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12.0 OBJECTIVES

We have been studying that protection of human rights is one of the prime duties of a liberal welfare state. Besides knowing in what ways the State can protect the rights, we have also observed instances of violation of human rights by the agencies of the State.

In this Unit, we will most importantly be:

- analyzing a recent real episode of human rights violation in Delhi.
- looking at ways which give the rule of law power over the executive.

After reading this unit you would be able to:

- know how the State violates individual’s human rights
- recognize the expanding interpretation of Human Rights

12.1 INTRODUCTION

Human Rights constitute the foundation for men and women to lead a civilized life. Liberal democracies all over the would have guaranteed a variety of rights so that their citizens lead a healthy life. In India, demand for fundamental rights had been voiced during the nationalist struggle itself. So, after 1947, the Constituent Assembly took upon itself the responsibility of framing chapters on Fundamental Rights and made it a pivotal point for the life of its citizens. It was accorded so much importance that all other provisions and activities came to be either directly or indirectly influenced by it. However, over the years, the succeeding governments both at the Centres and in the States began to curtail the citizens’ freedoms became through various legislations. Many of such acts became harmful to the very personhood of individuals. We will study in this unit how individual freedoms become abridged. We will also be looking at which agencies curtail the human freedom and civil rights. At the same time, we come to know about gradually expanding meaning and interpretation of Human Rights.
12.2 ANECDOTE

Ramzan lived and died in the jhuggis of New Seemapuri in Delhi. He was a rag picker who hailed from Bangladesh and came here as a refugee - maybe even an illegal immigrant. Ramzan did not only have to fill his own stomach, he had to support his family back home. On top of that fact his very citizenship was in doubt, he was also a resident of what is officially designated as an unauthorized settlement - a jhuggi jhonpri (hutment) cluster. Caught gambling one day, he was picked up by the police and died in custody. The Sub-Divisional Magistrate’s inquiry established it as a case of accidental death. Despite public protest, there was no investigation ordered into Ramzan's death in March 1992. [Capital Crimes: Deaths in Police Custody, Delhi 1980-1997, People’s Union for Democratic Rights (PUDR) Delhi, March 1998]

12.2.1 Inferences from the Anecdote

There are a number of strands in this little story that will help us to understand the overpowering role of the machine called State in the violation of rights. Human rights, or rights in general, are in classical liberal political theory, attributes of the human individual. They are considered to be therefore, an inalienable part of the individual’s person. Protecting these rights as the guarantor and executor, is the state. It is the state and the law that is supposed to ensure that the right of every person is protected from violation by others or by the state itself.

And yet, we see here a series of violations - all committed by the long arm of the state:

1. An individual who is probably a refugee of the Bangladesh war and came to live in this country for safety and livelihood, and whose stay here was sanctioned as a consequence of a formal understanding between the two governments, suddenly becomes “an illegal immigrant”. There is no proof required. There can be no proof - if at all the person held a piece of identification paper at any time in the past it was probably nibbled away by mice or washed away or lost in the jhuggi - who knows! In the days when this drama was enacted there was a big campaign ongoing to turn the refugees into “infiltrators”. This drama was already acquiring a different form - that of common sense. In this “common sense”, a combination of being Bengali (not necessarily Bangladeshi!) and Muslim readily makes one into an infiltrator. (Today that common sense is in place and the fate of the Ramzan’s is much more seriously threatened today than it ever was.)

2. The individual concerned was picked up for a petty offence - and it is not even clear why gambling is an offence when it involves petty sums whereas it becomes a respectable profession while dealing in crores in the financial markets. For this offence, the individual was beaten to death. The state - the guarantor of his rights - itself turned to be the enemy of his very person. Was it because Ramzan was a non-citizen, an illegal “infiltrator”, who had to be deprived of his life - or that his death simply did not matter as a consequence? Would the state and its personnel have been any bit more respectful of Ramzan’s right to life, had he been a bona fide citizen? Considering the record, the number and the ways in which the apparatus of the state deprives individuals of their lives - this is not a guesswork that can be sustained. Human rights groups in Andhra Pradesh, for instance, have recorded nearly 900 killings by police encounters during 1990 and 1996. (In Search of Democratic Space, Committee of Concerned Citizens, Hyderabad, August 1998.) We shall see below the reality of the phenomenon of “encounters” as exposed by the Tarkunde Commission many years ago. The fact is that it really does not differentiate between its citizen and non-citizen victims beyond a point.

