SUBMISSION TO THE UN COMMITTEE ON THE RIGHTS OF THE CHILD

2021 DAY OF GENERAL DISCUSSION
CHILDREN'S RIGHTS AND ALTERNATIVE CARE
I. Reporting Organisation

Border Violence Monitoring Network (BVMN) is a coalition of organisations working to document illegal pushbacks, collective expulsions and police violence along the EU’s external borders since the network’s formulation in 2016. Our reporting countries include Croatia, Greece, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbia, Slovenia and Turkey. The collection of data on illegal pushbacks and police violence is done by a consortium of independent field volunteers who are part of or cooperate with humanitarian support groups united through the Border Violence Monitoring Network.

II. Executive Summary

Summary of Findings

BVMN attests that pushbacks often result in unnecessary separation of children from their families. Moreover, when children are already unavoidably separated, as is the case with unaccompanied minors, pushbacks systematically and by design, deny children the right to access procedures, thus hindering their access to family reunification processes, appropriate protection systems and deny them their right to “be provided with alternative care”.[1]

BVMN first demonstrates that pushbacks separate families and, due to the level of violence and inhuman treatment used, damage families’ abilities to care for children. BVMN then details how pushbacks deny children access to procedure, including family reunification processes and protection mechanisms. Finally BVMN will highlight that pushbacks often include arbitrary detention. BVMN identifies pushbacks as a root cause and driver of family separation and an inhumane and illegal response to children who have been unavoidably separated.[2]

Defining terminology

“Pushback” is a common term to denote the action of a State forcibly returning an individual or a group across borders to another country without due process and subsequently preventing or restricting them access to protection mechanisms. Pushbacks encompass the legal concept of non-refoulement which are implicitly prohibited under Article 3, 6, 20 and 37 of the CRC[3] and are explicitly prohibited by General Comment 6 of the CRC.[4]

Throughout this submission we use the term “migrant” as an all-encompassing term for people-on-the-move whose legal status could not be determined at the time of reporting.
III. Pushbacks disrupting intact families through separation and death

There is a plethora of legislation that is designed to protect families and prevent separation. For instance, the right to family life is drawn from rights accorded to children under international law, including Articles 3, 5, 9, 10, 18 and 20 CRC. Such rights include both positive and negative obligations. For example, the CRC requires that: priority should be given to support children’s parents and family to enable them to care adequately and prevent unnecessary separation, including “necessary protection and assistance” and that “States must respect the responsibilities, rights and duties of parents or, where applicable, the members of the extended family or community”. It is therefore widely accepted that States should not only prevent the unnecessary separation of children from their parents but also provide support to families in their caregiving role. Yet, what makes such legislation ineffective in practice is its lack of application at the borders of BVMN’s reporting countries. Pushbacks are an acute example of a systemic disregard for legislation and policies which are designed to strengthen families and prevent separation.

‘pushbacks, when resulting in family separation, constitute a violation of Article 9(1) CRC and place States who perform them in variance with basic norms of the Rights of the Child which require “that all necessary measures should be taken to prevent the separation of the child from her/his family”. For example, in 2019 BVMN recorded a testimony of two 16 and 20-year-olds who were apprehended in Kastav, Croatia. They had left their larger transit group, which included the respondent’s younger brother, to buy food in the nearby town. When questioned by the police as to the location of the transit group, and fearing something bad would happen to them, the respondent explained to BVMN, “I know where my brother is but I am scared to tell them”. Consequently, the respondent was separated from his younger minor brother and at the time of reporting they remained separated.

Death to family members

During pushbacks, families and children are frequently exposed to violence, with severe instances resulting in death to members of the pushback group. This places pushbacks both in variance with basic Alternative Care standards, as they result in the death and therefore the destruction of family units, but also Article 19 CRC, which states that children must be protected from all forms of violence, abuse and neglect in all settings.

