Ending legalised violence against children

More than half of UN member states have prohibited all corporal punishment or are committed to doing so

Following up the UN Secretary General’s Study on Violence against Children
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Note on facts and figures

The Global Initiative bases its analyses on a total of 198 states, all states parties to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child except Holy See, plus Taiwan, the US and Western Sahara. But note that the scales illustration on page 3 refers only to the 193 UN member states.

Child population figures are from UNICEF 2013 and, where no UNICEF figures are available, World Population Prospects 2010 (0-19) (Western Sahara) and Dept of Household Registration, Ministry of Interior, 2013 (Taiwan).
It is exciting to hear from the Global Initiative that we have reached a new tipping point: more than half of all UN member states have either prohibited all corporal punishment of children (48 states), or clearly committed to do so (another 52 states – making a total of 100). Now we have the additional context of full global commitment to new Sustainable Development Goals and targets – including the adopted target 16.2 to end “all forms of violence against children” by 2030: this has to include the prohibition and elimination of violent punishment of children, the most common and pervasive form of violence against them in the family – and in many states also in schools and other settings.

The Committee on the Rights of the Child has been consistently raising prohibition as a human rights obligation since it started to examine states’ reports back in 1993. And the African Committee of Experts on the Rights and Welfare of the Child is also addressing the issue in its engagement with state parties to the African Children’s Charter: hopefully this will lead to more progress across the continent, where seven states have achieved prohibition and another 14 have made a commitment to do so.

Nearly 10 years ago, the UN Secretary General’s Study on Violence against Children mapped out how far we have yet to travel to build a world free from violence against children. One of the central recommendations of the Study was to ensure that children enjoy full legal protection and to prohibit by law all forms of violence against children, including corporal punishment. It is heartening to see that, in the period since the Study’s submission to the General Assembly, there has been steadily growing progress.

As the 10th anniversary of the UN Secretary General’s Study approaches, we must all endeavour to ensure that this momentum continues to build. In this connection, it is important to recall that world leaders recently agreed a new sustainable development agenda, which commits all states to end all manifestations of violence against children, leaving no child behind. In doing so, states quite rightly affirmed that human progress and sustainable development cannot be achieved while violence against children persists. It is my hope that the start of the process of implementation of the development agenda will provide a renewed impetus that will bring us closer to an end to violence against children, everywhere and at all times!

These annual reports from the Global Initiative rightly note the incremental progress towards universal prohibition and elimination of corporal punishment. But the reports also confirm that corporal punishment remains the most common form of violence against children and that a small minority of states are still prepared shamelessly to defend the practice and its legality – in the Universal Periodic Review and other UN contexts. This is such a blatant denial of the very basis of human rights – human dignity. Denying children full respect for their dignity and physical integrity and equal protection under the law makes a mockery of the obligations implied by ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child. 2016 will mark the 10th anniversary of the presentation of the first comprehensive global study on violence against children to the UN General Assembly. There should be faster progress to celebrate.
Progress – and lack of – towards universal prohibition

The year 2015 has witnessed a milestone in progress towards universal prohibition of corporal punishment of children: now, more than half of UN member states have achieved prohibition in all settings or are committed to doing so. Since we published our global report for 2014, four states – Andorra, Benin, Ireland and Peru – have prohibited all corporal punishment, including in the home, bringing the total number of prohibiting states to 48. There are now 52 other states where Governments have made a commitment to prohibiting corporal punishment in all settings; in many, draft laws or bills are under discussion which would achieve prohibition.

But despite these significant advances, progress is not smooth. In some states, laws have been enacted which reassert justifications and authorisations for corporal punishment of children. In others, draft laws or bills which include prohibition have been amended or dropped at the last minute and efforts must be redoubled to reinstate prohibiting provisions. Laws against family or gender-based violence continue to be enacted which ignore the most common form of violence against girls and boys – violent punishment by parents and carers.

There are still 150 states where children can be lawfully hit in the family home, 143 where violent punishment remains lawful in alternative care and in day care settings, 71 where it is not prohibited in all schools and 62 lacking protection for children in penal institutions. In 36 states, children found to have committed an offence may be sentenced to corporal punishment under criminal, religious and/or traditional law; and in 21 states corporal punishment is not prohibited in any setting. Just 10% of the world’s children live in states where the law recognises their right to protection from all violent punishment and to equal protection from assault.