3. Ramzan could well have been Ram Chander, but as long as he was a jhuggi dweller this is an aspect that does not matter. The jhuggi jhonpri is an “unauthorized” settlement - beyond and
outside the law and hence punishable. We shall also see below how the question of human rights
denial to the residents of urban slums and squatter settlements happens in a more generalized
form.

12.3 FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS AND DIRECTIVE PRINCIPLES
OF THE INDIAN CONSTITUTION

There are seven freedoms provided as fundamental rights in the Indian Constitution that form the
basis of all human rights available to the Indian citizen. They are encoded in Articles 14 to 22
as you would have already seen in the earlier block. You may also have read in the earlier block
that there are, apart from these, certain other rights like those against exploitation, of freedom of
religion and belief, of cultural and education that are available to individual citizens and groups
of citizens. There are also the Directive Principles of State Policy whose provisions are, of course,
non-justiciable (that which can not be challenged in a court of law.) However, even the justiciable
fundamental rights enshrined in it can be abridged and contravened in a number of ways - legal
and illegal. We shall see some of the ways in which these happen.

Check Your Progress 1

1. When was the Bangladesh Liberation war fought?

2. What did the Tarkunde Commission Enquire into?

3. Are the Directive Principles of State Policy justiciable?

12.4 VIOLATION OF INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS: ACTS OF THE
EXECUTIVE

The Constitution itself gives the Executive and the Legislature enough opportunities to limit,
suspend and annul them in spite of the existence of Fundamental Rights. Rule by ordinances can
be carried on by extending these term after term. Emergency can be imposed either under the
pretext of external threat or of internal disorder.

One of the major ways in which rights of individuals may be annulled is through the provision
of Preventive Detention. According to the State of Human Rights in India, 1996 (Legal
Resources for Social Action, Chengalpattu, undated), about forty preventive detention laws exist
in the statute books in India. The first of these was The Preventive Detention Act, 1950, which
was in force till 1969. The Armed Forces (Special Powers) Act 1958 has been used extensively in the seven states of the North-East. The Maintenance of Internal Security Act, 1971 was in force till 1978 and was used extensively against the political opponents of the then existing regime. Laws like the Defence of India Act were enacted after the promulgation of internal Emergency in June 1975. The Jammu and Kashmir Public Safety Act came into force in 1978, the Assam Preventive Detention Act and the National Security Act, 1980 were both instituted in 1980 and the latter still continues to exist in the statute book. The Armed Forces (Punjab and Chandigarh) Special Powers Act and the Punjab Disturbed Areas Act were passed in 1983, followed by the Terrorist and Affected Areas (Special Courts) Act, 1984. A full decade after the Emergency, probably the most notorious of them all - the TADA or the Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act, 1985 came into force. The last mentioned law created new procedures, new hierarchies, new restrictions on the life and liberties of the people, according to the Report. An individual can be kept under detention for two years and this period can be indefinitely extended on the same grounds, any number of times. It shifted the onus of proof on to the accused completely upturning the fundamental norms of justice. Ordinary courts were barred to individuals arrested under the Act. The Jammu and Kashmir Disturbed Areas Act, 1990 also vests the armed forces with huge arbitrary powers to arrest and abrogate the civil liberties of individuals.

