Composed of 60 eminent judges and lawyers from all regions of the world, the International Commission of Jurists promotes and protects human rights through the Rule of Law, by using its unique legal expertise to develop and strengthen national and international justice systems. Established in 1952, in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council since 1957, and active on the five continents, the ICJ aims to ensure the progressive development and effective implementation of international human rights and international humanitarian law; secure the realization of civil, cultural, economic, political and social rights; safeguard the separation of powers; and guarantee the independence of the judiciary and legal profession.
THE ICJ’S SUBMISSION TO THE UNIVERSAL PERIODIC REVIEW OF UGANDA

Introduction

1. The International Commission of Jurists (ICJ) welcomes the opportunity to contribute to the Human Rights Council’s Universal Periodic Review (UPR) of Uganda. In this submission, the ICJ brings to the attention of the Human Rights Council’s Working Group on the UPR and to the Human Rights Council issues concerning: the detrimental impact of the adoption and enforcement of the Anti-Homosexuality Act, 2014; the effect of pre-existing and extant criminalization of consensual same-sex sexual conduct;¹ and the introduction of the Prohibition of Promotion of Unnatural Sexual Practices Bill, on the respect for and the protection and realization of human rights.²

2. The organization considers that those laws violate – or would violate if adopted in the case of the above-mentioned Bill – among others, the principle of non-discrimination under article 2(2) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), by which Uganda is bound; the right to work (article 6, ICESCR) and to just and favourable conditions of work (article 7, ICESCR); and the right to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health (article 12, ICESCR).

3. The Anti-Homosexuality Act, 2014 was in force between 24 February and 1 August 2014, when the Constitutional Court declared the Act invalid, as Parliament had adopted it without the required quorum.³ As detailed below, its adoption and enforcement gave rise to numerous violations of economic, social and cultural rights.

4. Furthermore, in addition to the human rights violations arising from the continued criminalization of “carnal knowledge against the order of nature”, the ICJ considers it of paramount importance that the UPR WG and the Human Rights Council address these issues because doing so may help to prevent the enactment of a further incarnation of legislation similar to the 2014 Act. In this respect, the ICJ’s concern has been heightened by the introduction of the Prohibition of Promotion of Unnatural Sexual Practices Bill. Indeed, preparations had been underway to introduce a bill since September 2014. To the ICJ’s knowledge, the Prohibition and Promotion of Unnatural Sexual Practices Bill, in its current draft dated 29 October 2014,⁴ retains the substance of the Anti-Homosexuality Act, and introduces new elements, such as among others ineligibility to apply for adoption, guardianship or fostering of a child for persons who would be convicted under its provisions;⁵ and the inclusion in the definition of “unnatural sexual practice” of any sexual act involving transgender persons.⁶

The principle of non-discrimination

5. The long title to the Anti-Homosexuality Act defined it as “[a]n Act to prohibit any form of sexual relations between persons of the same sex; prohibit the promotion or recognition of such relations and to provide for other related matters”. This criminalization directly resulted in discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation.

6. The same is true for the Prohibition of Promotion of Unnatural Sexual Practices Bill, which according to its long title aims “to prohibit the promotion of unnatural sexual practices; to criminalise funding for purposes of promoting unnatural sexual practices; to make it an offence to exhibit unnatural sexual practices; to criminalise inducement with intent to engage in unnatural sexual practices”. Unnatural sexual practices are defined as sexual acts “between persons of the same sex, or with or between transsexual person, a sexual act with an animal and anal sex”.⁷
7. The Bill’s treatment of the above-mentioned conducts, in combination with provisions criminalizing for instance adoption “for the purpose of engaging that child in unnatural sexual practices”\(^8\) or aggravated inducement with intent to engage in unnatural sexual practice where the perpetrator “adopts, is a guardian or fosters a child for the purpose of engaging the child in unnatural sexual practices”\(^9\); not only lacks the clarity and specificity that the criminal law requires, but it also conflates and confuses criminal conduct which the State has a legitimate interest in criminalizing, with conduct protected under international human rights law. In doing so, it foments an atmosphere of stigma, prejudice and hatred in the country directed at LGBT individuals.

8. The Anti-Homosexuality Act, because of its explicitly discriminatory purpose, constituted the legislative introduction of further, formal unlawful discrimination (given the pre-existing criminalization of consensual same-sex sexual conduct) on the basis of sexual orientation and/or gender identity in Uganda’s legal order. It also constituted substantive discrimination\(^10\) as it prevented the adoption of measures to prevent, diminish and eliminate the conditions and attitudes that cause substantive or \textit{de facto} discrimination. In fact, it fanned the flames of pre-existing stigma, prejudice and hatred and thus contributed to a rise in substantive discrimination, including in the enjoyment of certain rights as elaborated below in this submission.

9. For these reasons, the ICJ considers that the Uganda’s enactment and enforcement of the Anti-Homosexuality Act and the extant criminalization of same-sex sexual conduct, as well as the introduction of the Prohibition of the Promotion of Unnatural Sexual Practices Bill, have violated, or would violate in the case of the Bill’s adoption, the principle of non-discrimination.

