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# Introduction

1. Salam for Democracy and Human Rights (SALAM DHR) is a non-governmental organisation (NGO) whose members are based in the United Kingdom,Germany, France, Lebanon. Its work focuses, mainly, on Bahrain and the Gulf and the issue of statelessness / deprivation of citizenship. Formally registered in the UK, France and Switzerland, it has supporters in Bahrain, where it is unable to register. As part of its [mission](https://salam-dhr.org/?page_id=2), SALAM DHR endeavours to preserve universal principles of dignity and respect by shielding democracy and human rights. The NGO conducts research, produces reports and recommendations. It builds coalitions including through its membership of, amongst others, [CIVICUS](https://www.civicus.org/index.php) and [World Coalition Against the Death Penalty](https://worldcoalition.org/). SALAM DHR’s organisational [annual report](https://salam-dhr.org/?p=4452) details its activities in 2020.
2. Rights Realization Centre (RRC), UK charity number 1178519, was registered in 2018. It seeks to promote & protect international human rights standards in the Middle East & North Africa & Horn of Africa regions. It conducts outreach & training; research & advocacy & uses social media as well as individual casework to fulfill its mandate. It works mainly with other NGOs.
3. The following text for the Committee (henceforth, the Committee) on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women of sets out SALAM DHR and RRC - the authors’ - principal concerns regarding implementation by the Government of Bahrain (GoB) of its treaty obligations as a state party to the Convention (herafter, Covenant) on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women in advance of consideration of the GoB’s implementation of the Covenant, scheduled - at the time of writing - for November 2021. The authors set out concerns thematically, and we reference the relevant article of the Covenant that we believe are involved in each subheading title

# Political will, the scope and place of the Covenant in domestic law, reservations and accountability (Articles 2 [reservation], 3 , 9 [reservation], 15 [reservation] and 16 [reservation])

1. SALAM DHR and RRC are concerned that, despite over a decade of engagement, including by way of specific states at the Universal Periodic Review, the GoB’s reservations in respect to articles 2 and 16 continue serve to place the GoB outside the scope of application of the Covenant itself and therefore are against the object and purpose of the Covenant. The authors acknowledge that the state party’s report explains in paragraph 13 that: “Bahrain reaffirms its commitment to the Convention [...] in a manner consistent with Islamic sharia.”[[2]](#footnote-2) Paragraph 52 of the GoB’s report to the Committee responds to the recommendation to review the reservation with a view to withdrawing them, by adding that:

*“Bahrain wishes to reiterate that it fulfils its obligations [...] in a manner compatible with Islamic sharia. In other words, its reservation to those articles is maintained only inasmuch as they conflict with Islamic sharia and it does not detract from the essence of the Convention or from the principle of equality of rights and duties between men and women.”*

1. Yet the GoB’s twisting, convoluted assertions serve only to re-state and embed the broad, generalised nature of its reservation. Further, the measures set out in paragraphs 53 and 54 of the state party’s report, that legislature passed Decree-Law No. 70 of 2014 to amend certain provisions of Decree-Law No. 5 of 2002 and that the GoB’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs had contacted the United Nations to explain “*provisions to reword some of the reservations to the Convention*” continues to fall short of specific recommendations raised for many years.

1. The GoB’s reservation to article 29 of the Covenant, further, seeks to place the GoB above accountability for its implementation of the Covenant, by implying that it is accountable to no other, equal, contracting party save itself and the non-binding recommendations made to it by the Committee, which it has repeatedly chosen not to implement.

***SALAM DHR and RRC call on the Committee to:***

* ***Address this issue in the current cycle and to seek, as required, information from the International Court of Justice as to how this apparent contradiction can now be addressed by the state party; and to provide guidance to independent advocacy bodies as to how to understand this provision and whether it provides Bahrain with an enduring reason not to make good on treaty obligations.***

# Intersectional factors and corollary human rights violations of other covenants that impact on implementation of the Covenant