It may in fact, be useful to remember that in the years since it came into force, over 400 writ petitions, special leave petitions and appeals challenging the constitutionality of the TADA were filed in the Supreme Court. The National Commission on Human Rights also actively campaigned for the repeal of this law. The appeals were finally heard by a constitution bench of the SC in February/March 1994 after what has been termed as “nine years of legislated violence” (Striking Terror- The Tamil Nadu Prevention of Terrorist Activities Bill and its Implications, PUDR, Delhi, July 1998) and three judgements were delivered - the majority judgements by three judges and two minority ones. The main judgement noted that the business of notifying entire states as ‘terrorist-affected’ areas and of never denotifying was wrong and could only be done on the recommendations of a review committee. It also noted that the definition of ‘abetment’ was too wide and could include anyone who had no knowledge that s/he was assisting terrorists. A later judgement also ruled that the entitlement to bail was an ‘indefeasible and absolute right’ of an accused if the chargesheet was not filed within 180 days of arrest. These aspects of the judgement of the highest court of the land will give you an indication of how the preventive detention provisions are used or misused. How without filing of charge sheets, the accused are kept in detention, refused bail and how definitions of ‘abetment’ are so wide there may actually be more people behind bars who may have nothing to do with terrorist activities. If areas are notified arbitrarily and without any compulsion to denotify within a specific period, the area of operation of such a law can be extended at will. The latest in the series of such preventive detention laws is The Tamil Nadu Prevention of Terrorist Activities Bill (POTA) that actually flouts all the recommendations of the above-mentioned TADA judgement. In fact, the same TADA judgement states that ‘terrorism’ only falls in the ambit of ‘Defence of India’ and therefore is the sole jurisdiction of Parliament. Yet, the POTA is introduced by a state government which is legally not competent to do so. An indication of the arbitrariness of the preventive detention laws can be had from the fact that in nine years, of the 76,166 persons arrested only 843, that is 1.11 percent could be convicted. Let us bear in mind that in these convictions, ‘confessions’ made to police officers were also considered as evidence - a matter on which subsequently the Constitution Bench of the SC was divided 3:2. Despite this, no evidence could be brought against over 38,000 who were either discharged or acquitted.

12.4.1 Encounters and Custodial Deaths, Torture

We have referred to ‘encounters’ above in connection with the 900 killings in AP in the first six years of the 1990s. It was during the Janata Government’s rule in April 1977, that a commission
headed by Justice V.M. Tarkunde was set up by Jaya Prakash Narayan as the head of the Citizens for Democracy, to inquire into over a hundred such cases reported in which naxalite activists were killed during the Emergency. In the course of its painstaking investigations, the Tarkunde Commission reached the conclusion that the ‘encounters’ were stage-managed and that all of them were cold blooded murders. It was actually discovered that the police themselves picked up political activists, took them to the jungles, tied them to the trees and shot them dead and then issue statements that they had to open fire in self-defense. The dead bodies were cremated or buried and never handed over to the relatives.(P. A. Sebastian, “The Shifting Modalities of Struggle - The Setting up of the Human Rights Tribunal” in S. Kothari and H. Sethi (ed.) Rethinking Human Rights; New Horizons Press, New York and Lokayan, New Delhi 1989). In the two reports submitted by the commission, it was made clear that while the victims were killed in cold blood, in none of the cases did the state administration hold an inquest as stipulated under Section 174 of the Criminal Procedure Code. This was pretty much the pattern of political killings in the urban setting of West Bengal in the period after 1969 especially after 1972, and the art was perfected later by he AP police. After 1980, this practice has been widely used in Tamil Nadu also. It was in the aftermath of a bomb explosion in August 1980 near Tirupattur of North Arcot district. “In the thirteen months that followed,18 young men joined the ranks of liquidated ‘extremists’. Half of them were dalits, the rest of them belonged to the most backward castes. All of them came from peasant and artisan stock. Thirteen of them were killed in ‘encounters’...; one succumbed to brutal attack of the police; another was tortured to death in broad daylight; one was pushed down from a running vehicle and two persons ‘disappeared’ from police custody.”(K. Manoharan, “Encounter Deaths in Tamil Nadu” in A.R. Desai ed. Violation of Democratic Rights in India, Popular Prakashan, Bombay 1986).