The right to work, including access to employment, and the enjoyment of just and favourable conditions of work, and equal treatment in the employment context

10. The criminalization of consensual same-sex sexual conduct engenders stigma and gives rise to unlawful discrimination against people based on their real or imputed sexual orientation and/or gender identity, and/or against members of their families.\(^11\) Further, it results in the cutting off of avenues to obtain redress for those whose access to or enjoyment of the right to work was impeded on those grounds. Moreover, it impedes the elaboration of specific, targeted policies aimed at realizing the right to work for people at risk of unlawful discrimination and human rights abuses because of prejudice and animus against their or their family members’ real or imputed sexual orientation and/or gender identity. The criminalization of consensual same-sex sexual conduct thus violates the core obligations under article 6 of the ICESCR.\(^12\)

11. Domestic civil society organizations have documented several recent cases of individuals whose employment was terminated explicitly on the basis of their sexual orientation or gender identity.\(^13\)

12. Beyond their effects on the right to work as defined in article 6 of the ICESCR, the Anti-Homosexuality Act (when in force) and the extant criminalization of consensual same-sex sexual conduct have sanctioned and promoted stigma, prejudice and animus against Lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) people, and have contributed to a climate in which LGBT persons are persecuted and discriminated against with impunity. In addition, they have also affected the enjoyment by LGBT persons of just and favourable conditions of work, including fair and equal remuneration and opportunity for promotion, protection against harassment,\(^14\) including sexual harassment, which includes harassment on the basis of sexual orientation and/or gender identity\(^15\) and safe and healthy working conditions, protected by article 7, ICESCR.
13. For these reasons, the ICJ considers that the Uganda’s enactment and enforcement of the Anti-Homosexuality Act and the extant criminalization of same-sex sexual conduct have violated the right to work, including access to employment, and the enjoyment of just and favourable conditions of work, and equal treatment in the employment context.

The right to the highest attainable standard of health

14. The Anti-Homosexuality Act criminalized “promotion of homosexuality”. It also criminalized “aiding and abetting homosexuality”.16

15. The Prohibition of Promotion of Unnatural Sexual Practices Bill makes those convicted liable to imprisonment of up to seven years for the offence of “promotion of unnatural sexual practices”. In addition, acting as an accomplice to, or attempting to engage in, any of the above activities can lead to criminal liability.17

16. Further, the Prohibition of Promotion of Unnatural Sexual Practices Bill also sets out to hold criminally liable “[a] person who makes a representation through publication, exhibition, cinematography, information technology or by whatever means, of a person engaged in real or fictitious unnatural sexual practices”.18

17. As the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights has clarified, the right to health contains a number of interrelated and essential elements, which include, among other things, non-discrimination (i.e., “health facilities, good and services must be accessible to all, especially the most vulnerable or marginalized sections of the population, in law and in fact, without discrimination on any of the prohibited grounds”) and “information accessibility” (i.e., “the right to seek, receive and impart information and ideas concerning health issues”).19

18. The same Committee has noted that, “[b]y virtue of article 2.2 and article 3, the Covenant [ICESCR] proscribes any discrimination in access to health care and underlying determinants of health, as well as to means and entitlements for their procurement, on the grounds of ... sexual orientation ..., which has the intention or effect of nullifying or impairing the equal enjoyment or exercise of the right to health”.20

19. Guaranteeing that the right to health will be exercised without discrimination of any kind constitutes an immediate obligation for Uganda.21 The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights has identified a number of specific legal obligations stemming from the right to the highest attainable standard of health, including, among other things, “refraining from denying or limiting equal access for all persons”; “abstaining from enforcing discriminatory practices as a State policy”; refraining “from limiting access to contraceptives and other means of maintaining sexual and reproductive health, from censoring, withholding or intentionally misrepresenting health-related information, including sexual education and information”; establishing a public health infrastructure that provides for sexual and reproductive health services; and “supporting people in making informed choices about their health”.22

20. As the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health has affirmed, the “health-related impact of discrimination based on sexual conduct and orientation is far-reaching, and prevents affected individuals from gaining access to other economic, social and cultural rights. In turn, the infringement of other human rights impacts on the realization of the right to health, such as by impeding access to employment or housing”. The Special Rapporteur stated that “[t]hese infringements ultimately undermine the inherent dignity of persons upon which the international human rights framework is based”.23
21. The Anti-Homosexuality Act violated the right to the highest attainable standard of health of persons who engage in consensual same-sex sexual conduct, as it impeded their access to health facilities, goods and services on a non-discriminatory basis. The criminalization of “aiding and abetting” of homosexuality jeopardized the relationship between doctor and patient, as the provision of scientific, relevant medical information could lead to charges under this section. The same will be true for the Prohibition of Promotion of Unnatural Sexual Practices Bill if it were to pass into law. In jurisdictions in which consensual same-sex sexual conduct is criminalized, such as Uganda, affected individuals are much more likely to be unable to gain access to effective health services, and preventive health measures that should be tailored to these communities are suppressed.26

22. Furthermore, the criminalization of homosexuality prevents the elaboration and operation of a health strategy that addresses the specific needs of persons who engage in consensual same-sex sexual conduct.

