



Assemblée générale

Distr. générale
1^{er} février 2013
Français
Original: anglais

Conseil des droits de l'homme

Vingt-deuxième session

Point 4 de l'ordre du jour

Situations relatives aux droits de l'homme qui requièrent l'attention du Conseil

Rapport du Rapporteur spécial sur la situation des droits de l'homme en République populaire démocratique de Corée, Marzuki Darusman*

Résumé

Dans la déclaration qu'il a faite devant la Troisième Commission de l'Assemblée générale en novembre 2012, le Rapporteur spécial sur la situation des droits de l'homme en République populaire démocratique de Corée a invité les États Membres et la communauté internationale à entreprendre un examen exhaustif des nombreux rapports relatifs à la situation des droits de l'homme en République populaire démocratique de Corée qui avaient été présentés dans le cadre de son mandat ainsi que par le Secrétaire général au cours des huit années précédentes afin d'évaluer les constantes et les tendances sous-jacentes, et à envisager la création d'un mécanisme plus précis d'enquête. Le présent rapport présente un examen exhaustif des documents et des résolutions de l'ONU concernant la situation des droits de l'homme en République populaire démocratique de Corée qui se sont succédé depuis 2004.

Outre un total de 22 rapports établis depuis 2004 par le Secrétaire général et le Rapporteur spécial sur la situation des droits de l'homme en République populaire démocratique de Corée, et 16 résolutions adoptées par l'Assemblée générale et ses organes subsidiaires, le rapport vise à évaluer les documents concernant l'Examen périodique universel, les observations finales des organes de surveillance des traités de droits de l'homme et les avis adoptés par le Groupe de travail sur la détention arbitraire et le Groupe de travail sur les disparitions forcées ou involontaires dans des affaires relatives à la République populaire démocratique de Corée durant cette période. L'examen a permis de mettre en évidence neuf schémas sous-jacents de violations sur lesquels ont porté ces différents documents. Une analyse plus précise de ces schémas de violations est présentée dans l'annexe I au rapport.

* Les annexes au présent rapport sont distribuées telles qu'elles ont été reçues, dans la langue originale seulement.

Le rapport se conclut par des recommandations à l'intention de la communauté internationale, suggérant notamment quelques pistes éventuelles pour les prochaines étapes et priorités de l'action des Nations Unies concernant la situation des droits de l'homme en République populaire démocratique de Corée. Le rapport préconise l'établissement d'un mécanisme d'enquête doté de ressources suffisantes pour mener des investigations et rassembler des éléments de preuve concernant des violations graves, systématiques et généralisées des droits de l'homme en République populaire démocratique de Corée et faire rapport au Conseil des droits de l'homme et à l'Assemblée générale, en vue d'examiner la question de la responsabilité à raison de ces violations ainsi que de crimes contre l'humanité.

Table des matières

	<i>Paragraphes</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction.....	1–4	4
II. Schémas de violations mis en évidence par l’Organisation des Nations Unies	5–7	5
III. Évaluation par l’Organisation des Nations Unies des violations des droits de l’homme en République populaire démocratique de Corée	8–16	6
IV. Impunité et non-coopération avec les Nations Unies	17–30	8
V. Conclusions et recommandations.....	31–32	12
Annexes		
I. Analysis of patterns of human rights violations in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, documented by the United Nations through its reports and resolutions since 2004.....		14
A. Violation of the right to food.....		14
B. Torture and inhuman treatment		17
C. Arbitrary detention		19
D. Prison camps		21
E. Discrimination		24
F. Violations of freedom of expression		27
G. Violations of the right to life		29
H. Violations of freedom of movement		30
I. Enforced disappearances, including abduction of foreign nationals		32
II. List of United Nations documents reviewed		35

I. Introduction

1. Le mandat du Rapporteur spécial sur la situation des droits de l'homme en République populaire démocratique de Corée a été établi par la Commission des droits de l'homme en 2004 par sa résolution 2004/13 et prorogé chaque année depuis lors. En application de cette résolution et des résolutions adoptées ultérieurement par l'Assemblée générale, le Rapporteur spécial soumet chaque année deux rapports, l'un au Conseil des droits de l'homme, et l'autre à l'Assemblée générale. Dans le dernier rapport qu'il a soumis à l'Assemblée générale (A/67/370), le Rapporteur spécial a présenté une vue d'ensemble de la situation des droits de l'homme en République populaire démocratique de Corée et des problèmes touchant aux droits de l'homme, comme les graves restrictions imposées à la liberté d'opinion et d'expression, la situation économique et ses incidences sur les droits économiques, sociaux et culturels, la question de la protection des demandeurs d'asile en provenance de la République populaire démocratique de Corée, et la traite. Le 2 novembre 2012, dans la déclaration qu'il a faite devant la Troisième Commission de l'Assemblée générale, le Rapporteur spécial a également souligné qu'il restait préoccupé par la question de l'enlèvement de ressortissants étrangers et japonais, en regrettant l'absence de toute évolution dans ce domaine.

2. Dans cette déclaration, le Rapporteur spécial a invité les États Membres et la communauté internationale à entreprendre un examen exhaustif des nombreux rapports relatifs à la situation des droits de l'homme en République populaire démocratique de Corée qui avaient été présentés au fil des années par le titulaire de son mandat et le Secrétaire général, afin d'évaluer les constantes et les tendances sous-jacentes, et à envisager la création d'un mécanisme plus précis d'enquête. Le présent rapport présente un examen exhaustif des documents et des résolutions de l'ONU concernant la situation des droits de l'homme en République populaire démocratique de Corée qui se sont succédé depuis 2004. Le rapport vise à évaluer dans quelle mesure les entités des Nations Unies ont pu étayer les violations des droits de l'homme commises en République populaire démocratique de Corée depuis le début du mandat du Rapporteur spécial en 2004¹. Le rapport propose quelques pistes éventuelles pour les prochaines étapes et priorités de l'action des Nations Unies concernant les droits de l'homme dans le pays.

3. L'examen a porté sur pas moins de 60 documents relatifs aux droits de l'homme, dont des rapports du Secrétaire général à l'Assemblée générale; des rapports du Rapporteur spécial à l'Assemblée générale et au Conseil des droits de l'homme et auparavant à la Commission des droits de l'homme; des résolutions adoptées par ces organes intergouvernementaux; différents rapports concernant l'Examen périodique universel de la République populaire démocratique de Corée par le Conseil des droits de l'homme; des observations finales et des rapports de l'État aux différents organes conventionnels, à savoir le Comité des droits de l'homme, le Comité des droits économiques, sociaux et culturels, le Comité pour l'élimination de la discrimination à l'égard des femmes et le Comité des droits de l'enfant; et des documents relatifs à des affaires dont se sont saisis les titulaires de mandat au titre des procédures spéciales du Conseil des droits de l'homme

¹ Vitit Muntarbhorn a exercé le mandat de Rapporteur spécial sur la situation des droits de l'homme en République populaire démocratique de Corée pendant six ans à partir du 15 juin 2004. Marzuki Darusman a repris le mandat de Rapporteur spécial à compter du 1^{er} août 2010. Pour des considérations pratiques, le présent rapport emploie le terme «Rapporteur spécial» pour désigner les deux titulaires du mandat, sans faire de distinction entre eux. Cependant, par souci d'exactitude, le rapport indique la cote du document ou l'année au cours de laquelle les observations ont été formulées par le Rapporteur spécial afin de permettre au lecteur de déterminer à quel titulaire de mandat les informations doivent être attribuées.

comme le Groupe de travail sur la détention arbitraire et le Groupe de travail sur les disparitions forcées ou involontaires, sur la situation des droits de l'homme en République populaire démocratique de Corée².

4. Une analyse plus précise des schémas de violations des droits de l'homme mis en évidence par les rapports et résolutions de l'ONU depuis 2004 est présentée dans l'annexe I.

II. Schémas de violations mis en évidence par l'Organisation des Nations Unies

5. L'Assemblée générale et ses organes subsidiaires ont adopté 16 résolutions depuis 2003³. Au total, 22 rapports ont été présentés aux États Membres de l'ONU par le Secrétaire général et le Rapporteur spécial depuis 2004. Ces documents font ressortir la durée et l'ampleur des violations graves et systématiques des droits de l'homme dans toute la République populaire démocratique de Corée, ainsi que la prise de conscience de la situation par l'Organisation des Nations Unies et ses États Membres.

6. Une analyse de ces documents permet de mettre en évidence neuf aspects ou schémas essentiels interdépendants de violations des droits de l'homme sur lesquels l'ONU a principalement porté son attention, à savoir:

a) Des violations du droit à l'alimentation, en particulier les conséquences sur l'état nutritionnel et la santé de la population des politiques de distribution des denrées alimentaires contrôlées par l'État et les restrictions d'accès imposées à l'aide humanitaire internationale pour remédier à la crise alimentaire endémique;

b) La torture et autres peines ou traitements cruels, inhumains ou dégradants, y compris des conditions inhumaines de détention;

c) La détention arbitraire, constituant une forme de persécution, et l'incrimination de tout comportement censé menacer ou être contraire à l'idéologie officielle du Gouvernement, l'inexistence d'un état de droit et l'absence de garanties d'une procédure régulière et d'indépendance de l'appareil judiciaire;

d) Des violations des droits de l'homme liées aux camps pénitentiaires;

e) La discrimination et les effets disproportionnés ou spécifiques des violations des droits de l'homme sur les groupes vulnérables, en particulier les femmes, les enfants, les personnes handicapées et les rapatriés. Une source particulière d'inquiétude tient au fait que la société est divisée en trois catégories distinctes définies en fonction de l'allégeance politique au Gouvernement et que la place qu'occupe une personne dans cette hiérarchie détermine son degré d'accès aux droits humains fondamentaux, dont l'accès à la nourriture, à la santé et à l'éducation, et la liberté de circulation;

f) Des violations importantes de la liberté d'expression et des autres libertés connexes;

g) Des violations du droit à la vie, en particulier l'application abusive de la peine de mort et le recours aux exécutions publiques;

² L'examen n'a pas inclus les rapports des bureaux et institutions spécialisées des Nations Unies, comme le Bureau de la coordination des affaires humanitaires (BCAH), le Programme alimentaire mondial (PAM) et l'Organisation des Nations Unies pour l'alimentation et l'agriculture (FAO), entre autres.

³ Il s'agit de trois résolutions de la Commission des droits de l'homme adoptées entre 2003 et 2005, de cinq résolutions du Conseil des droits de l'homme adoptées depuis 2008 et de huit résolutions de l'Assemblée générale adoptées depuis 2006.

- h) Les restrictions à la liberté de circulation et les mauvais traitements infligés aux citoyens rapatriés de force;
- i) Les disparitions forcées, y compris les enlèvements de ressortissants étrangers.

7. Ces neuf domaines, mis en évidence par l'examen des questions à propos desquelles l'ONU a exprimé les plus vives préoccupations, dénotent l'existence d'un ensemble systématique et généralisé de violations. Une présentation exhaustive des éléments étayant ces neuf schémas de violations figure en annexe I au présent rapport. Les dossiers constitués sur chacune de ces violations sont de taille inégale, vu la difficulté d'obtenir des informations en raison de l'absence d'observateurs et de médias indépendants dans le pays, des restrictions touchant les citoyens quittant le pays, et du refus du Gouvernement de la République populaire démocratique de Corée de donner accès aux mécanismes de protection des droits de l'homme de l'ONU ou de coopérer autrement avec eux. Par crainte des représailles, notamment contre les membres de la famille restés dans le pays, il est par ailleurs difficile aux victimes individuelles de se faire connaître ou de consentir à la publication de certains détails. Il n'en reste pas moins que les renseignements réguliers, crédibles et cohérents qui ont été reçus – et les schémas de violations qu'ils font apparaître – mettent en évidence la nécessité d'un mécanisme d'enquête plus systématique, plus exhaustif et mieux doté en ressources que ce n'est le cas de l'actuel Rapporteur spécial, appuyé dans l'exercice de son mandat par le Haut-Commissariat aux droits de l'homme. Un mécanisme d'enquête pourrait dresser un tableau plus complet des violations, les quantifier et les qualifier au sens du droit international, en attribuer la responsabilité à tel ou tel acteur ou auteur et proposer des voies d'action efficaces au niveau international.

III. Évaluation par l'Organisation des Nations Unies des violations des droits de l'homme en République populaire démocratique de Corée

8. Nombre des violations commises en République populaire démocratique de Corée ont été qualifiées par l'ONU de violations graves, systématiques et généralisées des droits de l'homme.

9. Dans les résolutions relatives à la République populaire démocratique de Corée qu'elle a adoptées entre 2006 et 2012, l'Assemblée générale s'est déclarée plusieurs fois très profondément préoccupée par la persistance d'informations faisant état de violations graves, systématiques et généralisées des droits civils, politiques, économiques, sociaux et culturels en République populaire démocratique de Corée, notamment la pratique de la torture, les exécutions publiques, les détentions arbitraires, l'absence de procédures régulières et d'état de droit, l'imposition de la peine capitale pour des motifs politiques et religieux, les peines collectives et l'existence d'un grand nombre de camps pénitentiaires et le recours très fréquent au travail forcé. À partir de 2008, l'Assemblée générale a durci son approche et exprimé de très graves inquiétudes à propos de ces violations.