Already in the above descriptions you can see the lurking phenomena of custodial deaths and Torture. The very act of being lodged in jail is one of a series of deprivations of various human rights - of fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution. Prisoners do not lose their human/ fundamental rights simply because they are held in incarceration as their “rights are inherent in them and inalienable”. “Human rights are to be associated with life not with liberty.”(LRSA report) This is the profound meaning of the philosophy of human rights. The Supreme Court of India in the Charles Shobraj vs. Tihar has affirmed that prisoners have all the rights of any free citizen except to the extent that the situation of incarceration truncates his ability to enjoy them to the fullest. Apart from the various international conventions against torture and regarding the treatment of prisoners, there are rights enshrined in Part III of the Constitution, the Prisoners Act, 1894 and the Jail Manual. Apart from solitary confinement, fettering, keeping prisoners hungry, abusing women prisoners and such like, there are extreme cases of perversity. In one shocking incident that came before the Delhi High Court, a jail superintendent had engraved his name with red hot iron on the body of a prisoner when the latter refused to pay a bribe. So the ‘institution’ of torture is not meant for the political opponents of the regime alone but exists at a more quotidian and generalized level. Many of the deaths which take place as a result of such torture and third degree methods, occur after the victims are released because the police knows that after the merciless beatings it is hazardous to keep them in lock-up, that they can die any moment. In some investigations conducted in the post-Emergency period, it was discovered how torture has actually been institutionalized, especially in Punjab and Haryana in the form of the Central Interrogation Agencies (CIA) - who true to their name specialized in interrogation and not investigation.(Sudip Mazumdar, “Deaths In Police Custody” in A.R. Desai, Op.Cit.) Since many of those are simply picked up and the arrests were not even on record, when the victim died, the CIA simply denied having seen him/her. Nor, therefore, is torture something that exists only in the stories of the nazi concentration camps or of Stalinist labour camps. Normal democratic societies like India have as much claim to it as anybody else.
It may also be interesting to note that the overwhelming majority of prison inmates are under trials - the figure sometimes going up to as high as 90 percent, but on the average remaining near 60 to 70 percent. It has been estimated that although most of them are there for petty offences, they are lodged in jails as under trials for periods longer than would be their maximum punishment under the law for that particular crime. In the case of 30 under trials who were held in Bombay jails for over 7 years, the legal punishment for their offences were far less. This incident came to light in October 1995 and the High Court ordered their release following the publication of an article in the press. Many of them are in jail because, says the LRSA report, they could not purchase their freedom with bail - the procedure for which is highly unsatisfactory and suffers from a property-oriented approach. Overcrowding in these jails is the norm and the conditions are therefore unhygienic and simply unlivable. The Mulla Committee, headed by former justice A.N. Mullar appointed in 1980, noted in its reports submitted in 1983, that the majority of the people lodged in jails were people belonging to the underprivileged sections - and mainly from rural and agricultural backgrounds.

Even as India ratified the international convention against torture in June 1997, after dithering for 13 years, the number of custodial deaths countrywide rose sharply. According to the Home Ministry figures, as compared to 444 deaths in 1995-96, there were 889 deaths in 1996-97 government (these figures include those in judicial custody). Of these 889, 700 hundred deaths occurred in judicial custody alone. The PUDR has documented 93 cases of custodial deaths between 1980 and 1997, in the capital city itself. In the case of women, the abuses often take the form of custodial rape. There have been a number of cases that have come to light in recent years and some of them such as the notorious Rameeza Bee and Mathura rape cases which eventually became landmark events in the growth of the women's movement in the country. These were issues that provided a crucial mobilizational impetus, along with questions of dowry deaths, in the early 1980s, for the emergence of a strong and politically vigorous women's movement.

In the cases of such deaths/torture/rape, we get a glimpse of a dimension of Ramzan's story. Most of them live precarious lives as migrants struggling for adequate livelihood. Any attempt to find a livelihood, or create one, says the report, involves the violation of one rule or another - and failure to do so pushes some of them into the world of petty crimes. In the ten cases of custodial rape investigated by the PUDR between 1989 and 1994, too, we can see the same socio-economic profile of the victims - wife of autorikshaw driver, Bangladeshi immigrant, wife of DTC driver, wife of factory worker, Nepali migrant, Himachali migrant in resettlement colony and so on. (Custodial Rape - A Report on the Aftermath, PUDR, Delhi, May 1994). In this connection, certain amendments to the Criminal procedure Code that have been hanging fire are now seen to be in urgent need to be pushed. For over a decade, these have not been considered but now some of them are being segregated and considered. These are ones that specially relate to the rights of women prisoners. They relate to prohibition of arrest of a woman after sunset and before sunrise except in exceptional circumstances, casting obligation on the police to give intimation of the arrest of the person and the place where s/he is being held to anyone nominated by him/her and medical examination of a person accused of rape. Occasionally the urgency of the situation is recognized and adhoc decisions are taken to rectify the situation as in the case of the Madhya Pradesh government's decision in 1995 to release all undertrial women who had spent more than five years in jail.
Check Your Progress 2

1. What were the distinguishing features of the TADA?

2. What important findings have been made by the LRSA Report?

3. When did India ratify the International Convention against Torture?

What is “Torture”?