In 2019, BVMN recorded various testimonies recalling deaths during pushbacks. For example, two testimonies, possibly of the same event, reported that during a pushback from Slovenia to Bosnia a 19-year-old drowned in the river, ‘He couldn’t get out anymore and drowned in front of his friend’s eyes without them being able to help him’. In 2020, BVMN continued to record testimonies of people dying during pushbacks. For example, a respondent said how people “died like insects” during a pushback from Greece to Turkey. The group was abandoned by Greek border forces on an island in the Maritsa River and later died there. Likewise, in May 2020 BVMN partner Josoor was contacted by the mother of a 16-year-old boy from Pakistan who had crossed to Greece with a larger transit group in April and was pushed back. Instead of being pushed back to the Turkish side of the Evros/Meric river, the Greek authorities abandoned the group on an islet in the river. One group member was able to hide his phone and the boy was able to
call his mother from the islet. He told her that most of the others would swim to the Turkish side but he and two others were not able to swim and were desperate about what to do. She never heard from him again.[17]

In 2021, BVMN have continued to record testimonies of people dying during pushbacks.[18] For example, one man explained “[the officer] meant to let us die, to drown in the river” after someone in his migratory group drowned after being pushed back across the Evros river from Greece to Turkey.[19]

The fear and threat of drowning is frequently mentioned in testimonies at the Evros/Merîç/Marîtsa River, both at the Greek-Turkish and Bulgarian-Turkish border.[20] Multiple pushback testimonies recount Greek officers using unstable dinghies to take groups across the river to Turkey.[21] Others report on the difficulty of swimming across the river after being dropped in the middle, due to the strength of the current.[22] A trend emerged in 2020 in which Greek authorities purposefully push groups not to the Turkish shore but to islets in the river, leaving them stranded for days.[23]

Children and their families are also regularly put at risk of drowning in pushbacks on the Aegean Sea, even after reaching Greek land, as Greek authorities abandon them at sea in life rafts.[24]

BVMN asserts that pushbacks represent an antithesis to all accepted notions of alternative care as well as unnecessarily separating families by causing death and family separation.

Torture, trauma and the inability to fulfil familial care

There is a multitude of legislation and guidance that outline states’ positive obligations to ensure that families are adequately equipped to care for their children, carry out their parental duties and avoid the need for children to go into alternative care.[25] However, with pushbacks, not only are these obligations absent, the actions of state actors contribute to parents’ inability to perform their parental responsibilities.

Analysis of BVMN’s testimony database, revealed that in 2020 up to 85% of pushbacks across all reporting countries contain one or more instance of torture, inhuman or degrading treatment.[26] For instance, 37% of all testimonies contained the use of forced undressing;[27] 27% contained inhuman treatment in police vehicles;[28] and 23% of reports included the use of a firearm, including assault with the firearm, using firearms to hold mock executions and discharging the firearm at or in close proximity to the victim.[29]

Experiencing pushbacks, and suffering torture, inhuman and degrading treatment can have severe and long-lasting impacts, including trauma and PTSD.[30] The impact of trauma extends beyond the harm caused to the individual and can negatively impact the family unit. Caregivers and children suffering from the impacts of torture may cause strain on the family unit, perhaps even leaving some unable to effectively carry out their parental responsibilities and provide a safe and nurturing environment for children. For example, parents report “the way that children have a heightened fear of the dark, have difficulty sleeping, or suddenly wake up crying during the night”.[31] Moreover, pushbacks may well return people to persecution and human rights violations, thus challenging families’ abilities to care for children.
The UN Guidelines For the Alternative Care of Children highlights that, “States must take all necessary measures to prevent such practices [torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment] and ensure they are punishable by law”. During pushbacks children are both witness to and victims of violence, torture and inhuman and degrading treatment. Taking Croatia as a case study, BVMN found that from 2018 to 2020 an average of 40% of pushback groups contained children. In 2020, BVMN identified that 88% of all pushbacks involving children contained one or more forms of torture or inhuman treatment. For example, in 2021, BVMN recorded a testimony where a three-year-old and ten-year-old watched as a Croatian police officer held a knife to their father's throat threatening to kill him and later hit him on the head with the knife's handle. When the children started crying they were told to “shut up” by one of the officers. In too many instances, children are themselves victims of violence and inhuman and degrading treatment, including forced undressing and beatings.