10. Dans ses résolutions, l'Assemblée générale a également exprimé ses très graves préoccupations concernant les violations des droits économiques, sociaux et culturels ayant entraîné de graves malnutritions et d'autres problèmes sanitaires, ainsi que des restrictions à la liberté de circulation, présentant un caractère systématique et généralisé. De plus, l'Assemblée générale a dénoncé les violations touchant des groupes vulnérables, en particulier les femmes, les enfants, les personnes handicapées et les citoyens rapatriés en République populaire démocratique de Corée. La Commission des droits de l'homme a également fait état de ces mêmes préoccupations dans les résolutions qu'elle a adoptées à partir de 2004⁴.

⁴ Résolutions 2004/13 et 2005/11 de la Commission des droits de l'homme.

11. Depuis 2009, le Conseil des droits de l'homme déplore les violations graves, systématiques et généralisées des droits de l'homme en République populaire démocratique de Corée, en particulier l'utilisation de la torture contre les prisonniers politiques et les citoyens rapatriés et leur placement en camp de travail. En 2012, le Conseil des droits de l'homme est allé plus loin en se déclarant profondément préoccupé par la «détérioration persistante» de la situation des droits de l'homme dans le pays⁵.

12. En 2012, pour la première fois depuis le début du mandat du Rapporteur spécial, la résolution du Conseil des droits de l'homme sur la République populaire démocratique de Corée a été adoptée sans être mise aux voix, ce qui témoigne du nombre écrasant et en augmentation constante des pays préoccupés par la situation des droits de l'homme dans le pays⁶. Pour la première fois également, le 20 décembre 2012, l'Assemblée générale a adopté sans la mettre aux voix sa résolution concernant la République populaire démocratique de Corée, constatant avec une vive inquiétude que la situation des droits de l'homme en République populaire démocratique de Corée continuait de se dégrader considérablement malgré la succession à la tête de l'État⁷.

13. Les deux Rapporteurs spéciaux qui ont été titulaires de ce mandat ont constaté le caractère systématique des violations infligées à la population de la République populaire démocratique de Corée. En 2012, dans le rapport qu'il a présenté à l'Assemblée générale, le Rapporteur spécial s'est dit «déconcerté par la récente déclaration de Kim Jong Un selon laquelle ses première, deuxième et troisième priorités étaient de renforcer l'armée» et a noté qu'une «croissance économique lente conjuguée à une politique privilégiant les intérêts militaires seront préjudiciables au bien-être du peuple de la République populaire démocratique de Corée»⁸. Le précédent Rapporteur spécial avait exprimé des inquiétudes analogues. En 2005, il avait souligné que le «caractère antidémocratique du pouvoir en République populaire démocratique de Corée gêne considérablement la jouissance des droits de l'homme, et le caractère centralisé des autorités nationales, qui s'emploient à garantir la survie du régime au sommet sous le couvert de droits prétendument "collectifs" et de souveraineté nationale, s'oppose au respect des droits de l'homme⁹». Il notait en 2010: «On peut qualifier la situation des droits de l'homme dans ce pays [la République populaire démocratique de Corée] de spéciale, étant donné les particularités et anomalies qu'on y constate en abondance. Pour dire les choses simplement, il y a de nombreux cas de violation des droits de l'homme qui sont à la fois terrifiants et traumatisants¹⁰.».

14. Les deux Rapporteurs spéciaux ont également soulevé la question de savoir si des crimes contre l'humanité sont commis en République populaire démocratique de Corée. En 2007, le Rapporteur spécial avait signalé une étude dont les auteurs affirmaient que «la conduite des autorités équivaut à un crime contre l'humanité puisqu'elle est intentionnelle et qu'elle consiste en attaques généralisées ou systématiques contre la population civile¹¹». Il avait en outre soulevé la question de savoir si, au-delà de la responsabilité de l'État, une responsabilité pénale individuelle était «susceptible de découler de la perpétration de crimes

⁵ Résolution 19/13 du Conseil des droits de l'homme.

⁶ En 2008, la résolution 7/15 du Conseil des droits de l'homme a été adoptée par 22 voix contre 7, avec 18 absentions; en 2009, la résolution 10/16 a été adoptée par 26 voix contre 6, avec 15 absentions; en 2010, la résolution 13/14 a été adoptée par 28 voix contre 5, avec 13 absentions; en 2011, la résolution 16/8 a été adoptée par 30 voix contre 3, avec 11 absentions.

⁷ Résolution 67/181 de l'Assemblée générale.

⁸ A/67/370, par. 50.

⁹ A/60/306, par. 9.

¹⁰ A/HRC/13/47, par. 86.

¹¹ A/HRC/4/15, par. 40, signalant une étude intitulée «Failure to Protect: A Call for the UN Security Council to Act in North Korea», United States Committee for Human Rights in North Korea, Washington, 2006.

contre l'humanité¹²». En 2008, le Rapporteur spécial affirmait: «Il peut être également envisagé de se mobiliser pour invoquer la responsabilité pénale individuelle en tirant parti de l'existence de la Cour pénale internationale lorsque le système local ne peut ou ne veut intervenir pour demander des comptes aux responsables de crimes graves¹³». Le Rapporteur spécial concluait: «Si beaucoup dépendra de la volonté politique mondiale et locale de vérifier l'authenticité du désir de transparence et de responsabilisation ..., il importe de souligner le caractère persistant et systématique des atteintes aux droits de l'homme dans le pays, qui sont en outre flagrantes et substantielles et dont la progression est exponentielle¹⁴».

15. En 2010, le Rapporteur spécial a souligné que la «catégorie de crimes internationaux qui semblerait être le plus étroitement liée à ce qui se passe dans ce pays est celle des “crimes contre l'humanité”¹⁵», et noté: «Il est clair, au terme de six ans d'observation de la situation des droits de l'homme en République populaire démocratique de Corée, que les pratiques abusives à l'encontre d'une population dont le pouvoir devrait être responsable sont à la fois effroyables et endémiques¹⁶».

16. En 2012, le Rapporteur spécial a fait observer que, «dans certaines circonstances, l'emprisonnement généralisé ou systématique ou encore toute autre privation sévère de liberté, contraire au droit international, peu[ven]t constituer des crimes contre l'humanité¹⁷».

IV. Impunité et non-coopération avec les Nations Unies

17. Depuis près de dix ans, l'Assemblée générale, le Secrétaire général, la Commission des droits de l'homme puis le Conseil des droits de l'homme, le Rapporteur spécial et les organes de surveillance des traités de droits de l'homme demandent sans relâche aux autorités de la République populaire démocratique de Corée de mettre un terme à ces violations et de respecter les droits de l'homme de tous ses citoyens. En 2009, le Secrétaire général a constaté que le Gouvernement de la République populaire démocratique de Corée n'avait pas pris de «mesures notables pour protéger les droits de l'homme et mettre fin aux violations qui se produiraient de manière systématique et généralisée¹⁸».

18. La nécessité d'obliger les responsables à rendre des comptes a été réaffirmée et avancée dans des résolutions adoptées par les Nations Unies, en particulier les résolutions de l'Assemblée générale. Depuis 2009, l'Assemblée générale engage vivement «le Gouvernement ... à s'attaquer au problème de l'impunité et à veiller à ce que les auteurs de violations des droits de l'homme soient traduits en justice devant des tribunaux indépendants¹⁹».

19. Les inquiétudes au sujet de l'impunité ont été aggravées par la coopération intermittente qu'entretient le Gouvernement de la République populaire démocratique de Corée avec les mécanismes de droits de l'homme des Nations Unies. Un exemple notable est constitué par le fait que le 23 août 1997, le Gouvernement de la République populaire démocratique de Corée a adressé au Secrétaire général une notification de retrait du Pacte international relatif aux droits civils et politiques auquel le pays avait adhéré le

¹² A/HRC/4/15, par. 41.

¹³ A/HRC/7/20, par. 45.

¹⁴ A/HRC/7/20, par. 48.

¹⁵ A/HRC/13/47, par. 60.

¹⁶ A/HRC/13/47, par. 8.

¹⁷ A/67/370, par. 38.

¹⁸ A/64/319, par. 4.

¹⁹ Résolutions 63/190, 64/175 et 66/174 de l'Assemblée générale.

14 septembre 1981²⁰. Le 23 septembre 1997, le Secrétaire général des Nations Unies a adressé un aide-mémoire au Gouvernement de la République populaire démocratique de Corée dans lequel il exprimait l'avis que le retrait du Pacte semblait impossible à moins que tous les États parties y consentent²¹. Le 8 décembre 1997, le Comité des droits de l'homme a adopté l'Observation générale n° 26 sur la continuité des obligations souscrites en vertu du Pacte international relatif aux droits civils et politiques. Le Comité est fermement convaincu que le droit international n'autorise pas un État qui a ratifié le Pacte, qui y a adhéré ou qui a succédé à un État lié par le Pacte à le dénoncer ou à s'en retirer²². En définitive, le 25 décembre 1999, la République populaire démocratique de Corée a soumis au Comité des droits de l'homme son deuxième rapport périodique²³ couvrant en principe la période allant de 1984 à 1997, qui a été examiné par le Comité en juillet 2001²⁴.

20. D'autre part, le Gouvernement de la République populaire démocratique de Corée a refusé de reconnaître le Rapporteur spécial ou de coopérer avec lui et a de même constamment et catégoriquement rejeté les résolutions adoptées par la Commission des droits de l'homme, le Conseil des droits de l'homme et l'Assemblée générale sur la situation des droits de l'homme dans le pays, depuis la création du mandat du Rapporteur spécial en 2004. Dernièrement, le 20 décembre 2012, lors de l'Assemblée générale, le représentant de la République populaire démocratique de Corée aurait déclaré, entre autres, que son gouvernement avait catégoriquement rejeté la résolution sur la situation des droits de l'homme en République populaire démocratique de Corée, qui n'avait rien à voir avec l'état des droits de l'homme dans le pays, les violations mentionnées dans le texte n'existant pas. Il aurait aussi déclaré que le texte était de toute évidence un instrument de propagande visant à présenter une situation des droits de l'homme fabriquée de toutes pièces et à faire pression sur le système social du pays, ce qui constituait une ingérence dans ses affaires intérieures. C'était là un acte de terrorisme politique révélateur d'un système de deux poids deux mesures, alors que toute considération relative aux droits de l'homme devait être guidée par les principes d'objectivité dans le cadre de l'Examen périodique universel. Les principaux auteurs de la résolution avaient choisi la question des droits de l'homme pour tenter de déstabiliser le pays. La résolution avait certes été adoptée sans être mise aux voix mais cela ne pouvait pas être interprété comme une adoption par consensus²⁵.

21. De même, depuis 2003, le Gouvernement de la République populaire démocratique de Corée rejette toutes les offres d'assistance technique qui lui sont proposées par le Haut-Commissariat des Nations Unies aux droits de l'homme (HCDH)²⁶.

²⁰ Nations Unies, Collection des traités, voir http://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetails.aspx?src=TREATY&mtmsg_no=IV-4&chapter=4&lang=fr&clang=fr.

²¹ La notification de retrait et l'aide-mémoire ont été dûment diffusés aux États parties sous couverture de la notification dépositaire C.N.467.1997.TREATIES-10 du 12 novembre 1997.

²² CCPR/C/21/Rev.1/Add.8/Rev.1: Observation générale n° 26 sur les questions touchant la continuité des obligations, adoptée à la soixante et unième session du Comité des droits de l'homme, le 8 décembre 1997.

²³ CCPR/C/PRK/2000/2, par. 2.

²⁴ CCPR/CO/72/PRK, par. 1.

²⁵ A/67/PV.60; voir communiqué de presse à l'adresse: <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2012/ga11331.doc.htm>. Voir aussi les comptes rendus analytiques de la Troisième Commission, par exemple, A/C.3/67/SR/38; A/C.3/67/SR/45; et A/C.3/67/SR/46. Voir aussi les notes verbales adressées au Président du Conseil des droits de l'homme par la Mission permanente de la République populaire démocratique de Corée (A/HRC/19/G/1; A/HRC/16/G/2; A/HRC/13/G/7; A/HRC/10/G/6; A/HRC/7/G/3 et A/HRC/5/G/5).

²⁶ Voir par exemple E/CN.4/2005/G/13: lettre en date du 28 février 2005 adressée à la Haut-Commissaire des Nations Unies aux droits de l'homme par le Représentant permanent de la République populaire démocratique de Corée, rejetant toute offre de coopération technique.