1. Arbitrary restrictions imposed by the GoB in relation to freedom of association adversely impacts on implementation of the Covenant. SALAM DHR and RRC are therefore concerned that the GoB and Supreme Council for Women’s reliance on engagement with parliament members and bodies as informing the implementation of the Covenant in Bahrain is flawed and undermines effective implementation of the Covenant.[[3]](#footnote-3) The Committee must recognise, for example, that the GoB has tortured at least two former parliamentarians.[[4]](#footnote-4) Moreover, in 2017 the GoB confirmed the forced dissolution of the largest political association, al-Wefaq while in March 2017 the Minister of Justice filed a lawsuit against a smaller, secular opposition group Wa’ad for violating the Law on Political Associations. In May, the High Administrative Court ordered the dissolution of this party and the liquidation of its assets. In October the Appeal Court upheld the verdict. The GoB continues to detain al-Wefaq leader, Sheikh Ali Salman, whom Amnesty International terms a prisoner of conscience. In March 2017, the GoB charged former Secretary General of Wa’ad, Ebrahim Sharif, in relation to peaceful expressions of his conscientiously held beliefs, including by way of his posting on Twitter, including of an Amnesty International graphic and a tweet criticizing the lack of democracy in Bahrain.[[5]](#footnote-5) The authorities released him in June 2015.

1. Accordingly, the arbitrary imposition of restrictions on who can stand for parliament erodes democratic legitimacy and adversely impacts on the implementation of the Covenant. Therefore the assertion made in paragraph 42 of the state party’s report, that it is an ‘achievement’ and ongoing activity that the GoB is “*Cooperating with the legislature [...] by submitting opinions and proposals regarding laws to the Council of Representatives and the Consultative Council*” must be understood in the light of the selected nature of many, capable, members of parliament, on account of state-imposed policy.

1. The authors are likewise concerned that religious-based discrimination in, for example, employment, likewise impacts on implementation of the Covenant. Paragraph 73 of the state party’s report asserts, citing the Constitution of the Kingdom of Bahrain, that “[...] women may stand for election, vote and exercise their political rights”; paragraph 18 reminds the Committee that the Constitution states that all citizens, both men and women:

*“have the right to participate in economic activity as workers or as employers, within a framework of comprehensive legal equality that takes account of economic principles, rules of social justice and the human right to choose the most fitting form of work on the basis of skill without restricting one profession or field of activity to one sex at the expense of the other.”*

1. The same paragraph reminds the reader that, “[...] *article 16 (b) of the Constitution states that ‘citizens are equally entitled to occupy public service posts, in line with conditions established by law’* [...]” Yet, as the International Labour Organisation (ILO)’s Committee of Experts on the Application of Conventions and Recommendation (CEACR) has found in respect to Article 1(1)(a) of ILO’s Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention, 1958 (No. 111), “*discrimination on a religious basis is the major form of discrimination in the country and that it is ongoing on a large scale both in the private and the public sectors.*”[[6]](#footnote-6) The ILO’s CEACR reminded the GoB that while laws against discrimination existed, “it is also important for the law to be fully and strictly applied in practice”, a view which evokes the state of women’s rights legislation in Bahrain. The ILO’s CEACR called on the GoB “*to take proactive steps to foster respect and tolerance in society of all religious communities and to raise awareness of the existing legislation and mechanisms available for workers who consider that they have been subject to discrimination.*” Similarly, the July 2018 Concluding Observations of the Human Rights Committee (HRC) likewise expressed concern “at reports that members of the Shia community have been subjected to restrictions of their rights to worship and profess their religious beliefs and that liberty of conscience is not effectively guaranteed (art. 18).” The HRC called on the GoB to step “[...] up its efforts to ensure that the Shia population is fairly represented in the public and political spheres. The State party should take immediate steps to ensure that the Shia population is effectively protected from discrimination in every field.”[[7]](#footnote-7)

# Inaccurate representation of consultation and engagement with civil society, circulation of information relating to the Covenant, including in relation to the use of quotas

1. In the state party’s report, under the heading *Mechanism and methodology* used to draft the fourth periodic report of Bahrain, the GoB asserts, in paragraph 8, that the Supreme Council for Women, the author of the GoB report “*was careful to consult with all competent official (sic) bodies in order to obtain the necessary data and to learn about the difficulties and challenges they had faced and their current and future operations*” and that:

*“The Council also consulted and coordinated with the National Human Rights Institution, the legislature, the Bahrain Women Union, women’s civil society organizations and professional bodies in order to canvass their views and hear their comments on the third periodic and its concluding observations. All of that was taken into account when drafting the present report.”*

1. The authors are concerned that this assertion is inaccurate and methodologically flawed: a government body that consults other government bodies cannot independently determine the character of implementation of the treaty. The GoB asserts that it consulted women’s civil society organisations but does not provide any information about who they were, or even if they did consult and chose not to have their identity revealed.