States prohibiting corporal punishment in all settings
Albania; Andorra; Argentina; Austria; Benin; Bolivia; Brazil; Bulgaria; Cabo Verde; Congo, Republic of; Costa Rica; Croatia; Cyprus; Denmark; Estonia; Finland; Germany; Greece; Honduras; Hungary; Iceland; Ireland; Israel; Kenya; Latvia; Liechtenstein; Luxembourg; Malta; Netherlands; New Zealand; Nicaragua; Norway; Peru; Poland; Portugal; Republic of Moldova; Romania; San Marino; South Sudan; Spain; Sweden; FYR Macedonia; Togo; Tunisia; Turkmenistan; Ukraine; Uruguay; Venezuela

States committed to prohibition
Afghanistan; Algeria; Angola; Armenia; Azerbaijan; Bangladesh; Belize; Bhutan; Bosnia and Herzegovina; Burkina Faso; Chile; Comoros; Cuba; Dominican Republic; Ecuador; El Salvador; Fiji; Georgia; Guinea-Bissau; India; Kiribati; Kyrgyzstan; Lithuania; Marshall Islands; Mauritius; Mexico; Mongolia; Montenegro; Morocco; Nepal; Niger; Pakistan; Palau; Panama; Papua New Guinea; Paraguay; Philippines; Rwanda; Samoa; Sao Tome and Principe; Serbia; Slovakia; Slovenia; South Africa; Sri Lanka; Tajikistan; Thailand; Timor-Leste; Turkey; Uganda; Zambia; Zimbabwe
The rough path of progress towards universal prohibition is illustrated by developments in 2015. Most encouragingly, states are discussing draft laws and bills which would achieve prohibition in all settings, including for example in Haiti, Lithuania, Montenegro and Mauritius.

In other states, positive developments strengthen legal recognition of children’s rights but fall short of prohibiting corporal punishment in all settings, including Antigua and Barbuda (Child Justice Bill), Guyana (Juvenile Justice Bill), Malaysia (Children’s Bill), Seychelles (Education (Amendment) Bill) and Uganda (Children (Amendment) Bill). In Trinidad and Tobago, the Children Act 2012 came into force, prohibiting corporal punishment in all settings outside the home.

But there have also been negative developments. The Maldivian Penal Code 2014 came into in force, authorising parents, teachers and others to use force to punish children and courts to sentence child offenders to lashing for certain offences under Islamic law; in Singapore the Court of Appeal ruled that judicial caning is not unconstitutional; the draft Federal Constitution in the Solomon Islands expressly provides for “reasonable chastisement”; the Zimbabwian Constitutional Court suspended a High Court ruling against judicial corporal punishment, thus allowing sentences of caning to continue to be imposed on children.

This rocky road towards reform makes it all the more important to build on the growing – and now majority – support for prohibition among UN member states.
Drafting prohibiting legislation – and using immediate opportunities to promote it

Enacting legislation to prohibit all corporal punishment of children in all settings is an immediate obligation under the Convention on the Rights of the Child and other international and regional human rights treaties. As at December 2015, 150 states had not fulfilled this obligation. In every one of those states, the settings where prohibition is still to be achieved have been identified – as described in the individual country reports prepared and maintained by the Global Initiative at www.endcorporalpunishment.org. It is vital that the next steps, i.e. the preparation of draft laws and bills which will achieve prohibition in each of these states, are taken as a matter of urgency, so that concrete proposals can be used to inform advocacy for prohibition.

Drafting laws which prohibit corporal punishment

Prohibition can be achieved by amending existing legislation or enacting new laws or a combination of both. The key questions that must be answered in drafting the prohibiting law(s) are: (1) will this new law, once enacted, send a clear message that all forms of corporal punishment are prohibited and that there are no exceptions to this rule, and (2) does this new law ensure there are no legal loopholes which could be used by those seeking to justify or defend some level of violent punishment of children? The answer should be YES to both questions!

Ensuring the law sends a clear message means, for example, avoiding so called “compromise” laws – where some but not all corporal punishment is prohibited, or where some but not all children are protected. It means avoiding prohibiting only corporal punishment considered to be harmful or injurious – because in spite of evidence to the contrary it is not uncommon for people to argue that some corporal punishment is not harmful or injurious (or is not abusive or not violent, etc). It means understanding that prohibition of “physical violence” or “all forms of violence” or “physical abuse” or “cruel punishment” etc will not be understood as including all corporal punishment: because of the deep-rooted and widespread acceptance of physical punishment of children, it is rarely perceived as violent or abusive unless it reaches some level of severity.