22. De plus, en décembre 2009, lors de l'adoption du rapport établi à l'issue de l'Examen périodique universel (EPU) concernant la République populaire démocratique de Corée²⁷, le Gouvernement a refusé d'indiquer quelles étaient les recommandations auxquelles il souscrivait. C'était le premier État qui n'acceptait aucune des recommandations (167) qui avaient été formulées. La délégation a rejeté 50 recommandations figurant dans le rapport du Groupe de travail et ne s'est pas prononcée sur 117 autres. C'est pourquoi, le 21 décembre 2010, l'Assemblée générale s'est déclarée très profondément préoccupée par le fait que «le Gouvernement de la République populaire démocratique de Corée refuse de préciser quelles recommandations il a acceptées à l'issue de l'Examen périodique universel effectué par le Conseil des droits de l'homme, et regrette qu'il n'ait pris aucune mesure à ce jour pour appliquer les recommandations contenues dans le document final²⁸».

23. En 2008, le Rapporteur spécial a fait observer: «Il incombe aux autorités nationales et à la communauté internationale de s'attaquer au problème de l'impunité qui permet que de telles violations existent et ... persistent depuis longtemps²⁹». En 2010, il a expressément relevé que puisque «les pouvoirs publics nationaux ne peuvent pas ou ne veulent pas [amener les autorités constituées à rendre des comptes au niveau international]³⁰», la communauté internationale pourrait le faire, que ce soit au titre de la responsabilité de l'État et/ou de la responsabilité pénale individuelle. En 2011, le Rapporteur spécial a relaté ce qui suit: «La Cour pénale internationale a commencé à examiner si le naufrage du *Cheonan*, un navire de guerre de la République de Corée coulé par une torpille qui aurait été tirée d'un sous-marin de la République populaire démocratique de Corée le 26 mars 2010, provoquant le décès de 46 personnes, et le bombardement de l'île de Yeonpyeong le 23 novembre 2010, qui a provoqué la mort de deux civils et en a blessé de nombreux autres, constitueraient des crimes de guerre relevant de sa compétence. L'examen par la Cour de ces deux incidents soulève le problème de la responsabilité pour d'autres crimes qu'aurait commis la République populaire démocratique de Corée, notamment la question des enlèvements³¹».

24. Parmi les solutions envisageables pour régler la question de l'impunité et de la responsabilité, le Rapporteur spécial a demandé en 2010 «dans quelle mesure la Cour pénale internationale peut être saisie en l'occurrence, au titre de la responsabilité pénale individuelle, alors que le pays en question n'est pas partie au Statut de Rome de la Cour pénale internationale³²». En 2010, le Rapporteur spécial a fait également observer à ce sujet que «le Conseil de sécurité peut se saisir directement de l'affaire et créer une commission d'enquête sur les crimes contre l'humanité³³». Il a également invité la communauté internationale à «s'attaquer à la question de l'impunité sous différents angles, en visant la responsabilité de l'État et/ou les responsabilités pénales individuelles et permettre à l'ensemble du système des Nations Unies, en particulier au Conseil de sécurité et aux organismes apparentés, comme la Cour pénale internationale, d'adopter des mesures pour prévenir les violations graves, protéger la population contre l'oppression et offrir des voies de recours efficaces aux victimes³⁴».

²⁷ A/HRC/13/13, rapport du Groupe de travail sur l'Examen périodique universel: République populaire démocratique de Corée.

²⁸ Résolution 65/225 de l'Assemblée générale, par. 1 c).

²⁹ A/HRC/7/20, par. 43.

³⁰ A/HRC/13/47, par. 58.

³¹ A/HRC/16/58, par. 14. Voir aussi le rapport de la Cour pénale internationale sur les activités menées en 2012 par le Bureau du Procureur en matière d'examen préliminaire, par. 64 à 74 (<http://www.icc-cpi.int/NR/rdonlyres/C433C462-7C4E-4358-8A72-8D99FD00E8CD/285209/OTP2012ReportonPreliminaryExaminationsFRA22Nov2012.pdf>).

³² A/HRC/13/47, par. 59.

³³ A/HRC/13/47, par. 58.

³⁴ A/HRC/13/47, par. 89 e).

25. Le Rapporteur spécial est d'avis que sur les neuf schémas de violation mis en évidence dans le présent rapport, un grand nombre, sinon la totalité, peuvent constituer des crimes contre l'humanité, commis dans le cadre d'une attaque généralisée ou systématique lancée contre une population civile, tels qu'ils sont définis au paragraphe 1 de l'article 7 du Statut de Rome de la Cour pénale internationale, en particulier, aux alinéas: *a* meurtre; *c* réduction en esclavage; *e* emprisonnement ou autre forme de privation grave de liberté physique en violation des dispositions fondamentales du droit international; *f* torture; *h* persécution de tout groupe ou de toute collectivité identifiable pour des motifs d'ordre politique ou religieux; *i* disparitions forcées de personnes; et *k* autres actes inhumains de caractère analogue causant intentionnellement de grandes souffrances ou des atteintes graves à l'intégrité physique ou à la santé physique ou mentale.

26. Le droit de ne pas être soumis à la torture est un droit non susceptible de dérogation en vertu de l'article 7 du Pacte international relatif aux droits civils et politiques auquel la République populaire démocratique de Corée est un État partie.

27. De même, le droit international impératif met la disparition forcée sur le même plan, juridiquement, que la torture. Le Rapporteur spécial relève que dès lors que la disparition forcée peut être constitutive de plusieurs violations de différents droits de l'homme comme la liberté de circulation, la liberté et la sécurité de la personne, le droit de ne pas subir la torture ou des traitements cruels, inhumains ou dégradants, voire même le droit à la vie, un tel fait est contraire à plusieurs dispositions du Pacte international relatif aux droits civils et politiques. Il note aussi que les disparitions forcées, résultant notamment de l'enlèvement de ressortissants étrangers comme des citoyens de la République de Corée ou du Japon par les agents de la République populaire démocratique de Corée, peuvent constituer des crimes contre l'humanité au sens des paragraphes 1 i) et 2) i) de l'article 7 du Statut de Rome dans la mesure où elles s'inscrivent dans le cadre d'une attaque généralisée ou systématique lancée contre une population civile. À cet égard, il convient de souligner que les disparitions forcées (qu'elles constituent ou non des crimes contre l'humanité) sont des faits continus qui se poursuivent tant que le sort de la victime n'est pas connu et que pour ce seul motif, de tels faits ne sont déjà pas susceptibles de prescription.

28. Le Rapporteur spécial est d'avis que les graves violations des droits de l'homme commises dans les camps pénitentiaires, voire la simple existence de ces camps, où les prisonniers politiques sont détenus dans des conditions analogues à l'esclavage, peuvent constituer des crimes contre l'humanité au sens du paragraphe 1 de l'article 7 du Statut de Rome, dans ses alinéas *c* réduction en esclavage, et *e* emprisonnement ou autre forme de privation grave de liberté physique en violation des dispositions fondamentales du droit international. Il note aussi que le régime et le traitement particulièrement inhumains auxquels le Gouvernement soumet de manière intentionnelle les prisonniers politiques dans les camps pénitentiaires pourraient constituer des crimes contre l'humanité, y compris sur la base de toutes les définitions citées au paragraphe 25 ci-dessus.

29. Le 3 avril 2012, une coalition regroupant une quarantaine d'organisations non gouvernementales internationales dénommée, International Coalition to Stop Crimes Against Humanity in North Korea (ICNK)³⁵, a soumis une pétition³⁶ aux titulaires de mandat au titre des procédures spéciales du Conseil des droits de l'homme à propos de la détention de prisonniers politiques dans des camps de travail et des violations systématiques des droits de l'homme commises dans ces camps pénitentiaires. Ces violations ont été amplement exposées dans un mémorandum «The situation of detainees in Gulag System (*Kwan-li-so*) of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea». La coalition a notamment recommandé que la communauté internationale prenne des

³⁵ Voir http://www.stopnocrimes.org/about_01.php.

³⁶ Voir <http://www.fidh.org/The-International-Coalition-to->

mesures efficaces en vue de remédier aux souffrances de 150 000 à 200 000 personnes emprisonnées dans ces camps, et que l'ONU, agissant par l'intermédiaire de l'Assemblée générale ou du Conseil des droits de l'homme, crée une commission d'enquête sur les crimes contre l'humanité commis en République populaire démocratique de Corée en vue d'obliger l'État et les auteurs individuels de ces crimes à en répondre. En se fondant sur cette pétition, le 3 octobre 2012, cinq titulaires de mandat, à savoir le Rapporteur spécial sur la situation des droits de l'homme en République populaire démocratique de Corée, le Rapporteur spécial sur les exécutions extrajudiciaires, sommaires ou arbitraires, le Rapporteur spécial sur la torture et autres peines ou traitements cruels, inhumains ou dégradants, le Groupe de travail sur la détention arbitraire et le Groupe de travail sur les disparitions forcées ou involontaires, ont envoyé une lettre d'allégation conjointe au Gouvernement de la République populaire démocratique de Corée à propos des informations faisant état du placement des prisonniers politiques dans des camps de travail. Au moment de la rédaction du présent rapport, les titulaires de mandat n'avaient reçu aucune réponse du Gouvernement.

30. Le Rapporteur spécial est d'avis que, conformément à l'engagement qu'elle a pris lors du Sommet mondial de 2005, il incombe à la communauté internationale, dans le cadre de l'Organisation des Nations Unies, de mettre en œuvre des moyens pacifiques appropriés afin d'aider à protéger des crimes contre l'humanité la population de la République populaire démocratique de Corée³⁷. À titre de mesure minimale, et conformément à la pratique nouvellement adoptée à l'égard de la situation d'autres pays où de graves violations sont commises de manière systématique ou généralisée, le Rapporteur spécial considère qu'il incombe à la communauté internationale de faire procéder à une enquête internationale indépendante et impartiale lorsqu'il y a des motifs de croire que des crimes contre l'humanité sont commis et que le pays concerné ne diligente pas lui-même d'enquêtes indépendantes et impartiales efficaces. S'il est vrai que cela n'est habituellement pas suffisant, en soi, pour mettre fin à des crimes contre l'humanité, il reste qu'une surveillance accrue par le biais d'une enquête internationale offre une mesure de protection, en particulier lorsque s'y ajoute la perspective de futures enquêtes pénales, avec l'effet dissuasif qu'une telle perspective peut avoir sur les auteurs individuels de tels crimes.

V. Conclusions et recommandations

31. **L'examen des documents de l'ONU relatifs à la situation des droits de l'homme en République populaire démocratique de Corée qui ont été élaborés depuis 2004 fait ressortir la nécessité d'instituer un mécanisme d'enquête doté de ressources suffisantes pour enquêter et rassembler davantage d'éléments de preuve sur les violations graves, systématiques et généralisées des droits de l'homme en République populaire démocratique de Corée et faire rapport au Conseil des droits de l'homme et à l'Assemblée générale. L'enquête devrait porter sur les questions touchant à la responsabilité institutionnelle et individuelle pour ces violations, en particulier lorsqu'elles constituent des crimes contre l'humanité, et conduire à la formulation de recommandations appropriées aux autorités de la République populaire démocratique de Corée et à la communauté internationale sur les mesures à prendre. L'enquête comporterait les éléments suivants:**

a) **Une analyse plus précise des violations graves, généralisées et systématiques des droits de l'homme en République populaire démocratique de Corée mises en évidence dans le présent rapport, par la collecte et la vérification de témoignages de victimes et les récits de survivants, de témoins et d'auteurs de telles violations;**

³⁷ Résolution 60/1 de l'Assemblée générale, par. 139.

b) Des recherches plus précises sur les violations les plus graves des droits de l'homme commises en République populaire démocratique de Corée, notamment la pratique généralisée et systématique de la torture et de la détention arbitraire et l'ensemble des violations commises dans les camps pénitentiaires, ainsi que l'enlèvement de ressortissants étrangers;

c) Un examen plus attentif de la question de la discrimination dans le déni et la violation systématiques des libertés et droits humains fondamentaux, s'agissant notamment de l'accès à la nourriture, des restrictions à la liberté de circulation et à la liberté d'expression, des arrestations arbitraires et de la torture;

d) Un examen précis et une analyse juridique de la question de savoir si des crimes contre l'humanité sont perpétrés en République populaire démocratique de Corée, ainsi que des crimes contre des ressortissants étrangers victimes, par exemple, d'enlèvements;

e) Un examen plus attentif de la question de la responsabilité au sein de la République populaire démocratique de Corée, compte tenu du problème de l'impunité généralisée et de la non-coopération du Gouvernement, depuis près d'une décennie, avec les mécanismes des droits de l'homme de l'ONU.

32. Le Rapporteur spécial réitère aussi toutes les recommandations qu'il a déjà formulées à l'intention du Gouvernement de la République populaire démocratique de Corée dans les rapports qu'il a présentés au Conseil des droits de l'homme et à l'Assemblée générale.

Annexes

Annexe I

[Anglais seulement]

Analysis of patterns of human rights violations in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, documented by the United Nations through its reports and resolutions since 2004

A. Violation of the right to food

1. The right to food in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is the human rights issue that has been extensively documented by the United Nations. The question of access to food, food distribution and humanitarian food assistance is dealt with in all resolutions of the Human Rights Council and the General Assembly and all reports by the Special Rapporteur and the Secretary-General.