According to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman and Degrading Treatment and Punishment of the UN General Assembly Resolution 39/46 of December, 10. 1984, “Torture” means any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted on a person for such purposes as obtaining from him or a third person information or a confession, punishing or is suspected of having committed, or intimidating or coercing him or a third person, for any reason based on discrimination of any kind, when such pain or suffering is inflicted by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity. It does not include pain or suffering arising only from, inherent in or incidental to lawful sanctions.

Supreme Court’s interpretation of immunity from cruel and unusual punishment. As there is no specific provision in the constitution of India against cruel and unusual punishment, the Supreme Court has given immunity after a combined reading of Articles 14, 19, and 21. The Supreme Court is for using torture and cruelty to suit a matured, advanced and progressive society with standards of decency in vogue.

12.5 DEMOCRATIC RIGHTS

But let us now look beyond these specifically civil liberties issues - issues that are framed in the Fundamental Rights section of the Indian Constitution and are therefore justiciable - to the more general democratic rights issues. There may or may not be a direct contravention of fundamental rights involved here but they are affected nevertheless, howsoever indirectly. Here we cannot catalogue all such legalized attacks but only indicatively refer to the more notorious central legislations/ordinances.

It was in the beginning of the 1980s, especially after the fall of the Janata Government, that some of the most stringent news laws were enacted. We have already mentioned the NSA being enacted in December 1980. Close on its heels, came the Essential Services Maintenance Act (ESMA) in
September 1981. It was meant to check labour unrest particularly in the so-called essential services - fourteen of which were listed in the act. As a matter of fact, in a couple of months before it became an act, it had already been promulgated as an ordinance. Strike, the Labour Minister had proclaimed, is a luxury in a poor country! And what were the essential services? Any service connected with post & telegraphs, telephones, railways, airports, shipping, customs, armed forces, hospitals, public conservancy and sanitation, banking, oilfields, mint-security-press and elections to the parliament and state legislatures were all pronounced to be essential. One could of course stretch the meaning of “any service connected to” in any way convenient. Strike, of course was defined as “cessation of work”, “refusal to continue to work” or even “refusal to accept employment”, worse, also ‘refusal to work overtime’. More importantly, it included any other conduct “which is likely to result in cessation or substantial retardation of work in any essential service.” As was rightly remarked by a scholar, a farmer in Bengal refusing to sell paddy at unremunerative prices, a labourer working on Asiad refusing to work unless paid minimum wages or a tribal in Chhattisgarh refusing to fell timber for a pittance, a teacher refusing to accept employment as a police informer, a journalist refusing to write government handouts - all could be charged under this act with either obstructing production or the normal work of the government. (Suresh Sharma, “Strike-ban Ordinance: A Lawless Law” in A.R. Desai, Op. Cit.). Shortly after that, the government proposed to drastically amend the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 and the Indian Trade Unions Act 1926, and to introduce The Hospital and Other Institutions (Settlement of Disputes) Bill. The amendment to the ID Act sought to remove hospital, educational institutions and such others from the purview of the Act, which were sought to be covered by the separate Act mentioned above. It also made strikes and other form of protest illegal and punishable under the law. The amendment to the TU Act gave wide powers to the Registrar of Trade unions in terms of granting recognition. The Hospital and Other Institutions Bill sought to introduce a separate bureaucracy to deal with and arbitrate disputes within these institutions - appeals against whose decisions were not to be allowed. Many of these proposals eventually fell through in the face of stiff resistance and opposition from parties, trade unions and the public at large. Some other local ones like the Bihar Press Bill which sought to place severe restrictions on the freedom of the press - an extension of the freedom of expression - had also be withdrawn due to public outcry and large-scale protests.

