsel to the Secretary of State, U.S. Department of State

Kristine Huskey, Senior Associate, Shearman and Sterling LLP

Richard Wilson, Professor of Law, WCL

Continuing Legal Education Accreditation (approx. 5 credits) will be available for the program.

Registration: You may register online at <http://www.wcl.american.edu/secle> (click on event registration)

For additional information contact the SECLE office at 202 274-4075 or secle@wcl.american.edu