1. According to information available to SALAM DHR and the RRC, the government and Supreme Council for Women chose not to consult independent human rights organisations such as SALAM DHR but also, the Bahrain Centre for Human Rights (BCHR), Amnesty International (AI), Human Rights Watch (HRW), Americans for the Defence of Human Rights in Bahrain (ADHRB), Bahrain Institute for Rights and Democracy (BIRD) or the Gulf Centre for Human Rights (GCHR). Accordingly, SALAM DHR and RRC are concerned that the government and Supreme Council for Women’s assertions regarding consultation relating to the rights of women in Bahrain serves to misdirect the Committee and other stakeholders with regard to the true situation in the country: assertion is not the same as actually doing but rather suggests an ‘operationalisation’ of the human rights narrative for political ends, rather than for one related to the human rights of women.

1. The authors are likewise concerned over section *D. Cooperation with the Committee and progress made* of the state party’s report. Paragraph 42 states that the GoB has “*Ongoing coordination with civil society bodies with a view to promoting their social role in raising awareness about concepts and methodologies associated with gender balance and equal opportunity*” yet none of the organisations named above are aware of any engagement with them or indeed any individual women human rights defenders in the country.

1. The authors are concerned that the Supreme Council for Women’s rejection of the efficacy and power of quotas flies in the face of tens of countries’ experience and that its out-of-hand rejection is based, itself, on discrimination against women and a failure to implement Article 2 of the Covenant. SALAM DHR notes, too, that the GoB does not set out the basis for its assertion in, inter alia, paragraph 73 of the state party’s report, namely that:

*“[...] the Committee’s concerns about de facto or substantive equality between women and men in areas where women are underrepresented or disadvantaged, including in political life, decision-making bodies and the private sector, do not represent the reality of Bahraini women, either directly or indirectly.”*

Paragraph 74 likewise asserts that:

*“The equality of men and women in political and public life is enshrined in the Constitution and practical reality has shown that Bahraini women are not in need of a quota system as they can, on the basis of their own abilities, gain access to parliament and to municipal councils.”*

1. While it is the case that women in Bahrain have benefitted from their own and government action, the experience of scores of other countries has been that quotas advance women’s rights and equality. The GoB does not explain how Bahrain is an exception in this regard.

1. In light of documented restrictions on freedom of expression, discrmination against the Shi’a community and in respect to women themselves, SALAM DHR and RRC, set out above, express concern over the accuracy of the assertion in paragraph 48 of the state party’s report that “*The legislature has demonstrated a clear commitment to the implementation of the Convention [...]*” and the measures it sets out. In order to make such an assertion, the GoB would need show greater freedom of association, less religious discrimination and less discrimination against women.

# On the National Institution for Human Rights (NIHR) (Article 2 [reservation], 3, 4, 5, 10, 11 and others)

1. Paragraph 210 of the state party’s report asserts that the NIHR is *“fully independent and is not subject to the oversight of any other agency or institution*”. It has nevertheless rejected engagement with SALAM DHR following emails raising concerns rooted in international human rights standards, while the NIHR appears unwilling or unable to take a leading role in reducing discromination against women, including by, inter alia, combating stereotypes. Similarly, it has failed to publish statistics on complaints received by women or any measures taken upon its receipt of such complaints.

