**IDA submission on** **the CERD Committee’s draft general recommendation 36**

**“Preventing and combating racial profiling”**

1. **INTRODUCTION**
2. The International Disability Alliance (IDA) is a unique, international network of eight global and six regional organisations of persons with disabilities (OPDs). Each IDA member represents a large number of national OPDs, covering the whole range of disability constituencies. IDA thus represents the collective global voice of persons with disabilities counting among the more than 1 billion persons with disabilities worldwide, the world’s largest –and most frequently overlooked– minority group. IDA’s mission is to advance the human rights of persons with disabilities as a united voice of OPDs utilising the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and other human rights instruments.
3. IDA appreciates the initiative by the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (*hereinafter* “the Committee”) to call for comments on its draft general recommendation 36. Indeed, racial profiling by law enforcement agents is a pervasive discriminatory practice leading to severe human rights violations, including police brutality and extrajudicial executions, which needs to be addressed.
4. However, IDA highly regrets that the current draft:

* does not thoroughly elaborate on the notion of intersectionality;[[1]](#endnote-1)
* does not elaborate on and/or refer to “disability” and/or “persons with disabilities”;
* does not consider neither negative stereotypes on persons with disabilities (e.g. dangerousness of persons with psychosocial disabilities), nor barriers of communications faced based persons with disabilities (e.g. deaf persons), that concur in practice with race-based stereotyping and profiling; and
* consequently, ignores the increasingly visible disproportionate impact of law enforcement agents' activity on persons with disabilities, including those with psychosocial disabilities and deaf people.

1. This submission elaborates on the impact of the criminal and mental health systems on persons with disabilities, in particular those with psychosocial disabilities and deaf persons, highlighting intersectionalities with race and ethnic origin. Law enforcement agents play a key role through surveillance, detentions and custody. It also puts forward key human rights standards on discrimination, intersectionality and access to justice recognised by this Committee and the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (*hereinafter* “the CRPD Committee”).
2. **PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES AND LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENTS: NEGATIVE STEREOTYPING, INTERSECTIONALITY AND HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS**
3. Persons with disabilities, especially those with psychosocial disabilities and intellectual disabilities, are typical “clients” of the criminal and mental health systems. Others, such as deaf persons, face communication barriers when interacting with law enforcement agents. Hence, persons with disabilities are more prone to suffer abuses and human rights violations by law enforcement agents, ranging from discriminatory detentions on the basis of actual and perceived impairments to extrajudicial killings.[[2]](#endnote-2) For instance, media coverage studies show that from one-third to half of all cases reported of persons killed by the United States’ police were persons with psychosocial disabilities.[[3]](#endnote-3) Available information also shows the relevance of intersectionality as persons with psychosocial disabilities from racial and ethnic minorities are disproportionately impacted: mental health detention is four times higher for black British than for their white peers.[[4]](#endnote-4)