2. The Secretary-General has consistently highlighted his particular concern about the severity of the food situation the country is facing and its impact on the economic, social and cultural rights of the population.¹ A number of actors within the United Nations system have highlighted that even if the food shortage was caused by natural disasters, the root causes are due to the mismanagement on the part of the authorities. The Special Rapporteur noted, "Even where there are natural disasters afflicting the general population, the root causes are often man-made, and it is the regime in power which shares responsibility for this."² The Human Rights Council has expressed deep concern "at the continuing reports of systematic, widespread and grave violations of...economic, social and cultural rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea."³

3. The Special Rapporteur stressed that the issue is not simply lack of food for the population, but rather the **manipulative control of food distribution by the regime**. He noted, "The authorities seek to control the food distribution process as a means of controlling the population and making them dependent on the regime."⁴

4. In 2002, the Government took various measures to open the door to quasi-market activities (the new Economics Management Improvement Measures Policy), thus enabling the population to engage in the market system at a limited level, to produce, buy and sell their goods. The public distribution system (PDS) was seen as non-functional, and people were given additional wages to fend for themselves. In 2005, for fear of losing their grip on the population, the authorities started to impose the PDS again on the population and to prohibit market activities, despite the fact that the system was unable to respond effectively to the needs of the population.⁵

¹ A/63/332, para 6

² A/64/224, para 66

³ A/HRC/RES/7/15

⁴ A/64/224, para 66

⁵ A/64/224, para 16

5. Economic activities, particularly by women, were severely curtailed in the period of 2007-2008, when the authorities prohibited women under 40 years of age from trading; the age was subsequently raised to 49.⁶

6. In 2008, it was reported that army personnel were forcing farmers to provide them with food, to the detriment of the latter's livelihood. The authorities were also reportedly subjecting markets to greater scrutiny and punishing traders in the pursuit of State control over the population.⁷

7. At the end of 2008, the authorities planned to reduce the frequency of the trade at open markets to once a month. The authorities were also reportedly closing general markets and transforming them into farmers' markets, with a ban on rice sales.⁸

8. In 2009, it was reported that small-lot and small-patch farming would be prohibited.⁹

9. Moreover, the Special Rapporteur has stressed the discriminatory nature of food policies, noting the great disparity between access by the elite to food and other necessities and access by the rest of the population to the wherewithal of life. He has concluded that food aid is provided by the Government in violation of the principle of non-discrimination.¹⁰ He has also stressed that the **excessive expenditure by the authorities on its defence sector**, based upon the country's "military-first" policy causes serious distortions in the national budget and its use of national resources. The Special Rapporteur considers this a key impediment to the country's development process as well as the right to food and life and other rights.

10. The Special Rapporteur has expressed particular concern **about those most vulnerable** to food insecurity, like children, pregnant and lactating women, the elderly and people with disabilities. In 2004 an extensive food and nutrition survey carried out by United Nations agencies in cooperation with the Democratic People's Republic of Korea revealed that while the situation of children had improved on some fronts in regard to malnutrition, the situation of women had not improved: some one third of mothers were found to be malnourished and anaemic, which obviously affected children's malnutrition.¹¹

11. The United Nations has also consistently highlighted the problem of **access of humanitarian assistance**.¹² In 2004, the Government started to accept foreign food aid to alleviate the chronic situation. However, in 2005 and 2006, it tried to reduce that aid and the presence of international agencies working on the issue in an attempt to curb outside influence¹³. There was a further obstacle in July 2006 due to the missile tests launched by the Government in the face of global opposition. This event had a negative impact on the food situation of the country, since it caused various contributors of humanitarian aid to discontinue providing that aid.¹⁴

⁶ A/64/224, para 17

⁷ A/64/224, para 17

⁸ A/HRC/10/18, para 15; A/64/224, para 18

⁹ A/HRC/10/18, para 15

¹⁰ A/HRC/7/20, paras 15-23

¹¹ A/60/306, para 38

¹² See General Assembly Resolutions: A/RES/61/174, A/RES/62/167, A/RES/63/190, A/RES/64/175, A/RES/66/174; see also Human Rights Council resolutions: A/HRC/RES/10/16, A/HRC/RES/13/14, A/HRC/RES/16/8, A/HRC/RES/19/13

¹³ E/CN.4/2006/35 paras 4-5; A/61/349

¹⁴ A/61/349

12. Concurrently, matters became more complicated due to devastating floods that caused substantial damage and loss of lives in July and August 2006. These disasters pressured the authorities to reopen the country to outside aid.¹⁵ Owing to this humanitarian crisis, some of the contributors of humanitarian aid changed their position and resumed provision of aid, particularly at the bilateral level. However, the Special Rapporteur noted that the World Food Programme (WFP) monitoring showed that progressive cuts had led to rations of 150 grams of cereals per person per day in June 2008, down from 450 grams in early 2008.¹⁶

13. According to the Special Rapporteur, in 2009 the aid situation became more desperate.¹⁷ Although in 2008, the offer by the United States of America of some 500,000 tons of food aid over a 12-month period was accepted by the country, and a group of United States (US) non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were permitted access to the country to help with the delivery, at the beginning of 2009, the country stopped accepting US aid and asked all the NGOs to leave. The Special Rapporteur noted that this was the result of “the authority’s unease with the monitoring of the food aid process and the use of Korean interpreters from outside the country.”¹⁸

14. In 2009, the Secretary-General took note of a range of reports indicated that the authorities had blocked access to alternative sources of food by forbidding kitchen farming in private households and closing down markets where food items were traded. In 2009, the Secretary-General concluded that the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea was **failing to fulfil its obligations under international human rights law to protect the right to adequate food.**¹⁹

15. In March 2011, a United Nations survey found that more than six million vulnerable people urgently required international food assistance. In a report, released in November 2011, by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and WFP showed that many of the factors behind the shortage of food, including the adverse weather conditions, underdevelopment and structural problems, in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea had intensified.²⁰

16. Moreover, in December 2011, the General Assembly noted a deterioration of the situation and expressed its “very deep concern at the precarious humanitarian situation including a serious deterioration in the availability of and access to food, in the country, partly as a result of frequent natural disasters, compounded by structural weakness in agricultural production resulting in significant shortages of food, and the increasing State restrictions on the cultivation and trade in foodstuffs, as well as the prevalence of chronic and acute malnutrition, particularly among the most vulnerable groups, pregnant women, infants and the elderly, which, despite some progress, continues to affect the physical and mental development of a significant proportion of children.”²¹

Recommendations on the right to food

17. Since 2008, the Human Rights Council in its various resolutions has urged “the Government of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea to ensure safe and unhindered access of humanitarian assistance that is delivered impartially on the basis of need, in accordance with humanitarian principles.”²²

¹⁵ E/CN.4/2006/35 paras 4-5; A/61/349.

¹⁶ A/63/332, para 30

¹⁷ A/64/224

¹⁸ A/64/224, para 13

¹⁹ A/64/319, para 8

²⁰ A/HRC/19/65, para 23

²¹ A/RES/66/174, para 3

²² A/HRC/RES/10/16, A/HRC/RES/13/14, A/HRC/RES/16/8, A/HRC/RES/19/13

18. The Special Rapporteur emphasized that “the primary obligation to feed people lies with the State, which must take all measures necessary to rectify existing flaws in the production and distribution system that have contributed [to] the shortage of food.” He also called on the Government to reduce military/defence expenditure and ensure equitable re-allocation of resources to respond effectively to the food crisis and other areas needing development.²³

19. The Special Rapporteur stressed that the human rights obligations of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea are in no sense contingent on the provisions of external humanitarian assistance by the international community, but merely an impetus for emergency response.²⁴

20. Finally, he further recognized that it is important to ensure such aid distribution reaches the neediest population and in line with the long-standing United Nations policy of “no access, no aid,” which needs to be respected by all States receiving aid.²⁵

B. Torture and inhuman treatment

21. General Assembly resolutions adopted between 2006 and 2012 highlighted “torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment” among several systemic, widespread and grave violations of human rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea. Moreover, the General Assembly made specific reference to punishments inflicted on citizens of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea who have been repatriated from abroad, “such as treating their departure as treason, **leading to punishments of internment, torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment** or the death penalty” (emphasis added).²⁶ The Human Rights Council deplored “the use of torture...against political prisoners and repatriated citizens of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea”.²⁷

22. In 2007, the Special Rapporteur stressed that there are continuing reports of violence against the human person committed by State authorities, such as torture, public executions, and persecution of political dissidents.²⁸

23. In 2008, the Secretary-General expressed his serious concern at the fact that reports emanating from the country “continue to indicate trends of torture, inhumane conditions of detention, public execution, ill-treatment of refugees or asylum-seekers repatriated from abroad.”²⁹ The same year, in his report to the General Assembly, the Special Rapporteur stated that an “overhaul of the prison system is long overdue, and the harsh conditions imposed by the criminal justice system and related detention give rise to a plethora of abuses, including torture and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment. The abuses are ubiquitous, and include degrading treatment of deceased persons.”³⁰

24. In 2009, the Special Rapporteur highlighted that although torture is prohibited by law, it is extensively practised in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea.³¹ He quoted from the White Paper on Human Rights in North Korea, a document³² produced by the

²³ A/HRC/19/65, para 26

²⁴ A/HRC/19/65, para 58

²⁵ A/HRC/19/65, para 58

²⁶ A/RES/60/173; A/RES/61/174; A/RES/62/167; A/RES/63/190; A/RES/64/175; A/RES/66/174

²⁷ A/HRC/RES/10/16; A/HRC/RES/13/14; A/HRC/RES/16/8; A/HRC/RES/19/1

²⁸ A/HRC/4/15

²⁹ A/63/332; A/65/391.

³⁰ A/63/322, para 31

³¹ A/HRC/10/18, para 24

³² Kim Tae-Hoon, “Human rights for the socially marginalized class”, in White Paper on Human Rights in North Korea, Korean Bar Association, p. 431

Korean Bar Association that documents violations, including cases of torture practised against women who are returned to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea: "Female repatriates suffer what is called 'pumping' torture, which is a common sexual torture to find money hidden inside a woman's vagina. Women who face this torture are stripped of their clothing, and their arms are tied behind their backs. Then they squat and stand repeatedly until they lose consciousness. It maximizes the sense of shame in women ... Assault against pregnant women is also routinized, and wrapping the forcibly aborted baby's face with plastic to [induce] death is known [in] frequent occurrences."³³

25. In 2011, in his report to the Human Rights Council³⁴, the Special Rapporteur analysed the situation of human rights in detention and correctional facilities. He noted he had learned from various sources that human rights violations are committed in all correctional centres: "Correctional officers sometimes beat inmates, but it is understood that more often it is the inmates who would beat up other inmates upon instruction from the officers."³⁵

26. While in Japan on 25-28 January 2011 and the Republic of Korea on 22-26 November 2010, the Special Rapporteur heard some graphic stories of the conditions and treatment of the detainees in various camps in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. He noted that "some of the most flagrant human rights violations, such as torture and detention without due process of law, are reported to be perpetrated in these camps."³⁶

27. The Secretary-General noted in 2012 that some reports also indicate the existence of prison camps where torture and execution are widespread.³⁷

28. A joint urgent appeal was sent on 24 February 2012 by the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions and the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention, raising concerns about the arrest of a group of 31 citizens of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in a neighbouring country and fears regarding their possible refoulement to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. It had been alleged that, if repatriated, the individuals would be subjected to detention, torture and execution as illegal border crossers.³⁸

Recommendations on torture and inhuman treatment

29. During the Universal Periodic Review of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in December 2009, several Member States recommended that the Government of the ratify the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and its Optional Protocol.³⁹ Moreover, in several of his reports, the Special Rapporteur called upon the Government to reform the prison system in order to prevent torture and to end public executions.⁴⁰

³³ A/64/224, para 58

³⁴ A/HRC/16/58

³⁵ A/HRC/16/58, para 53

³⁶ A/HRC/16/58, para 56

³⁷ A/67/362, para 14

³⁸ A/67/362, para 25

³⁹ See for example A/65/391, para 43; and Universal Periodic Review documents [<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/KPSession6.aspx>]

⁴⁰ A/62/264; A/64/224; A/HRC/10/18; A/HRC/13/47

C. Arbitrary detention

30. In 2004 and 2005, the Commission on Human Rights identified arbitrary detention as part of a continuing pattern of “systemic, widespread and grave violations of human rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea.”⁴¹ General Assembly resolutions adopted between 2006 and 2012 highlighted, among several systemic, widespread and grave violations of human rights, “extrajudicial and arbitrary detention; the absence of due process and the rule of law, including fair trial guarantees and an independent judiciary,” expressing its serious concern.