***SALAM DHR calls on the Committee to:***

* ***Ensure that the GoB details the actions taken by the NIHR so as to be clear about its status, in practice.***

# Violence against women (Articles 2 [reservation], 3, 4, 15 [reservation])

18. SALAM DHR and RRC are concerned that the Domestic Violence Act, Law 17 of 2015, and the Penal Code do not provide adequate safeguards to women’s safety and legitimise abuse. Article 353 of the Penal Code exempts rapists from prosecution and punishment if they marry their victims. In this regard, in 2016, parliament moved to repeal the entire article, but the cabinet of the GoB rejected the proposal. Article 334 of the Penal Code also reduces penalties for perpetrators of so-called honor crimes. Despite issuing the Law No. 17 of 2015 on protection against domestic violence, which identified acts of abuse in four types and allocated a definition for each, however regarding the penalties, it referred it to the general rules of the Penal Code, this is regarding the imposition of sanctions on perpetrators of domestic violence. It should be noted, too, that the Penal Code is free of any provision punishing the husband with spousal rape, although the Domestic Violence Act included the act of sexual abuse as a punishable act.

19. Paragraphs 94 and 95 of the state party’s report set out aspects of legislation relating to violence against women, viz Domestic Violence Act No. 17 of 2015. Paragraph 104 describes the December 2017 launch of the “*national statistical database on domestic violence*”, noting the involvement of the Deputy Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Executive Director of UN‑Women and others. Yet on the UN Women landing page for Bahrain, the reader faces:[[8]](#footnote-8)

*Prevalence Data on Different Forms of Violence against Women:*

*Lifetime Physical and/or Sexual Intimate Partner Violence :****Official National Statistics Not Available***

*Physical and/or Sexual Intimate Partner Violence in the last 12 months :* ***Official National Statistics Not Available***

*Lifetime Non-Partner Sexual Violence :* ***Official National Statistics Not Available***

20. On the other hand, the International Medical Journal reported:

*“A cross-sectional study included 602 Bahraini women meeting the inclusion criteria, who were asked to share any domestic abuse experience. A questionnaire comprising of 10 questions was used. The reliability of the screening tools was determined using Cronbach’s alpha test. The prevalence of domestic abuse among women attending primary health was 30.1%, while the prevalence rate of more than one type of abuse is only 3.3%. Marital status and marriage duration are associated with a significant p-value. Abused women reported that the main perpetrator was the husband 64.3%, a sibling 21.7%, the father 20.9% and the mother 17.8%. The most significant risk factors for the abuser are either having an aggressive personality (34%) or having a history of previous childhood abuse (29.1%) Domestic violence is prevalent in Bahrain. National screening and education programs should be implemented in order to protect women and minimize the consequences of domestic abuse.”[[9]](#footnote-9)*

***SALAM DHR and RRC call on the Committee to:***

* ***Find out whether the GoB has, in fact, created a national statistical database on violence against women, and if so, the current status of the database; and if it is, in fact, in operation, who it is being operated, by whom and its methodological integrity. If it does not exist as presented, the Committee should explore why the GoB asserted its existence to the UN.***

# Apparent inaction in response to trafficking by United States military personnel (Article 6)

21. With respect to implementation of Article 6 of the Covenant, while not privy to the legal arrangements relative to the presence of (sovereign) United States (or other) military personnel in Bahrain, SALAM DHR and RRC could not find any expression of concern by the GoB in respect to the findings of a five-part series of investigative pieces published on 17 June 2020 by the Sightline Media Group’s MilitaryTimes.com - also called Naval Times, entitled Tinder, Sailor, Hooker, Pimp. They are accessible on YouTube at: <https://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=Tinder%2C+Sailor%2C+Hooker%2C+Pimp> (accessed 15 November 2020). The series - Part 1: They do sex and make u money; Part 2: The Informant; Part 3: She tried to fight; Part 4: She came to my room and Part 5: Unacceptable - set out a 2017/18 investigation by Naval Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS) of a web of activity relating to human trafficking, prostitution and extortion. Naval and NCIS officials took action to end what appears to be criminal activity amongst United States 5th Fleet personnel. The Naval Times series concludes by noting that the Navy disciplined a total of 16 officials but added that specific outcomes were not made public; and that there have been no new cases since September 2018. SALAM DHR and RRC’s overarching concern in this matter is the ability of the Government of Bahrain (GoB) to fulfill its international human rights obligations, such as in relation to its obligations as a state party to the Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), to which the United States is also a state party.