4. Societies stigmatize persons with disabilities based on their actual or perceived impairments. Stereotypes and prejudice against them result in their exclusion and discrimination in all aspects of their lives.[[5]](#endnote-5) In particular, persons with psychosocial disabilities are deemed to be prone to violence or even “dangerous” for themselves or society.[[6]](#endnote-6) This scenario is aggravated by the structural and systemic discrimination and multiple and intersecting forms of discrimination persons with disabilities face, including on the basis of age, gender, ethnic, indigenous, national or social origin, and race.[[7]](#endnote-7)
5. Law enforcement agents, if not properly trained, and like anybody else, are likely to incorporate and reproduce disability stereotypes and prejudice when performing their functions, especially street-policing. Hence, they may incur in the unlawful profiling of persons not only based on their race and ethnic, indigenous, national or social origin, but in concurrence with disability-based stereotypes. For instance, police and social services commonly rely on the criterion of “dangerousness” of persons with psychosocial disabilities to assess the need for the imposition of detention and security measures.[[8]](#endnote-8) Furthermore, law enforcement agents might not consider the accessibility requirements of persons with disabilities, including of deaf people (e.g. sign language interpretation).
6. Moreover, persons with psychosocial disabilities are typically criminalised on the basis of their so-called “atypical behaviors” in public spaces. When non-compliant behaviours mix with codes of conduct, surveillance measures, and coercive actions taken by the police, persons with psychosocial disabilities might end up being deprived of their liberty.[[9]](#endnote-9) Even worse was the tragic case of Nathaniel Julius, a 16-year-old child with intellectual disability (Down syndrome), who was killed by the South African Police in August for not answering officers’ questions. As IDA publicly stated, “this senseless killing is an example of the lack of awareness and understanding among the public, but most worryingly, among forces which serve to protect people”.[[10]](#endnote-10)
7. Communicational barriers and lack of training of law enforcements officers on their regard can lead to discrimination of persons with disabilities. For instance, deaf people are usually unable to fully access spoken languages and exclusively utilise sign languages, which are the primary means of their communication. As body language and facial expression are key in sign language, deaf persons tend to create space to ensure that others have full view of their hands, body and face. In this sense, the use of handcuffs and similar practices limit the person’s ability to communicate. Unaware officers might misunderstand these elements and feel threatened, choosing to retaliate against a deaf person.[[11]](#endnote-11) Further, the sound of deaf voices might be misinterpreted by police officers leading to mistreatments (e.g. they may think the person is under drug or alcohol influence or experiencing a psychotic episode).
8. Worrisome data and analyses confirm that persons with disabilities are particularly vulnerable when interacting with law enforcement officials, as the first daily face of the criminal system.[[12]](#endnote-12) As mentioned, media coverage studies show that from one-third to half of all persons killed by the United States police are persons with psychosocial disabilities.[[13]](#endnote-13) Apart from police brutality, persons with both physical and psychosocial disabilities in the United States are 44% more likely to be arrested by age 28, whereas their non-disabled peers have a lower 30% probability of arrest.[[14]](#endnote-14) Given communicational barriers when interacting with law enforcement officers or when placed in prisons without being provided sign language interpretation, deaf persons also remain vulnerable to mistreatments.