In D.D. v. Spain (No. 4/2016) the Committee held that States are required “to take all necessary measures to identify children as being unaccompanied or separated at the earliest possible stage, including at the border”. Failing to do so before refusing entry would violate the best interest of the child (Article 3) and the right to freedom from torture (Article 37). As best interest assessments require access to territory, access constitutes a prerequisite to the initial assessment process by the authorities. This is in line with basic standards for Alternative Care which require States to ensure “that all decisions, initiatives and approaches related to children without parental care are made on a case-by-case basis […] grounded in the best interests and rights of the child”. In a migratory context, this requires “States to establish rigorous screening procedures through national and local authorities […]”, which include child protection authorities being “promptly informed and assigned to participate in procedures for the determination of the best interests of the child once an unaccompanied or separated child crosses an international border”.

Families and children cross borders to seek safety and reunite with family. Yet, they are frequently pushed back from, and within, Europe's borders. The systematic use of pushbacks, which by design deny children access to the territory, an assessment of their best interest, their identification as unaccompanied and/or separated child, access to protection systems and access to family reunification processes, ipso facto violates Articles 3, and 9 of the CRC and Alternative Care standards highlighted in paragraph 19. Additionally, pushbacks of unaccompanied children violate the right to special protection for children without families as stipulated by Article 20 CRC. Moreover, when unaccompanied children are pushed back, their access to family reunification processes are stifled, thus forcing them to remain alone and vulnerable.

BVMN have reported multiple pushback testimonies from children. One incident in 2018 recounted four unaccompanied children from Afghanistan who were beaten by Croatian officers and pushed back to Serbia. A similar pushback occurred in 2019 where three unaccompanied minors were severely beaten by Croatian officers, “from closed fists lasting approximately 5 minutes”. Another 17-year-old unaccompanied minor from Palestine explained how he was violently pushed back from Hungary to Serbia in 2020 despite his expression to seek asylum. In 2021, a 15 year old Afghan minor was subjected to a chain pushback from Croatia to Slovenia, then from Slovenia to Serbia. They were deprived of food and water by officers, despite not having eaten for two days.

IV. Appropriate ways to respond to separation where it is unavoidable including identification of unaccompanied or separated children and access to procedure.
Under the Dublin III regulation, family is considered the most crucial criteria for determining which EU member state should be responsible for examining an asylum application. When any family member, be that a child or adult, is pushed back, access to these protection mechanisms are prohibited, which in turn prolongs, if not prevents, the reunification of families and forces children to remain unaccompanied. Therefore pushbacks are a leading factor which causes and prolongs family separation.

V. Use of extralegal detention of minors during pushbacks

An integral element to the modus operandi of pushbacks is arbitrary detention, that is neither prescribed by law or reviewable by an administrative or judicial body. Such detention often entails the use of blacksites. 38% of BVMN testimonies involve inhuman treatment conditions in detention including mass forced undressing and violent beatings. Not only does such detention represent a disregard for appropriate care models, it is in variance with international law including Article 37 and 3 of the CRC. In 2019, the UN Advocacy Group on Children Without Parental Care was deeply concerned that children are placed in ‘unregistered, unregulated alternative care in violation of international standards [...] without proper assessment, care plans, and review processes in place’. Likewise, BVMN is deeply concerned many children are placed in unregistered and unregulated detention, without review processes, a clearly unsuitable arrangement for unaccompanied and separated children.

The Global Study concluded that, “States should adopt all necessary measures in order to eradicate any form of immigration detention of children and families”. This is not only true for regulated detention which “for children can never be considered as a measure of last resort” but is especially pertinent for cases of arbitrary detention.
A. The EU border monitoring mechanism strengthens “national and cross-border child protection systems that have the capacity to assess the unique needs of vulnerable children and families, determine the best interests of the child, make referrals to local resources [...]”.[54]

B. State parties refrain from implementing any measures, including pushbacks, that adversely affect the best interest of children, especially within the context of migration and border control.

C. If a child is travelling unaccompanied or in the company of adults, the child's best interest takes precedence over a States migration management objectives.

D. Children-on-the-move, whether they be unaccompanied, separated or with family, are identified and granted access to essential services and protection mechanisms.

E. Appropriate legislative mechanisms are fully implemented to prevent forced separation of migrants and refugees.

F. To ensure family unity, the practice of pushbacks must be immediately ceased.

G. The Border Violence Monitoring Network respectfully recommends that the Committee implement a future Day of General Discussion on the rights of children-on-the-move. We cordially suggest this includes, but is not limited to, the issue of the pushback, collective expulsion and refoulement of children.
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