***SALAM DHR and the RRC call on the Committee to:***

* ***Urge the GoB to set out what actions it took to ensure that this matter, apparently under US jurisdiction, did not have secondary ramifications for the GoB and analogous criminal activity in Bahrain itself.***

# Denial of the existence of women human rights defenders (Articles 2 [reservation], 3, 5, 11 and 15 [reservation])

22. The authors are alarmed that Paragraph 138 of the state party’s report asserts that:“*[...]there are no so-called women human rights defenders but civil society institutions regulated by law.*” According to the landing page of the United Nations’ Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders, “*Human rights defenders (HRDs) are all persons, who individually or in association with others, act to promote or protect human rights peacefully.*” Under *1. Defending human rights through professional activities – paid or voluntary*, the United Nations further states that:

*“The most obvious human rights defenders are those whose daily work specifically involves the promotion and protection of human rights, for example human rights monitors working with national human rights organizations, human rights ombudsmen or human rights lawyers.[..] However, what is most important in characterizing a person as a human rights defender is not the person’s title or the name of the organization he or she works for, but rather the human rights character of the work undertaken.”[[10]](#footnote-10)*

23. Furthermore, on the *About human rights defenders*, under *B. Who can be a human rights defender?* the United Nations further states that “*There is no specific definition of who is or can be a human rights defender.*”[[11]](#footnote-11)

***SALAM DHR and RRC call on the Committee to:***

* ***Provide information to the GoB so that they understand what human rights defenders are and that the GoB is not in a position to say who is and who is not a human rights defender, but that, rather, it, Bahraini society and the international community will know and recognise those persons by their actions and***
* ***Urge the GoB to abide by international standards in relation to human rights defenders.***

# Justification of torture and ill treatment of a woman human rights defender (Articles, 2, 3, 4, 12 and 15)

24. Paragraph 139 of the state party’s report asserts that it has “paid special attention to the allegations of some women that they were subjected to ill-treatment and intimidation by law enforcement personnel, to dismissals and suspensions, and to other forms of retribution such as detention and revocation of nationality.” Paragraphs 139 to 143 set out measures that the GoB claims it has instituted to limit the practice of torture. Paragraph 144, not addressing the claims of women whow faced torture or ill treatment, asserts that “*they were in fact found guilty of criminal offences following due process of law and a fair trial, during which they enjoyed the safeguards guaranteed by law*.” UN Special Procedures have, for example, raised the case Ebtesam Abdullhusain Ali Alsaegh (OHCHR Special Procedures Communications Database, references BHR 8 and 9/2017, 4 and 13 July 2017. The government’s 8 August 2017 response to these communications, which denounces human rights activist as terrorism, likewise consists of assertions that have not been supported by international human rights organisations: the government has, in short, sought to justify ill treatment of a human rights defenders in the name of security, despite the actions of the individual being remarkably transparent.

***SALAM DHR and RRC call on the Committee to:***

* ***Acknowledge the measures recently taken to limit the incidence of torture, but remind the GoB of 2017 recommendations made by the Committee against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, in paragraphs 9 and 23 of its 2017 Concluding Observations.[[12]](#footnote-12)***

# On Marriage and effective dependency (Articles 3, 15 and 16)

25. SALAM DHR and RRC acknowledge that GoB law stipulates that 16 is the minimum age for marriage, except where permitted by court order. This issue is addressed in the state party’s report in paragraph 201.

26. With respect to the designation of specific locations as - as described in paragraph 1999 of the state party’s report - appropriate judicial environment for Bahraini families, SALAM DHR amd RRC are concerned about the concept of women's dependency and obedience to men by imposing a “house of obedience” (Beit Al-Ta’a) on women who refrain from staying in their husband's chosen home or leaving to work if the husband does not agree to their work. The authors are concerned that if the wife refrains from “obeying” and recognizing the marital residence without legal justification, the husband may ask the judiciary to issue a ruling by forcibly returning her to the marital home and entering into “obedience” and that, in such an instance, her alimony could be deprived if she refrains from implementing a court order to “obey” her husband.