1. Available data also suggests that the intersection between disability and race, ethnic, indigenous or national origin, brings negative disproportionate impacts. For instance, in the United Kingdom, where the Mental Health Act allows police to detain persons who “appear” to be suffering from a “mental health disorder” and take them to special detention facilities,[[15]](#endnote-15) the Care Quality Commission reported that such detentions are over four times higher for black British than for their white peers.[[16]](#endnote-16) Additionally, Black Caribbean, African and, to a lesser extent, Asian patients are more likely to be compulsory admitted to mental health centres than white ethnic groups.[[17]](#endnote-17) Research has explained that amongst “the most common explanations for the increased risk of detainment in BAME [Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic] populations [there are] […] increased perceived risk of violence, increased police contact, absence of or mistrust of general practitioners, and ethnic disadvantages”.[[18]](#endnote-18) In regards to deaf persons, in the USA, The Helping Educate to Advance the Rights of Deaf Communities (HEARD) gathers data on cases police brutality that highlight the intersectionality with African or Latin descent.[[19]](#endnote-19) This can be illustrated by the case of Magdiel Sanchez, a deaf man who was killed in front of his Oklahoma City home by police.[[20]](#endnote-20) This shows that lack of training and competencies of agents can produce fatal consequences for deaf persons.[[21]](#endnote-21)
2. Such disadvantages faced by persons with disabilities, including on account of their race and ethnic backgrounds, contribute to explain why they are disproportionately overrepresented in prisons, institutions and mental health centres.[[22]](#endnote-22) In the United States, at least 17% of all persons living in prisons are persons with psychosocial disabilities.[[23]](#endnote-23) Moreover, persons with disabilities, particularly those with psychosocial disabilities, are overrepresented in Australia’s criminal justice system, constituting 18% of the States’ population, but almost 50% of those entering prison.[[24]](#endnote-24) According to the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, stereotyping persons with disabilities as dangerous and reactions based on fear increase the number of arbitrary detentions and violations of the right to due process, and the ratio of persons with psychosocial disabilities in prisons.[[25]](#endnote-25)
3. In addition, while data are not systematically collected around the world, some available figures suggest that great numbers of deaf people can be found in jails and prisons in the USA,[[26]](#endnote-26) where they are denied sign language interpretation and healthcare and face violence committed by State agents. Race, ethnicity and class are considered as compounding factors leading to worse rates of criminalisation and victimisation.[[27]](#endnote-27) Finally, the lack of accessible information and services and of sign language interpretation prevent deaf prisoners from reporting abuses suffered in detention.[[28]](#endnote-28)
4. **HUMAN RIGHTS STANDARDS ON DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF DISABILITY, INTERSECTIONAL DISCRIMINATION AND ON THE RIGHTS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES UNDER THE CRPD**
5. **Combatting discrimination and profiling: “disability” as prohibited ground of discrimination and awareness raising**
6. This Committee has repeatedly stressed the need to combat intersectional discrimination pertaining to race and ethnic or indigenous background, and other grounds of discrimination such as age,[[29]](#endnote-29) gender,[[30]](#endnote-30) including in connection with nationality,[[31]](#endnote-31) religion,[[32]](#endnote-32) and sexual orientation.[[33]](#endnote-33) Regarding “disability” as a ground contributing to intersectional discrimination, this Committee has stressed the lack of available information[[34]](#endnote-34) and more recently has called to “take the necessary steps to combat the multiple forms of discrimination faced by persons with disabilities, including by mainstreaming an ethnic dimension in the measures it takes to combat discrimination on the basis of disability.”[[35]](#endnote-35)
7. As the defined in the draft,[[36]](#endnote-36) racial profiling, as a discriminatory practice, covers several grounds of discrimination. This Committee also briefly acknowledges in paragraph 17 of the draft that “profiling can also be biased on the basis of sex, gender, age, or religion or other prohibited *or intersecting grounds*”. IDA believes that this draft general comment constitutes a unique opportunity to include explicitly “disability” (and “actual and perceived impairment”) to be consistent with its developments related to “intersectional discrimination” and, more importantly, to acknowledge the serious impacts that profiling, street-policing, surveillance and criminalization have on persons with disabilities, on account of their disability but also of their race and ethnic background.
8. In this vein, the CRPD Committee provides some elements that can nurture and enhance the draft and its impact on national policy making in respect to persons with disabilities. To begin with, under Articles 2 and 5 of the CRPD, “discrimination on the basis of disability” includes “the denial of reasonable accommodation”. Article 2 of the CRPD defines “reasonable accommodation” as the “necessary and appropriate modification and adjustments not imposing a disproportionate or undue burden, where needed in a particular case, to ensure to persons with disabilities the enjoyment or exercise on an equal basis with others of all human rights and fundamental freedoms.”[[37]](#endnote-37)
9. Importantly, distinguishing from “reasonable accommodation”, “*procedural* accommodation” applies in the context of access to justice (Article 13 of the CRPD) and it is not limited by the concept of disproportionality.[[38]](#endnote-38) In the context of law enforcement activity, an example of procedural accommodation would be to make available sign language interpretation in police stations for police officials to communicate with deaf persons.
10. The CRPD Committee has thoroughly elaborated on intersectional discrimination, from its perspective:

“Intersectional discrimination” occurs when a person with a disability or associated to disability suffers discrimination of any form on the basis of disability, combined with, colour, sex, language, religion, ethnic, gender or other status. Intersectional discrimination can appear as direct or indirect discrimination, denial of reasonable accommodation or harassment. […] Intersectional discrimination refers to a situation where several grounds operate and interact with each other at the same time in such a way that they are inseparable and thereby expose relevant individuals to unique types of disadvantage and discrimination.”[[39]](#endnote-39)

1. In this regards, under Article 8 of the CRPD (awareness raising), the CRPD Committee has called States to adopt awareness raising strategies “to effectively address stereotypes related to disability and stigmatization based on negative beliefs to prevent and address discrimination, including *multiple and intersectional discrimination.*”[[40]](#endnote-40) It has also identified law enforcements agents as a relevant target audience of awareness raising efforts.[[41]](#endnote-41)
2. **Participation of persons with disabilities in decision making and implementation of legislation and policies (draft GR para. 30)**
3. Article 4(3) of the CRPD requires States to ensure the close consultation and active involvement of persons with disabilities, through their representative organizations, in the development and implementation of legislation and policies to implement the Convention and on issues concerning them. The CRPD Committee has further elaborated on its general comment 7.[[42]](#endnote-42)
4. Given the tremendous impact that legislation and policies on surveillance and law enforcement’s activity have on them, the participation of persons with disabilities, especially those with psychosocial disabilities, is crucial. In this sense, paragraph 30 of the draft general recommendation should be enhanced by explicitly referring to persons with disabilities and their representative organizations. In this way, racial profiling and the intersectionality with disability could be tackled and prevented with the adequate input of persons with disabilities.
5. **Training of law enforcement agents on disability and access to justice (draft GR para. 28)**
6. Article 13 of the CRPD (Access to justice), paragraph 2, requires States to “promote appropriate training for those working in the field of administration of justice, including police and prison staff”, in order to enhance their skills and awareness to work with persons with disabilities.[[43]](#endnote-43) Any training to prevent racial profiling and intersectional discrimination by law enforcement agents should contemplate the disability perspective to support implementation of Article 13(2) of the CRPD.
7. In particular, police and prison staff should be trained on how to engage with persons with disabilities from the different constituencies, their accessibility requirements and on identifying the need to provide procedural accommodation (article 13 of the CRPD) in a particular case for the person to be able to engage during administrative procedures and interaction, e.g. sign language interpretation provided to a deaf detainee, and reasonable accommodation to ensure proper conditions of detention (article 14(2) of the CRPD). In this sense, trainings should cover the main elements of Article 9 of the CRPD on accessibility. Such trainings would allow law enforcement officers and prisons staff to perform more efficiently and clearly vis-à-vis persons with disabilities, including e.g. knowing when and how to book a sign language interpreter for deaf persons.

1. To sum up, paragraph 28 of the draft general recommendation should include explicit references to the biases and negative stereotypes faced by persons with disabilities, including from racial and ethnic minorities, and the need to train public agents to enhance their skills vis-à-vis persons with disabilities, including on general accessibility, and the provision of procedural accommodation, and reasonable accommodation in detention. In addition, it should be stated that persons with disabilities should be engaged in the development and delivery of training (in line with their right to participation referred above).
2. **Data disaggregation by disability (draft GR para. 31)**
3. Article 31 of the CRPD (Statistics and data collection) requires States “to collect appropriate information, including statistical and research data, to enable them to formulate and implement policies to give effect” to the Convention. This includes data disaggregation by disability (Article 31, paragraph 2). The CRPD Committee has systematically suggested the use of the methodology ofthe Washington Group on Disability Statistics,[[44]](#endnote-44) which proposes different tools.
4. In this vein, the required attempts to improve information systems and facilitate rigorous assessments of the activity of law enforcement agents must allow for intersectional analysis by disaggregating by disability. Only measuring disability in these contexts, disproportionate impacts can be confirmed in specific contexts and measures to correct them can be adopted.
5. **Recommendations**
6. Based on the previous considerations, IDA encourages the Committee to:
   1. Further elaborate in the text of the draft on the notions of intersectional discrimination in connection to racial profiling, in order to:
      1. Acknowledge the negative stereotypes and prejudice faced by persons with disabilities and the consequent disproportionate impact that law enforcement’s activity can have on account of their disability and their race and ethnic background;
      2. include explicitly “disability” as a forbidden ground for intersectional discrimination and as an intersecting ground for racial profiling and add references to persons with disabilities throughout the draft where appropriate.
   2. Call States to ensure the close consultation and active involvement of persons with disabilities, through their representative organisations, in the development of legislation and policies guiding the activity of law enforcement agents and seeking to prevent profiling based on race or ethnic background, and disability;
   3. Call States to ensure trainings provided to law enforcement agents, including penitentiary staff, to prevent racial profiling include an intersectional perspective addressing persons with disabilities and contribute to enhance agents’ capacities and skills to perform their functions in full respects of the rights of persons with disabilities, including on the provision of procedural accommodation (Article 13 CRPD) and reasonable accommodation in detention (Article 14.2 of the CRPD); and
   4. Call States to ensure that data collection efforts on relevant law enforcements practices (identity checks, traffic stops, etc.) include disability disaggregation in order to better assess the impact of those practices on persons with disabilities and identify and correct patterns of intersectional discrimination and profiling by law enforcement agents.
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