31. In 2006, the Special Rapporteur stressed that the judicial system lacks independence and is heavily influenced by the regime in power. In addition to the opaque nature of the ordinary courts, there is a parallel quasi-penal regime which does not comply with rule of law guarantees such as judicial independence, natural justice, respect for the rights of the accused and access to lawyers.⁴²

32. Moreover, in 2009 the Special Rapporteur highlighted that “...judges are appointed by the State and operate under the direction of the Supreme People’s Assembly. The jury system is based on two people who work with the courts (usually one judge at first instance) - not to ensure that the rights of the accused are upheld but to confirm the list of crimes presented at the trials and to confirm the conviction of the alleged wrongdoer. Anomalously, lawyers protect the State rather than their defendants. On-site open trials are also held, ostensibly to educate the public; in reality, they are an instrument to intimidate the public, without any regard for the defendant’s right to a fair trial and the right to privacy.”⁴³

33. In his 2009 report to the Human Rights Council, the Special Rapporteur qualified many punishments applied in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea as “totally unreasonable and abusive”⁴⁴. The Special Rapporteur noted, for instance, “students are reported to have been sent to labour training (re-education and forced labour) for watching South Korean dramas. Citizens who fail to turn up for work allocated to them by the State are sent to labour camps. There is a wide variety of detention facilities ranging from political detention camps (kwanliso) for political crimes to correctional labour punishment in labour camps (kyohwaso) for other crimes.”⁴⁵

34. The United Nations documentation has highlighted that a number of constitutional and legislative provisions seriously endanger the impartiality and independence of the judiciary in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea. Moreover, some articles in the Criminal Code are either not in line with international standards or contain terms that are not defined or are vague, thus allowing scope for misinterpretation and abuse by the State.

35. In his 2007 report to the Human Rights Council,⁴⁶ the Special Rapporteur had noted that there are a large number of provisions concerning anti-State activities that give rise to concern due to their excessively broad scope and the way that the authorities might use such provisions to repress political dissent. He noted for instance that there are “14 types of anti-State, anti-people crimes; 16 types of crimes of disturbing the national defence system; 104 types of crimes of injuring the socialist economy; 26 types of crimes of injuring the socialist culture; 39 types of crimes of injuring administrative systems; and 20 types of crimes of harming socialist collective life. Several may be punished with the death sentence.”⁴⁷

⁴¹ E/CN.4/RES/2004/13, para 13; E/CN.4/RES/2005/11, para 1

⁴² A/61/349, para 15

⁴³ A/HRC/10/18, para 25

⁴⁴ A/HRC/10/18, para 23

⁴⁵ A/HRC/10/18, para 23

⁴⁶ A/HRC/4/15

⁴⁷ A/HRC/4/15, para 12

36. In 2012, the Special Rapporteur stressed that a number of provisions in the Criminal Code fall below the standard required to ensure that due process of law is maintained and the rights of people are respected; for instance, the definition of “labour training” and “training detention facilities” remains unclear; the possibility of a broad interpretation of the category of “political crime” remains; and elements such as “crimes by association” are maintained in several parts of the Criminal Code. Similar vague terms, such as “extremely grave crime” and “reform through labour”, are contained in an addendum to the Criminal Code, which was adopted on 19 December 2007.⁴⁸ A number of provisions of the Criminal Code also stipulate punishment for acts that would not normally warrant criminal liability.⁴⁹ All these provisions can be the basis for arbitrary.

37. One particularly worrying practice, widely documented by the United Nations, is detention due to **guilt by association**: when a person is punished for a political or ideological crime, members of his or her family are also punished. As early as 2005, the Special Rapporteur had denounced forms of collective punishment based upon ‘guilt by association.’ The Special Rapporteur noted that this practice “has both horizontal and vertical impact – horizontal in that it leads to the persecution of immediate family members and vertical in that it may lead to the stigmatization of subsequent generations, given that the authorities keep records of families as part of the iron grip on the population.”⁵⁰

38. Political prison camps are another issue of serious concern. In 2011, the Special Rapporteur stated that in Kwalinso 15 and Yodok camps, thousands of people are believed to be held by reason of “guilt by association.” The majority of such people reportedly do not seem to know the reasons for their imprisonment or what crimes they are accused of.⁵¹

39. Several United Nations reports also document the detention of the citizens of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, who return to their country after deportation, including victims of trafficking, in violation of their rights. In a joint urgent appeal by several Special Rapporteurs, it was stated that according to the information received, nationals of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea commit a criminal offence if they leave the country without official permission, punishable by up to two years in a labour training camp (*nodongdanryundae*) or a detention centre (*jipkyulso*), in grave cases up to three years. Defection to a foreign country or to the enemy in betrayal of the country and the people is also a criminal offence punishable by no less than five years of detention in a political labour camp (*kwanliso*) or a re-education labour camp (*kyohwaso*).⁵² The 2012 report of the Special Rapporteur to the General Assembly notes that article 233 of the Criminal Code foresees up to five years of labour for anyone illegally crossing the border of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, which is in contravention to the right to freedom of movement.⁵³

40. The United Nations has clearly identified arbitrary detention as a widespread, systematic and grave form of abuse occurring in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea. Political prison camps are said to have as many as 200,000 prisoners and citizens are routinely imprisoned for acts that should not be punishable by law, including for leaving their own country.

⁴⁸ A/HRC/19/65, para 34

⁴⁹ A/67/370, para 29

⁵⁰ A/60/306, para 19

⁵¹ A/66/322, paras 60-63

⁵² E/CN.4/2006/52/Add.1, paras 62-65, joint urgent appeal sent by the Special Rapporteurs on the Independence of judges and lawyers; Freedom of religion or belief; Torture; Trafficking; Violence Against Women; and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea

⁵³ A/67/370

Recommendations on arbitrary detention

41. The Special Rapporteur has consistently called on the Government to release political prisoners, particularly those imprisoned for guilt by association.⁵⁴
42. The Special Rapporteur has called on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to repeal provisions in its legislation that run counter to international standards, in particular within the Criminal Code.⁵⁵
43. The Special Rapporteur has recommended that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea guarantee personal security and freedoms by, among others, reforming the justice system, and abiding by the rule of law with safeguards for accused persons, fair trials, the development of an independent judiciary and checks and balances against abuses of power.⁵⁶
44. The General Assembly and the Human Rights Council have made repeated calls for the authorities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to stop subjecting returnees to the country to any kind of punishment, including detention.⁵⁷

D. Prison camps

45. Many United Nations entities have decried the use of prison camps in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, ranging from the General Assembly and the Human Rights Council to the Secretary-General and the Special Rapporteur.
46. The General Assembly, in its resolutions adopted between 2006 and 2012 on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea highlighted, among several **systemic, widespread and grave violations** of human rights, "the existence of a large number of prison camps and the extensive use of forced labour," expressing its serious concern.⁵⁸
47. The Commission on Human Rights and the Human Rights Council "expressed very serious concern" at the use of prison camps in their annual resolutions from 2003 to 2012.⁵⁹ In 2009, the Human Rights Council deplored the grave, widespread and systematic human rights abuses in the country and in particular the use of torture and labour camps for "political prisoners and repatriated citizens of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea."⁶⁰
48. In 2007, the Special Rapporteur referred to the existence of a large variety of detention centres ranging from those for political dissidents to those for criminals, as well as re-education camps and forced labour camps. He noted the various denominations of these centres including gwanliso (political labour camp), gyohwaso (long-term prison labour camp), jipgyulso (detention facility) and rodongdanryundae (labour facility).⁶¹
49. In 2009, the Special Rapporteur underlined his concern at the use of unreasonable and abusive punishments, and noted in his reports to the Human Rights Council and the General Assembly that there are allegations of public and secret executions in political detention camps.⁶² In February 2010, the Special Rapporteur indicated that "different

⁵⁴ A/66/322, paras 62, 71

⁵⁵ A/67/370, para 68

⁵⁶ A/HRC/13/47, para 88 (b) (iv)

⁵⁷ A/RES/66/174; A/RES/65/225; A/RES/64/175; A/64/224, para 73(a) (ii); A/63/322, para 62(a) (ii); A/HRC/13/47, para. 88 (a) (iii)

⁵⁸ For example, A/RES/67/181; A/RES/66/174

⁵⁹ E/CN.4/RES/2003/10

⁶⁰ A/HRC/RES/10/16

⁶¹ A/HRC/4/15, para 13

⁶² A/HRC/10/18, para 23; A/63/322, para 5; See also A/HRC/WG.6/6/PRK/2.

sources indicate a conglomeration of huge camps for political prisoners and their families, who are often held there in perpetuity.” These included Kaecheon, Yodok, Hwasong, Bukchang, Hoeryong, Chonjin are some of the camps of infamy.⁶³

50. In March 2010, the Special Rapporteur sent a letter to the Government of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea regarding conditions in six prison camps and detention centres for political detainees, raising concerns about allegations of forced labour and limited access to basic necessities, such food, shelter, clothing, sanitation and medical treatment. He noted the allegation that the camps hold a large number of persons who have been detained for expressing political opinions, defecting or engaging in acts against the Government, or who are family members of accused persons. In a letter dated 31 March 2010, the Government responded to the Special Rapporteur’s communication by simply stating that it did not recognize his mandate. The Government also stated that since it believed that the communication was based on fabricated information, it saw no need to comment on its substance.⁶⁴

51. In his report to the Human Rights Council in 2011, the Special Rapporteur dealt with the question of detention centres and political prisons in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea.⁶⁵ In this report, he noted that apart from the official correctional centres, North Korea is reported to have been operating a number of “political concentration camps”, collection centres and labour training camps. Political prisoners are incarcerated in what is known as “Kwanliso”, operated by the Farm Guidance Bureau of the State Security Agency. He noted that these facilities are also often called “control districts” or “special district for dictatorial control” and that some of the most flagrant human rights violations, such as torture and detention without due process of law are reported to be perpetrated there.

52. The Special Rapporteur further noted that references to such labour training camps can be found in some of legal instruments of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (Article 18 of the Sentences and Decisions Enforcement Law, as amended on 9 November 1998, the revised Penal Code of 2004). This reinforced the Special Rapporteur’s view that reforms need to take place both to end the use of such labour training camps and amend legislation to ensure it is aligned with international standards.⁶⁶

53. In his 2011 report to the General Assembly⁶⁷ the Special Rapporteur highlighted the fact that human rights groups have published satellite images of alleged political prison camps in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea. He noted that these images show four of the six camps occupying large land areas within vast wildernesses of the provinces of South Pyongan, South Hamkyung and North Hamkyung. He also explained that a comparison of the latest pictures with satellite imagery from 2001 reportedly indicates a significant increase in the scale of the camps. He stated that it is estimated that the network of political prisons in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, some of which are believed to be in operation since 1950s, hold up to 200,000 people.

54. The Special Rapporteur’s report described some of the conditions under which prisoners are reportedly held: “Reports indicate that a room of about 50 square metres houses about 30-40 political prisoners under harsh conditions. It is alleged that in most camps, no clothing is provided and prisoners face harsh winters. Inmates are also expected to work long hours performing manual labour.”⁶⁸

⁶³ A/HRC/13/47, para 31

⁶⁴ A/65/391, paras 33-34

⁶⁵ A/HRC/16/58

⁶⁶ A/HRC/16/58, para 55

⁶⁷ A/66/322, paras 60-63

⁶⁸ A/66/322, para 60

55. He further noted that in Kwanliso 15 and Yodok prison camps, thousands of people are believed to be held by reason of “guilt by association.” The majority of such people reportedly do not seem to know the reasons for their imprisonment or what crimes they are accused of.⁶⁹ The Special Rapporteur had already noted in 2005 that “A very disconcerting practice is documented by various sources – collective punishment based upon ‘guilt by association.’ This means that if a person is punished for a political or ideological crime, members of his or her family are also punished.”⁷⁰

56. At its sixty-third session in 2012, the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention adopted an opinion in the case of Shin SookJa, Oh Hae Won and Oh Kyu Won.⁷¹ The three were allegedly detained in 1987 solely in response to the defection of Oh Kil Nam (husband of the former and father of the latter two). The three were allegedly held in Yodok political prison camp and later transferred to a camp near Pyongyang. In its opinion the Working Group stated that under certain circumstances “widespread or systematic imprisonment or other severe deprivation of liberty in violation of the fundamental rules of international law may constitute crimes against humanity.”⁷² The Working Group concluded that the continued detention of Shin SookJa, Oh Hae Won and Oh Kyu Won is in contravention to international law and arbitrary. It requested the Government to take the necessary steps to remedy the situation, which in its view, includes the immediate release from detention and an enforceable right to compensation for the prisoners.⁷³

57. In 2012, the Special Rapporteur mentioned the case of Shin SookJa, Oh Hae Won and Oh Kyu Won in his report to the General Assembly⁷⁴ stating that this is an example of citizens of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea held in prison camps for guilt by association. He noted several disturbing reports from non-governmental organizations and other sources of widespread arbitrary detention and forced labour, without specific charges or due process and with gross violations of human rights. He also observed that “under certain circumstances, widespread or systematic imprisonment or other severe deprivation of liberty in violation of international law **may constitute crimes against humanity**” (emphasis added).⁷⁵

Recommendations on prison camps

58. In 2011, the Secretary-General urged the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea to improve conditions in prisons and detention centres, and release political prisoners.⁷⁶ The Special Rapporteur also made similar calls and proposed “that the authorities begin the release of political prisoners starting with certain categories of prisoners, such as the elderly, those having medical conditions, long serving prisoners, women who have children and persons imprisoned due to guilt by association.”⁷⁷

⁶⁹ A/66/322, para 60

⁷⁰ A/60/306, para 19

⁷¹ A/HRC/WGAD/2012/4

⁷² A/HRC/WGAD/2012/4, para 26

⁷³ A/HRC/WGAD/2012/4, para 28

⁷⁴ A/67/370, paras 31-38

⁷⁵ A/67/370, para 38

⁷⁶ A/66/343, para 74

⁷⁷ A/66/322, para 62

E. Discrimination

59. The United Nations reports and resolutions have documented several patterns of discrimination in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, in particular:

- (a) Division of society into three different groups of allegiance to the regime, which affects the citizen's level of enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including access to food;
- (b) Discrimination against women, children, the elderly and persons with disabilities, including the disproportionate effect of malnutrition on these populations and specific violations that individuals in each of these categories suffer; and
- (c) Violations specifically affecting those who have been repatriated to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and their families.