12.6 JUDICIAL ACTIVISM AND THE VIOLATION OF RIGHTS

Strange though it may sound, some of the more recent attacks on the human rights - defined in the wider sense - of sections of the people have come from orders from the hyperactive judiciary, the very institution entrusted with the task of protecting them. The most well-known cases are those where there has been recently, an open conflict between two different sets of rights: say, the right of the people of Delhi to a clean environment and the right of the workers to their livelihood. Though the apparent conflict between the demands for a clean environment and the rights of workers or the poor has emerged as a more generalized one in recent years, it was in Delhi that it recently acquired a dimension that forced it onto the arena of public debate. The Supreme Court in its order in July 1996 order the closure of 168 hazardous and noxious industries. Immediately the result was that close to 50,000 workers were on the streets without jobs. Many starved, some attempted/committed suicide and one of them committed public self-immolation. The question was: why did the court, in the eleven years of the case proceedings not once ask the workers’ side of the story; why did it not try to work out any other method in any serious way; why did it not make any explicit demand from the offending, profit-making owners, to submit a detailed plan for relocation stating clearly what they would do with the workforce? It was felt therefore, that the conflict between two sets of rights was not all that real - that the real conflict was between two different interests, namely, that of profit and wages.
12.7 UNDERSTANDING HUMAN RIGHTS IN A WIDER PERSPECTIVE

In subsequent times, the increased awareness of human rights has led to many other important issues being framed as human rights questions. So the refusal to hold elections to various representative bodies, attempts to gag the freedom of press and expression, the specific attacks on women’s rights, the question of dalits’ struggle for dignity and self-respect have all been seen as constituting the wider field of human rights violations. The displacement of tribal and other rural populations from their land by mega-development projects have also increasingly been articulated in the language of human rights - of the right over their land and resources and the right, therefore to be consulted in the overall orientation of development. The right to peaceful and dignified life of people of various communities is also widely seen as threatened by endemic communal and sectarian violence under the benign eye of the state. The massacres of Muslims in Maliana perpetrated by the notorious Provincial Armed Constabulary of UP or the massacres of the Sikhs in Delhi in 1984, under the watchful eye of the police have been cited as important indicators of the fact that communal strife is no longer about a clash between two otherwise equal communities - that the state is implicated in every one of these.

1. State whether the following are true or false:
   (a) The ESMA came into force in 1981,
   ...........................................................
   ...........................................................
   ...........................................................

   (b) The National Security Act came into force in December 1977.
   ...........................................................
   ...........................................................
   ...........................................................

12.8 LET US SUM UP

We had seen through a real incident, how a poor slum dweller became a target for the police and how he was killed after being victimized. We had also studied the extent of deaths in police custody and the number of tragedies suffered by women prisoners in jails. Added to these human rights violations committed by the Executive against the codes of manuals and recommendations of different committees, we also witness to Judiciary’s expanding role which reflects elitism notice than concern for the poor. All these have a common thread - that is, in the name of protecting the interests of the State or a group of people, larger interests of people, mostly of the poorer sections and the under privileged have become compromised. On the one hand, we have the civil liberties organizations expanding but on the other there is an increasing violation of rights by the State and its agencies. Although such a development is only expected of democracy with an active Civil Society, yet, with globalization, the sphere of citizens’ rights also needs to be enlarged. Good and responsible governance in today’s world ensures that both the state and the citizen - groups constantly engage in mutual consultation to arrive at consensus. To ensure this, larger number of citizens should become educated of their rights and duties. An enlightened citizenship is the best guarantee of the Fundamental Rights enshrined in the Indian Constitution.
Fruits of such a project will come in the form of more political space (than hitherto enjoyed) to the people.

12.9 KEY WORDS

Detenue: A person who is detained for arrest.

Work exercises

Carefully note the arguments of the Supreme Court of India and the State governments of M.P. and Gujarat and those of the Narmada Bachao Andolan (NBA) about the need for Big Dams in the country.

12.10 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

Check Your progress 1

1. 1970-1
2. Tarkunde Commission enquired into ‘encounters’ and deaths
3. No, they are non-justiciable.

Check Your Progress 2

1. The distinguishing features of TADA were: its new features and characteristics, selling up of new hierarchies, and imposing new restrictions on the life and liberties of the people like detention of an arrested person up to 2 years and grounds for expansion of his/her imprisonment. The arrested were also prevented from approaching ordinary courts to seek justice.
2. It recommended that human rights be associated with life and not necessarily with liberty. Thus the meaning of the philosophy of Human Rights was defined.
3. India acceded to the Convention against Torture in June 1997; it remains to be ratified however.

Check Your Progress 3

1. (a) True    (b) False