Leaving no legal loopholes means repealing all laws which authorise or regulate corporal punishment, for example in schools, care institutions and the criminal justice system, and explicitly repealing all provisions – whether in written law or only in common or case law – that constitute a defence to charges of assault or cruelty in cases of corporal punishment. The importance of the latter cannot be overstated. When laws provide for – and when courts have recognised – a “right to discipline”, a “right of correction”, a “right to administer reasonable punishment”, a right of “reasonable chastisement” and so on, they have done so specifically to ensure that violence against children imposed in the guise of “discipline” does not amount to criminal assault, even though it would be considered as such if the victim was an adult. This is hugely symbolic of children’s low status in society – and rectifying this by repealing legal defences is perhaps the most potent symbol of a state’s recognition of children as fully human and as holders of human rights.
Using immediate opportunities for law reform to achieve prohibition

The review, revision and drafting of laws relating to children, including laws on the family, education and juvenile justice, present opportunities to promote and enact prohibition of corporal punishment. The revision and enactment of criminal and civil codes are also key opportunities for prohibiting corporal punishment. As at December 2015, opportunities like these exist in at least 118 states: in 23, the draft laws/bills under discussion include or are reported to include prohibition of all corporal punishment; in 12, prohibition is being considered only in settings outside the home. Urgent action is needed to ensure that prohibition is drafted and promoted in the context of reforms in all states.

Ireland’s repeal of the “reasonable chastisement” defence – leading the way

When Ireland achieved prohibition of corporal punishment in all settings in November 2015, it did so by explicitly repealing the common law defence of “reasonable chastisement”. This defence had long existed in common law, and had been confirmed in the Children Act 1908, article 37 of which stated: “Nothing in this Part of this Act [on prevention of cruelty to children] shall be construed to take away or affect the right of any parents, teacher or other person having the lawful control or change of a child or young person to administer punishment to such child or young person.” The 1908 Act was replaced by the Children Act 2001, which did not include this right to administer punishment but did not explicitly repeal the defence of “reasonable chastisement”, which remained in common law. The defence was finally removed by the Children First Act 2015, which inserted a new article 24A into the Offences Against the Person (Non-Fatal) Act 1997:

“The common law defence of reasonable chastisement is abolished….”

Speaking during the final stages of debate in the Seanad (upper house of the Irish Parliament), Senator Jillian van Turnhout, who tabled the original amendment, captured the historic symbolism of this reform:

“This ancient defence of reasonable chastisement is not an Irish invention. It came to us from English common law. Through its colonial past, England has been responsible for rooting this legal defence in over 70 countries and territories throughout the world. In England, Wales and Northern Ireland, the reasonable punishment defence still allows parents and some other carers to justify common assault on children. In Scotland, there is another variation, namely the defence of justifiable assault. In this action being taken today, the [Irish] Government is putting children first and providing leadership, which will hopefully give confidence to the Government at Westminster, the devolved UK administrations and other countries across the globe to discard these archaic and disreputable defences and give full respect to the dignity of children….”

Urgent action is needed to abolish “reasonable chastisement” and similar defences derived from English law and enshrined in written legislation and/or common law in the following countries:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Afghanistan</th>
<th>Cameroon</th>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
<th>Myanmar</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anguilla</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigua and Barbuda</td>
<td>Cayman Islands</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td>St Helena, Ascension and Tristan da Cunha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>Isle of Man</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>St Kitts and Nevis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>Niue</td>
<td>St Lucia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Jersey</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>St Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Falkland Islands</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>Swaziland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>Tonga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda</td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Gibraltar</td>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Virgin Islands</td>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei</td>
<td>Guernsey</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darussalam</td>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Montserrat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ending legalised violence against children
Human rights – the rationale and foundation for prohibiting and eliminating corporal punishment

In 2015, Somalia became the 196th state party to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child, leaving the US as the only state in the world not to have ratified the Convention. This most widely ratified treaty, now in its 26th year, imposes clear obligations on states to prohibit by law all corporal punishment of children, including in their family homes, and to ensure it is eliminated in practice. In monitoring implementation of the Convention by states parties, the Committee systematically reviews progress towards prohibiting corporal punishment and has to date made almost 400 observations/recommendations on the issue to around 190 states.

Other international treaty bodies recommend prohibition and elimination of corporal punishment to states under their respective treaties, including the Human Rights Committee, the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Committee Against Torture and the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women.

The issue is also pursued at the regional level, through the jurisprudence of the European Committee of Social Rights, the European Court of Human Rights, the African Committee of Experts on the Rights and Welfare of the Child, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights.

For full details and analyses of all aspects of the human rights imperative to prohibit corporal punishment of children, see the Global Initiative website www.endcorporalpunishment.org.