60. Since 2005, the Special Rapporteur has highlighted that while the Constitution and other laws in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea enshrine the principle of non-discrimination, the practice is defective.⁷⁸ The Special Rapporteur notes that the Government **divides the population into three different groups**: those close to the regime (the core mass), the group in the middle (the basic mass), and those considered hostile to the regime (the complex mass).⁷⁹ He describes the way in which these divisions affect **people's access to basic rights and services**: "The first group is the ruling elite, which is well endowed with privileges, such as access to special schools and hospitals. They are allowed to own private phones and read foreign publications. The second is the majority of the population, such as farmers and workers. They are provided with food rations, although dwindling in recent years due to the Government's experimentation with the market economy and a reduction in the State-sponsored public distribution system. The third group is considered to be the enemies of the State and is persecuted accordingly. They include the landed class before the communist takeover of the country, public officials under Japanese rule, religious groups, and those who assisted South Korean forces during the Korean War (1950-1953). They are denied access to college education and are discriminated against in their access to basic necessities such as housing, medical care and education. Many land up in the prisons referred to below. While this practice may have been abolished in law, it seems to persist and is implied by the testimonies of those who leave the country in search of refuge elsewhere."⁸⁰

61. Another particularity of this division identified by the Special Rapporteur is the application of the policy of "**crime by association**" which also provides a basis for discrimination: "Political dissent is heavily punished and has an intergenerational impact; where the parents are seen as antithetical to the regime, the child and the rest of the family are also discriminated against in their access to school, hospitals and other necessities."⁸¹

62. The 2008 reports of the Special Rapporteur to the Human Rights Council and the General Assembly specifically analyse patterns of **discrimination that affect development, access to food and other necessities, and particular sectors of society**. With reference to the right to food, the Special Rapporteur has stressed that "beyond the elite, the people are faced with a painful paradox: on the one hand, the social safety nets which the State offered in the past are now no longer reliable and they must seek other ways to fend for themselves; on the other hand, when they undertake various livelihood

⁷⁸ A/60/306, para 20

⁷⁹ A/60/306; A/HRC/7/20; A/HRC/10/18; A/64/224

⁸⁰ A/HRC/7/20, para 24

⁸¹ A/HRC/10/18, para 28

initiatives to supplement their income, the authorities clamp down on them for fear of losing their grip on the population.”⁸²

63. In 2009, the Special Rapporteur dedicated part of his report to the General Assembly to the issue of “freedom from discrimination”. He noted that the discrimination that results from the stratification of society can be seen through the plight of several groups, and that food and other shortages have particularly taken their toll on women, with high malnutrition rates particularly recorded in pregnant women.⁸³

64. The General Assembly resolutions have reflected the concerns raised in these reports. For instance, resolution 66/174 expressed concern at the precarious humanitarian situation which is compounded by the “prevalence of chronic and acute malnutrition, particularly among the most vulnerable groups, pregnant women, infants and the elderly.”⁸⁴

65. In its consideration of the State report of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea in 2005, the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW) underscored that there is a difference between de jure and de facto **equality between men and women**. The Committee noted with concern the persistence of traditional and stereotyped assumptions and attitudes in respect of the roles and responsibilities of women and men, which are discriminatory against women and have a pronounced impact, particularly in the areas of education and employment as well as in other areas of their lives. There is only limited access by women to key decision-making positions at the top, particularly in politics, the judiciary and the civil service. It is also concerned that in times of economic crisis, as in the current situation of the country, women’s prescribed roles and lesser entitlement intensifies their hardship and amounts to compounded discrimination.⁸⁵

66. The concerns of CEDAW have been echoed by the Secretary-General and the Special Rapporteur in all their reports and have been reflected in numerous United Nations resolutions. Several resolutions express deep concern at the “continued violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of women, in particular the **trafficking of women for prostitution or forced marriage**,” as well as **forced abortions and gender based discrimination**.⁸⁶

67. In 2005, the Commission on Human Rights expressed deep concern about the continued violation of the women’s rights, in particular the trafficking of women for prostitution or forced marriage, ethnically motivated forced abortions, including by labour-inducing injection or natural delivery, as well as infanticide of children of repatriated mothers, including in police detention centres and labour-training camps.⁸⁷

68. In its 2006 and 2007 resolutions, the General Assembly expressed serious concerns at the “continuing violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of women, in particular the trafficking of women for the purpose of prostitution or forced marriage, forced abortions, and infanticide of children of repatriated mothers, including in police detention centres and camps.”⁸⁸

⁸² A/HRC/7/20, para 13; A/63/322, paras 9, 29, 45, 50

⁸³ A/64/224, paras 39-52

⁸⁴ A/RES/66/174, para 3; See also A/RES/63/190; A/RES/64/175; A/RES/65/225; A/RES/66/174.

⁸⁵ CEDAW/C/PRK/CO/1, paras 35, 45, 57; See also documents available at <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/33sess.htm>

⁸⁶ E/CN.4/RES/2004/13, para 1(d); E/CN.4/RES/2005/11; A/RES/60/173; A/RES/61/174; A/RES/62/167; A/RES/63/190; A/RES/64/175; A/RES/66/174; A/HRC/RES/13/14

⁸⁷ E/CN.4/RES/2005/11

⁸⁸ A/RES/60/173, paras 1(b) (i), 1 (b) (iv); A/RES/61/174, paras 1(b) (i), 1 (b) (iv), 1(b) (vii)

69. Both CEDAW and the Special Rapporteur highlighted the impact that discrimination has on the issue of **violence against women**.⁸⁹ Both domestic and institutional violence, particularly in prisons and other closed institutions, is widespread in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. This affects in particular women who do not belong to the ruling elite and who are marginalized by the cloistered political system. As the Special Rapporteur stressed, the Penal Code, amended in 2004, contains certain provisions that deal with sexual violence. However, what is lacking in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is specific legislation to deal with all forms of violence against women and accompanying prevention and protection measures for victims.⁹⁰

70. The Special Rapporteur has further added that there are prevailing cultural assumptions in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea that women are dependent on men, and it is expected that women will be obedient and passive. As a result, women are more directly exposed to various types of cultural practices in the family that result in violence towards them. **There is also a perception that domestic violence is not a crime and that the State should not intervene in such private family matters.** Even when a witness or a victim of domestic violence presents a case of violence to the police, reportedly, it is often not acted upon.⁹¹ The Special Rapporteur also reflects concerns about reports of public security agents and patrols physically assaulting women in marketplaces; but since these agents are Government personnel, victims are not in a position to appropriately report their abuses. In the absence of a proper complaint and accountability mechanism, women continue to be exposed to acts of violence which they have little choice but to endure.⁹²

71. The Secretary General, the Special Rapporteur, and the Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC) noted that the principle of non-discrimination is not fully respected in practice, vis-à-vis children with disabilities, children living in institutions, and children who are in conflict with the law. Moreover, it has been highlighted that children also face discrimination on the basis of political or other opinion, social origin or other status, either of themselves or because of their parents.⁹³ The General Assembly in its 2011 and 2012 resolutions addressed the specific **vulnerability of children**, in particular the continued lack of access to basic economic, social and cultural rights. These resolutions point to the particular vulnerability of repatriated children, street children, children with disabilities, children whose parents are detained, children living in detention or in institutions or in conflict with the law.⁹⁴ Several United Nations documents also point to discrimination against children of non-ethnic Korean origin and their mothers.⁹⁵

72. As early as 2003 the Commission on Human Rights expressed deep concern at the "mistreatment of and discrimination against disabled children". Since 2006 the General Assembly has consistently decried "continuing reports of violations of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of persons with disabilities, especially on the use of collective camps and of coercive measures that target the rights of persons with disabilities to decide freely and responsibly on the number and spacing of their children."⁹⁶ Whereas in 2006 the Special Rapporteur noted "to date, the situation facing those with disabilities has presented a very disconcerting picture. It is reported that those with disabilities are sent away from the

⁸⁹ A/60/306; E/CN.4/2006/35; A/61/349; A/HRC/7/20; A/HRC/10/18, A/66/322

⁹⁰ A/66/322, paras 52-59

⁹¹ A/66/322, paras 52-59

⁹² A/66/322, paras 52-59

⁹³ A/64/319; CRC/C/PRK/CO/4, para 19; E/CN.4/2006/35, para 29. See also A/RES/64/175 and CRC documents at <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/crc/crcs50.htm>

⁹⁴ A/RES/64/175; A/RES/65/225

⁹⁵ E/CN.4/2006/35, para 25; A/HRC/7/20, para 31; A/61/349, para 47

⁹⁶ See for example A/RES/62/167.

capital city, and particularly those with mental disabilities are detained in areas or camps known as 'Ward 49' with harsh and subhuman conditions."⁹⁷

73. Another group regularly referred to by the Special Rapporteur, the Secretary-General and numerous resolutions of the Commission on Human Rights, Human Rights Council and General Assembly are those **returned or repatriated to the Democratic People's Republic Korea and their families**. All reports and resolutions refer to the harsh punishments they suffer, the violations of their rights and the lack of respect for the principle of non-refoulement by neighbouring states.

Recommendations on discrimination

74. During the Universal Periodic Review in 2009, several States recommended that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea ratify the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD) and the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CPRD).⁹⁸

75. Several Human Rights Council resolutions reaffirm the responsibility of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to ensure the full enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms of its entire population.⁹⁹

F. Violations of freedom of expression

76. The United Nations has called upon the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to respect the right to freedom of opinion, expression and assembly of its citizens.

77. Since 2006, the General Assembly has expressed "its very serious concern at ...all pervasive and severe restrictions on the freedoms of thought, conscience, religion, opinion and expression, peaceful assembly and association, and on equal access to information, by such means as the persecution of individuals exercising their freedom of opinion and expression, and their families."¹⁰⁰

78. The Commission on Human Rights also echoed its concern about the same reported violations.¹⁰¹

79. With regard to freedom of expression, the Special Rapporteur noted, in 2006, that there was no ostensible improvement during the year. The opaque and non-democratic nature of the State militates against the right to self-determination and the need for democracy in the country. Although the advent of technology and globalization has meant that some Democratic People's Republic of Korea nationals have more access to foreign information, there is still no genuine free access to information, since media and related information are State-controlled and it is illegal to listen to foreign radio, watch foreign TV or to own computers without official permission.¹⁰²

⁹⁷ E/CN.4/2006/35, para 33

⁹⁸ A/HRC/13/13; Universal Periodic Review documents
[<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/HRBodies/UPR/Pages/KPSession6.aspx>]

⁹⁹ A/HRC/RES/13/14; A/HRC/RES/16/8; A/HRC/RES/19/13

¹⁰⁰ A/RES/60/173; A/RES/61/174; A/RES/62/167; A/RES/63/190; A/RES/64/175; A/RES/66/174

¹⁰¹ E/CN.4/RES/2004/13; E/CN.4/RES/2005/11

¹⁰² E/CN.4/2006/35; A/60/306.