***SALAM DHR and RRC call on the Committee to:***

* ***Urge the government to enact express legal provisions requiring effective consent by females under the age of 16 with respect to marriage and that the required court order be informed by an objectively verifiable and independent assessment by social services regarding the character of consent given by the female.***
* ***Explain the legal and practical application of the “house of obedience” (Beit Al-Ta’a) with a view to identifying variation from Covenant obligations.***

# On Nationality and conferral of nationality by women (Articles 2 [reservation], 3 , 9 [reservation], and 15)

27. The authors are concerned that the GoB’s reservation to Article 9 provides for gender discrimination inherent in the Nationality Act, and which is contrary to the spirit and letter of the Covenant, including Article 15, to which the GoB has not lodged a reservation. Under the terms of the Nationality Act, a Bahrain woman who marries a non-Bahraini faces suspensions of heer citizenship. Nevertheless, this inherently discriminatory act is covered by Bahrain’s reservation to Article 9, Law No. 21 of 2014, enables female Bahrainis to retain their nationality if they acquire another nationality after obtaining the approval of the Minister of the Interior, but SALAM DHR does not have data on this practice.

28. Paragraph 158 of the state party’s report sets out the legal position regarding the conferral of nationality by women, noting that Bahraini citizenship can only be conferred by women in the absence of information about the nationality of the father. While the government asserts that this is to prevent statelessness, paragraph 158 cites the vague notion of “*preservation of State sovereignty*”in order to declare that women are not fit, of their own accord, to confer nationality. In the event of possible dual nationality in a legal framework which allows only one, it can be a matter for the child to decide upon the age of legal responsibility. This would be a principle that accords maximum freedom and rights to people while safeguarding state sovereignty.

***SALAM DHR and RRC call on the Committee to:***

* ***Urge the GoB to suspend the succession of half measures set out in the state party’s report, designed to express willingness to abide, editorially, to the terms of the Covenant, while not doing so, and to lift its reservation to Article 9 of the Covenant, and, analogously,***
* ***Urge the government to end discrimination against women by allowing them to confer Bahraini citizenship to their children by way of an amendment in the Nationality Act and any other provision relating to the children.***

# On Inheritance (Article 2 and 15 [reservations])

29. As set out in paragraph 200 of the state party’s report, inheritance is regulated by religious denomination. As in other areas of civil law, this nevertheless remains a state decision and choice and the government can choose to impose state law over non-state Shari’a practice, as it does in the case of non-Muslims. As it stands, in inheritance the male gets twice as much as females.

***SALAM DHR and RRC call on the Committee to:***

* ***Urge the GoB to actively and publicly explore with faith communities the principle of gender equality in the case of inheritance, with a view to amending state law, and in line with the GoB’s self-professed intention to limit the scope of application of its reservations to the Covenant.***

# Matters arising in and from divorce (Articles 2 [reservation], 3, 5, 15 [reservation] and 16 [reservation])

30. SALAM DHR and the RRC, echoing the Bahrain Centre for Human Rights, are concerned over restrictions imposed on women to seek divorce on the same terms as men, notably in respect to restrictions that may be linked to the marriage contract itself. This facet of a woman’s life is subject to GoB reservations on the application of the Covenant and constitutes an express decision by the GoB to facilitate discrmination against women.

31. In respect to the custody of children, SALAM DHR and RRC note that the state party’s report is silent, in the event of divorce. Bahraini family law recognizes the mother's right to custody of her children after divorce until they reach a certain age, designated as 15, where male and up to 17 or until marriage for females in respect to Sunni families; and up to 7 for a male or 9 for a female in the case of Ja’fari / Shi’a families. As put by the Bahrain Centre for Human Rights in their alternative report, beyond these thresholds, children are given the choice of guardian, while judges also have the right to remove children from the custody of mothers following a remarriage.

***SALAM DHR and RRC call on the Committee to:***

* ***Explore with the GoB the notion that a codified (secular) Personal Status Law, addressing, inter alia, divorce or child custody, could pave the way to outcomes more in line with the Covenant than in its absence.***

//end//
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