23. The Anti-Homosexuality Act violated the right to health not just of those who engage in consensual same-sex sexual conduct but also of the population in general, in restricting access to information about sexuality, as providing such services could be classified as “promoting homosexuality”. The Act thus caused the withholding of health-related information and, as a result of this, Uganda failed to comply with its duty to support people in making informed choices. In this regard, the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health has also affirmed that “[l]aws restricting information about sexual and reproductive health and which censor discussions of homosexuality in the classroom fuel stigma and discrimination”.27

24. The criminalization of consensual same-sex sexual conduct and the Anti-Homosexuality Act have also undermined Uganda’s fight against HIV/AIDS. Men who have sex with men (MSM) have been identified as one of the categories of the population that is “most at risk” of HIV.28 However, as stated by the Uganda AIDS Commission, the criminalization of consensual same-sex sexual conduct in Uganda has meant that there are “virtually no tailored services available for MSM”, and that “the minimal services such as sensitization and awareness are mainly provided by CSOs [civil society organizations] and no direct service at all for MSM is provided by government facilities”.29 The fact that MSM are highly marginalized in Uganda precludes them from easy access to HIV/AIDS services, which leads to a heightened risk of HIV transmission and infection.30 Although the AIDS Commission’s assessment pertains to the period prior to the entry into force of the Anti-Homosexuality Act, the latter compounded these problems, as it built on and added to pre-existing discrimination, stigma and prejudice.

25. In addition, the Act also criminalized the provision of information and outreach such as teaching and promoting safe consensual same-sex conduct among men. It is generally recognized that “stigma, discrimination and violations of other human rights are major barriers to effective national responses to HIV” and that “[t]he criminalization of people who are at a higher risk of infection, such as men who have sex with men … drives them underground and away from HIV services”, which “increases their vulnerability to HIV, as well as to stigma, discrimination, marginalization and violence”.31 On the other hand, quality HIV and AIDS education embodies a number of crosscutting principles, including being rights-based, inclusive and scientifically accurate. Further, “[i]t is delivered in safe and secure learning environments that are free from stigma, discrimination … [and] homophobia”.32

26. Furthermore, the Anti-Homosexuality Act specifically stigmatized those living with HIV, by characterizing HIV-positive status as an aggravating circumstance in the commission of the
offence.\(^{33}\) The Act also mandated forced HIV testing.\(^{34}\)

27. More generally, when consensual same-sex sexual conduct is criminalized -- as it was under the 2014 Act and remains the case under the Penal Code 1950 -- patients may feel inhibited to share their sexual history with their doctor, which, in turn, may hinder their ability to recount their medical history and ultimately accurate diagnoses. Thus in general criminalization of consensual same-sex conduct detrimentally affects access to appropriate and adequate treatment and care.

28. The persecutory nature of the Anti-Homosexuality Act, of the continued criminalization of same-sex sexual conduct and of the introduction of the Prohibition of Promotion of Unnatural Sexual Practices Bill have had negative consequences for mental health too, as criminalization perpetuates stigma, through the reinforcement of existing prejudices and stereotypes.\(^{35}\) This can have a severe negative impact on the self-regard and mental well-being of persons who engage in consensual same-sex sexual conduct.\(^{36}\)

29. For these reasons, the ICJ considers that the Uganda’s enactment and enforcement of the Anti-Homosexuality Act and the extant criminalization of consensual same-sex sexual conduct have contributed to unequal access to health services and have violated the right to the highest attainable standard of health, including by restricting access to relevant health-related information, in particular for those who engage in consensual same-sex sexual conduct.

**Recommendations**

30. The ICJ therefore calls upon the Working Group and the Human Rights Council to recommend to the Ugandan authorities the following.

*Concerning the principle of non-discrimination*

I. amend legislation and repeal Section 145(a) of the Penal Code Act 1950 (Chapter 120), which criminalizes “carnal knowledge of any person against the order of nature” and is used to persecute persons engaging in consensual same-sex sexual conduct;

II. withdraw the Prohibition of Promotion of Unnatural Sexual Practices Bill; and

III. introduce concrete measure aimed at eliminating formal and substantive discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and/or gender identity.

*Concerning the right to work, including access to employment, and the enjoyment of just and favourable conditions of work, and equal treatment in the employment context*

IV. take measures in order to realize access to employment, under safe, healthy, just and favourable conditions of work, and equal treatment in the employment context, taking particular account of the challenges faced by those perceived as engaging in consensual same-sex sexual conduct; and

V. improve access to justice for those seeking redress for violations of the above-mentioned rights and provide remedies for persons who face or have faced discrimination in the enjoyment of the right to work, under safe, healthy, just and favourable conditions, on the basis of their real or perceived sexual orientation and/or gender identity.

*Concerning the right to the highest attainable standard of health*

VI. take tailored measures in order to ensure the right to the highest attainable standard of health for persons who engage in consensual same-sex sexual conduct; and
VII. take measures to improve access to HIV/AIDS services, including by ensuring access to and the provision of health-related information to those who engage in consensual same-sex conduct.
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