80. According to information received, in October 2006, the authorities threatened independent radio stations run by exiles and operated from another country. Another source indicates that the local police monitor sales of radios so as to ensure that they are pre-tuned to government stations and are sealed before they go on sale.¹⁰³

81. In 2009, the Special Rapporteur highlighted that the media is heavily controlled and censored, and forms the backbone of an enormous propaganda machine. Reading of books from the Republic of Korea is punishable as a crime of espionage. Chinese books are also prohibited. There is extensive wiretapping of telephones. Unless one belongs to the elite, it is forbidden to own computers and to use the Internet without official permission and it is prohibited to watch foreign videos. There are reports of official clamp-downs on compact discs, and surveillance teams of inspectors raid homes to see whether families are (illegally) watching or listening to foreign films and radio or television broadcasts. Such raids are particularly intense near the border with neighbouring countries. Radio and television sets are pre-tuned to Government programmes. People who were caught listening to foreign broadcasts were detained by the State authorities and sentenced to long prison terms.¹⁰⁴

82. In 2011, the Special Rapporteur underlined that the authorities in the country continue to impose severe restrictions on freedom of opinion, expression and assembly, despite constitutional guarantees of these rights.¹⁰⁵ He stressed that the provisions of the Press Law of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea are not in line with a State party's obligation under article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Article 48 of the Press Law, for instance, empowers the State to criminalize any statement, publication, news or article that is critical of the State or its organs. Furthermore, article 103 of the Penal Code of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, as amended in 1999, stipulates that anyone seriously disturbing the social order shall be punished with up to 5 years of correctional labour and, in serious cases, their leaders shall be punished with up to 10 years of correctional labour. When the Democratic People's Republic of Korea further amended the Penal Code in April 2004, with the aim of including specific acts that would constitute such crimes, it included listening to broadcasts from the Republic of Korea; collecting, possessing and circulating printed matter from the Republic of Korea; and spreading unfounded rumours.¹⁰⁶

83. In 2011, the Special Rapporteur highlighted the fact that the availability of foreign newspapers to the public is highly restricted with independent national media, and severe restrictions on journalists' travel within the country and abroad. Restrictions placed on journalists and others who seek to exercise their freedom of expression and opinion are incompatible with provisions under paragraph 3 of article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. State-controlled media have also been used to defame independent reporting through allegations attacking the integrity, morals and independence of journalists and media outlets. Complaints have been fabricated to discredit independent non-governmental organizations and journalists.¹⁰⁷

84. The Secretary-General also highlighted that the Government's control over the flow of information is strict and pervasive. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea's state news agency, the Korean Central News Agency, is the only source of information for all media outlets in the country.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰³ A/HRC/4/15, para 14

¹⁰⁴ A/64/224, para 31

¹⁰⁵ A/66/322, paras 48-51

¹⁰⁶ A/66/322, para 49

¹⁰⁷ A/66/322, para 50

¹⁰⁸ A/66/343, para 13

85. In 2012, the Special Rapporteur underlined that due to ambiguous terms in the Criminal Code of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the State can impose severe restrictions on the enjoyment of freedom of opinion and expression. For instance, article 166 of the Code refers to punishment of a worker in the communications and broadcasting service sector who makes "irresponsible" communications or does not conduct broadcasting in a "normal manner", resulting in "serious consequences". The use of terms such as "normal manner", "serious consequences" and "irresponsible" leaves scope for the Government to suppress freedom of opinion and expression. It should be noted that the universal right to freedom of expression includes the right to receive and impart information. "Article 195 of the Code provides for punishments, including short-term labour, for a person who listens to broadcasts that are hostile to the Republic or collects, keeps or distributes enemy propaganda, which can be broadly interpreted to restrict people in the exercise of their right to freedom of opinion and expression or to allow the Government to place severe restrictions on independent media in the country."¹⁰⁹

Recommendations on freedom of expression

86. The Secretary-General urged the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to "to take decisive measures to respect the rights to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; assembly; and opinion and expression."¹¹⁰ Furthermore, the Special Rapporteur, in concert with the statements made by the Secretary-General, also noted that "freedom of opinion and expression is an indispensable condition for the full development of society, and the realization of a number of rights. To this end, he calls on the Government to provide greater space for independent media, free access to the Internet."¹¹¹

G. Violations of the right to life

87. Over many years the General Assembly and the Commission on Human Rights have expressed their serious concern at the use of public executions and "imposition of the death penalty for political or religious reasons."¹¹² In 2001, the Human Rights Committee recommended that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea refrain from public executions and work towards abolishing capital punishment.¹¹³

88. In 2008, the Secretary-General informed the General Assembly that although their veracity could not be independently confirmed, "reports from a range of sources continue to cite a high number of public executions."¹¹⁴ The same year the Special Rapporteur noted that he found the continuing use of public executions to intimidate the public particularly disquieting. In his 2009 report to the Human Rights Council he noted reports of public and secret executions in political detention camps. In 2010 in relation to political prisoners, the Special Rapporteur noted that the lives of inmates are lost too easily to hunger and slave labour, brutality and atrocity. There is, however, little detail in United Nations documentation describing instances of death in custody or as a consequence of torture.

¹⁰⁹ A/67/370, para 26

¹¹⁰ A/67/362, para 57

¹¹¹ A/66/322, para 65

¹¹² E/CN.4/RES/2005/11; E/CN.4/RES/2004/13; E/CN.4/RES/2003/10; A/RES/66/174; A/RES/65/225; A/RES/64/175

¹¹³ CCPR/CO/72/PRK, 27 August 2001, Concluding Observations of the Human Rights Committee, Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

¹¹⁴ A/63/332, para 5

89. In relation to capital punishment, the Secretary-General noted in 2011 that the number of offences carrying the death penalty had been reduced from 33 to 5. However, he expressed concern at the fact that, of those five offences, four are essentially political offences (articles 44, 45, 47 and 52 of the Criminal Code) couched in terms so broad that the imposition of the death penalty may be subjective and arbitrary.¹¹⁵

90. Moreover in 2012, the Special Rapporteur highlighted that on 19 December 2007, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea adopted a unique form of law, referred to as an "addendum to the Criminal Code for ordinary crimes," which has gone largely unnoticed by the international community and which expands the "crimes" for which the death penalty is applied. The Special Rapporteur notes that the addendum has functioned as a complement to the Penal Code, and carried the same weight as other provisions of the Criminal Code. The addendum comprises a total of 23 articles, of which 16 stipulate the death penalty for a number of crimes, 14 including smuggling and dealing in narcotics, seizing State property, currency counterfeiting and illicitly selling State resources. With the adoption of the addendum, the total number of crimes that carry the death penalty in the country stands at 22. Furthermore, the addendum contains a number of vague expressions, such as "the gravest cases" or "extremely serious cases," which leave room for arbitrary decisions by the authorities. The addendum permits the application of capital punishment for various crimes as long as the authorities are able to establish that the crime in question was "extremely serious" and falls under one of the 16 listed crimes.¹¹⁶

Recommendations on the right to life

91. The General Assembly and Human Rights Council resolutions have consistently treated public executions and the application of the death penalty for political and religious reasons as a systematic, grave and widespread form of violation of human rights in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

92. The Secretary-General and the Special Rapporteur have reiterated recommendations by the Human Rights Committee that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea end public executions and adopt a moratorium on the death penalty.¹¹⁷

93. In 2011 the Special Rapporteur recommended that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea repeal provisions of law that run counter to international standards, particularly drawing the attention to the provisions of the Criminal code and its addendum.¹¹⁸

H. Violations of freedom of movement

94. The United Nations has consistently addressed reported violations of the right to freedom of movement occurring across the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, as well as of persons who cross or try to cross the border without a permit.

95. Since 2006, the General Assembly has expressed "its very serious concern at ... limitations imposed on every person who wishes to move freely within the country and travel abroad, including the punishment of those who leave or try to leave the country without permission, or their families as well as punishment of persons who are returned and at the "sanctions imposed on citizens of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea who have been repatriated from abroad, such as treating their departure as treason, leading to

¹¹⁵ A/66/343, para 17

¹¹⁶ A/HRC/19/65, para 36

¹¹⁷ A/HRC/10/18, para 80 (a) (iii); A/HRC/13/47, para 88 (a)(iii); A/66/343 para 74

¹¹⁸ A/HRC/19/65; A/67/370

punishments of internment, torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or the death penalty.”¹¹⁹

96. The Democratic People’s Republic of Korea has always had a strict policy on the movements of its people both internally and externally. Since its inception, the authorities have regulated migration stringently as an instrument of State control. Generally the population is not allowed to move freely within the country and people are only able to travel abroad with official permission.¹²⁰

97. In 2012 the Special Rapporteur summarized how the classification of the population on the basis of their loyalty to the Government affects the enjoyment of human rights, including freedom of movement. He noted that members of the “hostile” class face “the greatest number of restrictions and cannot live in Pyongyang or other major cities.”¹²¹

98. The Special Rapporteur noted that, for years, there has been a constant flow of people persecuted by the authorities fleeing the country clandestinely, without travel permits.¹²² The food crisis of the mid-1990s and thereafter has also led to increased migration of people in search of food and other necessities across the border. There has thus been a persistent flow of people into neighbouring countries at times in search of food, employment and livelihood, at times escaping from persecution and oppression, at times for both reasons.¹²³

99. In 2012 the Special Rapporteur recognized, that while some people flee the country due to persecution, others leave for economic reasons.¹²⁴ However, he noted that whatever their motivation it is necessary to provide all individuals leaving the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea with protection. The Special Rapporteur observed that many of those leaving the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea belong to what the Government considers the “hostile” class. “In such cases, there are strong grounds for arguing that their departure is motivated by political persecution or due to their membership in a particular social group, two of the five conditions established by the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees.”¹²⁵

100. The Special Rapporteur further argues that even if certain persons may not fit the definition of refugee when they leave the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, because the sole circumstance motivating their movement is economic hardship, they may become refugees *sur place* – because they have a valid fear of persecution upon return, given that leaving the country without authorization is a criminal offense.¹²⁶

101. In the Democratic People’s republic of Korea, it is a criminal offence for citizens to leave the country without permission. Therefore, punishment facing citizens of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea who have been repatriated from abroad raises serious concern.

102. On 18 November 2005, the Special Rapporteur sent a communication in connection with two groups of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea nationals who were deported back to their country by a neighbouring country against their will. The first group consisted of five women and two men who were deported on 29 September 2005, after having sought asylum in a foreign school in a neighbouring country. The second case related to a group of four women and one man who also sought asylum in a foreign school

¹¹⁹ A/RES/60/173; A/RES/61/174; A/RES/62/167; A/RES/63/190; A/RES/64/175; A/RES/66/174

¹²⁰ A/HRC/7/20, para 20

¹²¹ A/67/370, para 51

¹²² A/HRC/10/18, paras 34-35; A/61/349, paras 36, 61

¹²³ A/HRC/10/18, para 35

¹²⁴ A/67/370, para 59

¹²⁵ A/67/370, para 61

¹²⁶ A/67/370, para 62

in a neighbouring country, who were returned to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea against their will in October 2005. The Special Rapporteur requested the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to provide him with information on the current whereabouts and status of the above-mentioned groups and expressed concern about their safety. He further urged the Government to abstain from punishing the returnees for having left without an exit visa and to ensure their safety. In its reply, the Government reiterated its position that it did not recognize the mandate of the Special Rapporteur and therefore did not wish to meet or communicate with the Special Rapporteur regarding human rights issues.¹²⁷

103. Several persons interviewed by the Special Rapporteur have had experience with forced return to the country of origin and the punishments inflicted. If those who had left the country were "first-timers" without political affiliations, they would be questioned upon return without necessarily being punished. If they had left several times and subsequently returned, punishments would be increased accordingly, beginning with re-education and forced labour. If they had had access to religious groups or non-governmental organizations in neighbouring countries, they would be punished severely, with long-term incarceration in political prisons for those seen as being antithetical to the regime in the country of origin.¹²⁸

104. The Special Rapporteur noted in his 2007 report that during certain periods, there has been a slight relaxation of the control imposed on migrants. Article 233 of the revised 2004 Penal Code defines 'border crossing' broadly as 'those going and coming across the border' instead of 'simple crossing' in the old Penal Code. Furthermore, the level of the mandatory sentence for the crime of 'illegal going and coming across the border' was reduced from three years to two years of 'labour training' punishment. Since two years of 'labour training' is equivalent to one year of 'correctional labour', the level of punishment was reduced from three years to one year of 'correctional labour.'¹²⁹

105. However, the threat of punishment facing the repatriated citizens is ever-present. In March 2008, the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions together with the special Rapporteur on the right to food and the Special Rapporteur on the question of torture, sent a joint allegation letter regarding information received on the alleged public execution of 13 women and 2 men, who were reportedly accused of planning to cross over to a neighbouring country. It was alleged that this execution was designed to dissuade people from crossing illegally. The Government did not reply to this communication.¹³⁰

106. In each of his reports to the General Assembly the Secretary-General notes the concerns of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) relating to the flow of Democratic People's Republic of Korea nationals seeking protection, including reports that women are being subjected to human trafficking and forced marriages and in some instances children born in such conditions have been deprived of the care of their mothers.¹³¹

Recommendations on freedom of movement

107. Since 2005, the Special Rapporteur has called upon the Government to address the root causes of displacement, prevent persecution and victimization of those who are displaced, including when they return to their country of origin, and guarantee the right to freedom of movement without imposing sanctions on those who move without permission.¹³²

¹²⁷ E/CN.4/2006/35, paras 36-40

¹²⁸ A/HRC/4/15, para 23

¹²⁹ A/HRC/4/15, para 21

¹³⁰ A/HRC/WG.6/6/PRK/2, para 20

¹³¹ A/67/362; A/66/343; A/65/391

¹³² See for example A/60/306.

108. The General Assembly called upon the Government to ensure that citizens of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea expelled or returned to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea are able to "return in safety and dignity, are humanely treated and are not subjected to any kind of punishment."¹³³

109. As the Special Rapporteur underlined in 2007, "the preferred position is that those who left the country in search of refuge elsewhere should not be punished at all for having left the country without an exit visa. This would also help to fulfil the spirit of the country's 1998 Constitution whose article 75 states that "citizens shall have freedom of residence and travel."¹³⁴

I. Enforced disappearances, including abduction of foreign nationals

110. The United Nations, through many of its human rights mechanisms, has consistently documented and decried the crime of enforced disappearances in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Reports by the Secretary-General and the Special Rapporteur highlight the presence of long-existing cases of enforced disappearances, particularly in the form of abduction of foreign nationals, dating back to the Korean War. Since 2003, the Commission on Human Rights, followed by the Human Rights Council have repeatedly noted the existence and unresolved nature of the abduction of foreign nationals in each of their resolutions concerning North Korea. In a comprehensive list of widespread, systematic and grave human rights violations, the General Assembly's first resolution on North Korea in December 2005 (and those that followed) expressed its concern at the "unresolved questions relating to the abduction of foreigners in the form of enforced disappearance."¹³⁵ From 2006 onwards the General Assembly qualified these abductions noting that they violated "the human rights of the nationals of other sovereign countries."¹³⁶

111. The Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances (WGEID) was the first United Nations mechanism to address the issue of abduction of foreigners by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, in particular cases of Japanese and Korean nationals. In total the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances has transmitted twelve cases to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, all of which remain outstanding.¹³⁷ In addition to eight cases of disappeared Japanese nationals abducted in the 1970s and 1980s, another case of disappearance of a female national of the Republic of Korea on the border between China and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was reported to have occurred in 2004. The remaining three cases were received by the WGEID during its November 2010-2011 reporting period and concern Korean nationals who allegedly disappeared on December 1969 after their Korean Airlines flight YS-11 was hijacked and diverted to Democratic People's Republic of Korea.¹³⁸

112. Regarding the cases of abduction of Japanese nationals, the government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea responded to the WGEID by stating that it "had already provided the Government of Japan with detailed information on those persons."¹³⁹ In regards to the female national of South Korea, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea stated that after conducting an investigation into the matter, they had found that

¹³³ A/RES/63/190; A/RES/64/175; A/RES/66/174

¹³⁴ A/HRC/4/15, para 22

¹³⁵ A/RES/60/173, para 1(b)(v)

¹³⁶ A/RES/61/174, para 1(b)(v)

¹³⁷ A/64/319, para 20

¹³⁸ A/HRC/19/58/Rev.1, paras 143-146

¹³⁹ A/62/318, para 18

“neither that incident nor any similar act had occurred in the border area.”¹⁴⁰ The WGEID responded that, because of unsatisfactory reports from the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, these cases would remain outstanding and hoped that the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea would clarify them.¹⁴¹

113. The greatest number of enforced disappearances possibly happened during and after the Korean War, which took place from 1950-1953. In his 2011 report to the Human Rights Council, the Special Rapporteur noted that the exact number of persons from the Republic of Korea by the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea during the Korean War is not known.¹⁴² However he noted that in March 2002, the Korean War Abductees Family Union (KWAFU) began compiling the existing “List of Korean War Abducted Persons.” The list contains around 94,700 names of people abducted. As the Special Rapporteur noted in his report, “some 80.3 per cent of those abducted were either taken away from their home or near their homes, which indicates that these abductions were “carried out intentionally and in an organized manner”.”¹⁴³

114. The Special Rapporteur noted that since the war, 3,824 people have been reportedly abducted from the Republic of Korea, of which 3,310 have been returned after having been held for 6 months to a year. He has gathered information that an estimated 500 civilians abducted and 500 prisoners of war are currently being detained in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, which denies the existence of such abductees. Countries such as Japan, Lebanon, and Thailand have reported such abductions. The Special Rapporteur noted that of 17 identified abductees from Japan only 5 have been returned, with 12 cases still pending (some of which are being examined by the Working Group on Enforced and Involuntary Disappearances).¹⁴⁴ In relation to the abduction issue the Special Rapporteur argues that “**international criminal liability of those responsible for abduction cannot be ruled out** (emphasis added).”¹⁴⁵

115. As documented by the WGEID, the Secretary-General and the Special Rapporteur, the Government of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea has failed to investigate enforced disappearances sufficiently, transparently, or independently, resulting in unsatisfactory results that have not clarified the cases of abducted persons.

Recommendations on enforced disappearances

116. In its resolutions, the General Assembly has repeatedly called on the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea to “urgently resolve these questions, including through existing channels in a transparent manner.”¹⁴⁶ However, reiterated calls for the return of abductees by the Secretary-General, the Special Rapporteur and the General Assembly have been ignored by the Government of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁰ A/62/318, para 18

¹⁴¹ A/62/318, para 20

¹⁴² A/HRC/16/58, paras 18-25

¹⁴³ A/HRC/16/58, para 19

¹⁴⁴ A/HRC/16/58, para 20

¹⁴⁵ A/HRC/16/58, para 25

¹⁴⁶ A/RES/66/174, para 2; A/RES/65/225; A/RES/64/175; A/RES/63/190

¹⁴⁷ A/HRC/7/20; A/62/264; A/63/322; A/HRC/10/18; A/64/224; A/HRC/13/47; A/HRC/16/58; A/HRC/19/65, para 8

Annexe II

[*Anglais seulement*]

List of United Nations documents reviewed^a

Core documents

General Assembly resolutions

A/RES/67/181:	adopted without a vote on 20 December 2012
A/RES/66/174:	adopted with 123 votes in favour, 16 against, 51 abstentions and 3 non-votes, on 19 December 2011
A/RES/65/225:	adopted with 106 votes in favour, 20 against, 57 abstentions and 9 non-votes, on 21 December 2010
A/RES/64/175:	adopted with 99 votes in favour, 20 against, 63 abstentions and 10 non-votes, on 18 December 2009
A/RES/63/190:	adopted with 94 votes in favour, 22 against, 63 abstentions and 13 non-votes, on 18 December 2008
A/RES/62/167:	adopted with 101 votes in favour, 22 against, 59 abstentions and 10 non-votes, on 18 December 2007
A/RES/61/174:	adopted with 99 votes in favour, 21 against, 56 abstentions and 16 non-votes, on 19 December 2006
A/RES/60/173:	adopted with 88 votes in favour, 21 against, 60 abstentions and 22 non-votes, on 16 December 2005

Human Rights Council resolutions

A/HRC/RES/19/13:	adopted without a vote on 22 March 2012
A/HRC/RES/16/8:	adopted with 30 votes in favour, 3 against, and 11 abstentions, on 24 March 2011
A/HRC/RES/13/14:	adopted with 28 votes in favour, 5 against, and 13 abstentions, on 25 March 2010
A/HRC/RES/10/16:	adopted with 26 votes in favour, 6 against, and 15 abstentions, on 26 March 2009
A/HRC/RES/7/15:	adopted with 22 votes in favour, 7 against, and 18 abstentions, on 27 March 2008

^a This may not be an exhaustive list of all United Nations documents that address the human rights situation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Commission on Human Rights resolutions

- E/CN.4/RES/2005/11: adopted with 13 votes in favour, 9 against, and 14 abstentions, on 14 April 2005
- E/CN.4/RES/2004/13: adopted with 29 votes in favour, 8 against, and 16 abstentions, on 15 April 2004
- E/CN.4/RES/2003/10: adopted with 28 votes in favour, 10 against, and 14 abstentions, on 16 April 2003

Reports of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly

- A/67/362: dated 13 September 2012
- A/66/343: dated 7 September 2011
- A/65/391: dated 24 September 2010
- A/64/319: dated 24 August 2009
- A/64/319/Corr.1: dated 15 October 2009
- A/63/332: dated 26 August 2008
- A/62/318: dated 4 September 2007

Reports of the Special Rapporteur to the General Assembly

- A/67/370: dated 13 September 2012, by Marzuki Darusman
- A/66/322: dated 24 August 2011, by Marzuki Darusman
- A/65/364: dated 14 September 2010, by Marzuki Darusman
- A/64/224: dated 4 August 2009, by Vitit Muntarbhorn
- A/63/322: dated 22 August 2008, by Vitit Muntarbhorn
- A/62/264: dated 15 August 2007, by Vitit Muntarbhorn
- A/61/349: dated 15 September 2006, by Vitit Muntarbhorn
- A/60/306: dated 29 August 2005, by Vitit Muntarbhorn

Reports of the Special Rapporteur to the Human Rights Council

- A/HRC/19/65: dated 13 February 2012, by Marzuki Darusman
- A/HRC/16/58: dated 21 February 2011, by Marzuki Darusman
- A/HRC/13/47: dated 17 February 2010, by Vitit Muntarbhorn
- A/HRC/10/18: dated 24 February 2009, by Vitit Muntarbhorn
- A/HRC/7/20: dated 15 February 2008, by Vitit Muntarbhorn
- A/HRC/4/15: dated 7 February 2007, by Vitit Muntarbhorn

Reports of the Special Rapporteur to the Commission on Human Rights

E/CN.4/2006/35: dated 23 January 2006, by Vitit Muntarbhorn

E/CN.4/2005/34: dated 10 January 2005, by Vitit Muntarbhorn

Universal Periodic Review

A/HRC/13/13: Report of the Working Group, dated 4 January 2010

A/HRC/WG.6/6/PRK/1: National Report, dated 27 August 2009

A/HRC/WG.6/6/PRK/2: Compilation Report, dated 18 September 2009

A/HRC/WG.6/6/PRK/3: Summary of stakeholders' submissions, dated 28 August 2009

A/HRC/WG.6/6/PRK/3/Corr.1: Summary corrigendum, dated 23 November 2009

Supplementary documents

Treaty Bodies: Concluding Observations, State Reports and related documents

Human Rights Committee (CCPR)

CCPR/CO/72/PRK: Concluding Observations, 27 August 2001

CCPR/CO/72/PRK/Add.1: Replies submitted by the Government, 5 August 2002

CCPR/C/PRK/2000/2: State Party Report, 4 May 2000

CCPR/C/21/Rev.1/Add.8/Rev.1: General Comment 26 adopted on 8 December 1997

Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR)

E/C.12/1/Add.95: Concluding Observations, 12 December 2003

E/1990/6/Add.35: State Party Report, 15 May 2002

Committee on the Rights of the Child (CRC)

CRC/C/PRK/CO/4: Concluding Observations, 27 March 2009

CRC/C/PRK/Q/4/Add.1: Written replies by the Government to the list of issues, 22 December 2008

CRC/C/PRK/Q/4: List of issues to be taken up in connection with the fourth periodic report, 20 October 2008

CRC/C/PRK/4: Consideration of State Party Report, 15 January 2008

CRC/C/15/Add.239: Concluding Observations, 1 July 2004

CRC/C/Q/PRK/2: List of issues to be taken up in connection with the consideration of the second periodic report, 13 February 2004

CRC/C/65/Add.24: State Party Report, 5 November 2003

Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW)

CEDAW/C/PRK/CO/1:	Concluding comments, 22 July 2005
CEDAW/PSWG/2005/II/CRP.2/Add.3:	Responses to the list of issues and questions for consideration of the initial report, 15 April 2005
CEDAW/PSWG/2005/II/CRP.1/Add.3:	List of issues and questions with regard to the consideration of periodic reports, 9 February 2005
A/60/38 (SUPP):	CEDAW Report on 32nd and 33rd sessions, 2005
CEDAW/C/PRK/1:	Initial Report of State Parties, 11 September 2002

Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council*Working Group on Arbitrary Detention (WGAD)*

A/HRC/WGAD/2012/4: Opinion No. 4/2012 adopted on 2 May 2012

Working Group on Enforced and Involuntary Disappearances (WGEID)

A/HRC/19/58/Rev.1:	Annual Report 2011, 2 March 2012
A/HRC/16/48:	Annual Report 2010, 26 January 2011
A/HRC/13/31:	Annual Report 2009, 21 December 2009
A/HRC/10/19:	Annual Report 2008, 25 February 2009
A/HRC/7/2:	Annual Report 2007, 10 January 2008
A/HRC/4/41:	Annual Report 2006, 25 January 2007
E/CN.4/2006/56:	Annual Report 2005, 27 December 2005
E/CN.4/2005/65:	Annual Report 2004, 23 December 2004
E/CN.4/2004/58:	Annual Report 2003, 21 January 2004
E/CN.4/2003/70:	Annual Report 2002, 21 January 2003

Notes Verbales or letters from the Permanent Mission of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea addressed to the President of the Human Rights Council

A/HRC/19/G/1:	dated 1 February 2012
A/HRC/16/G/2:	dated 20 January 2011
A/HRC/13/G/7/Rev.1:	dated 21 January 2010
A/HRC/10/G/6:	dated 29 January 2009
A/HRC/7/G/3:	dated 30 January 2008
A/HRC/5/G/11:	dated 18 June 2007
A/HRC/5/G/5:	dated 8 June 2007

Letter from the Permanent Representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea addressed to the High Commissioner for Human Rights

E/CN.4/2005/G/13: dated 28 February 2005

Notes by the Secretariat

E/CN.4/2006/32: dated 25 January 2006

E/CN.4/2005/32: dated 22 December 2004

A/59/316: dated 1 September 2004

E/CN.4/2004/31: dated 17 February 2004