Increasing human rights pressure in 2015

Pressure on states from international and regional human rights bodies to prohibit corporal punishment of children has increased through 2015:

- **Mounting pressure from UN treaty bodies** – over 30 states received recommendations to prohibit corporal punishment, including 24 states receiving recommendations from the Committee on the Rights of the Child.

- **States held accountable for their progress (and lack of progress) by regional human rights bodies** – the African Committee of Experts on the Rights and Welfare of the Child systematically raised the issue in states being examined during the year; the European Committee of Social Rights, in issuing its decisions on a series of collective complaints brought by the Association for the Protection of Children (APPROACH) Ltd, found that France, Ireland, Slovenia, Belgium and the Czech Republic were in breach of article 17(1) of the Revised European Social Charter because corporal punishment of children is not prohibited (Ireland went on the achieve prohibition, see page 6).

- **Prohibition of corporal punishment reviewed in the UPR** – the issue was raised with 41 of the 42 states reviewed in 2015; of the 26 states which received recommendations to prohibit corporal punishment, 12 accepted these recommendations, 5 rejected them, 3 noted the recommendations, 1 gave an unclear response, and 5 have yet to respond.

- **Obligation to prohibit reiterated in revised standards** – the revised Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the “Nelson Mandela Rules”) adopted by the UN confirm that corporal punishment must not be used as a disciplinary measure; the revised CPT standards for places where persons are deprived of their liberty, adopted by the European Committee for the Prevention of Torture and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, confirm that corporal punishment “must be strictly prohibited”.

Ending violent punishment – critical to sustainable development

The Sustainable Development Goals
This year saw the historic adoption of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. On 25-27 September 2015, world leaders adopted 17 Sustainable Development Goals and 169 targets falling under them and committed to working for their full implementation by 2030. In target 16.2 of the agenda, states have committed to work to “End abuse, exploitation, trafficking and all forms of violence against and torture of children.”

Implementation of the agenda will be monitored through global indicators for each target, which are expected to be adopted in March 2016. An indicator on the prevalence of violent punishment of children has been proposed and is supported by UNICEF and many major INGOs: “Percentage of children aged 0-17 years who experienced any physical punishment by caregivers in the past month.” Fulfilment of this indicator, which monitors the prevalence of the most common form of violence against children, is crucial not only for target 16.2 but also for other SDG targets including those on ending violence against women and girls, eliminating discrimination, reducing health risks and providing safe and inclusive education for all.

For more information, see the Global Initiative’s briefing “Ending violent punishment of children – a foundation of a world free from fear and violence”, available at www.endcorporalpunishment.org.

Promoting prohibition and elimination of violent punishment of children in the development aid context
Countries that have achieved prohibition of all corporal punishment are well placed to lead by example and support universal prohibition in various ways. The Global Initiative believes that the negotiation and granting of development aid – in particular for school and health systems – is one context in which prohibition and elimination of corporal punishment should be legitimately and urgently pursued.

Promoting prohibition of all corporal punishment is a logical pursuit for donor states which have achieved a full ban, in order to address the incompatibility with a rights-based approach of financially supporting, for example, school systems in which children are still subjected to lawful corporal punishment, or supporting health systems in countries in which corporal punishment in the family and other settings has not been challenged.

“To achieve the world free from fear and violence to which we all aspire, we must build societies in which violent punishment of children is not legally or socially tolerated. The acceptance by states of SDG target 16.2 on ending all forms of violence against children is a breakthrough; fulfilling it is fundamental to the achievement of other SDG targets on health, education, violence against women and equality. Now it is essential to adopt indicators that specifically cover prohibition and elimination of violent punishment, acknowledged to be the most common form of violence against children.”

Paulo Sérôgio Pinheiro, the Independent Expert who led the UN Secretary General’s Study on Violence against Children
Experience of corporal punishment in childhood has been linked to a range of negative health, developmental and behavioural outcomes in children, many persisting into adulthood. The legality and social acceptance of violent punishment in many states not only clearly violates children’s dignity and physical integrity and their right to equal protection under the law, it also violates their education and health rights. In addition, while the effects of violence in families and society are felt by all, violence has been seen to disproportionately affect the development of low- and middle-income countries. In poorer countries, the economic and social impact of violence can be severe in terms of slowing economic growth, undermining personal and collective security, and impeding social development. Development agencies therefore have an additional major stake in preventing violence – including this most common form of violence against children – so as to ensure their investments are not undermined by the economic and social costs of violence.

During 2016, the Global Initiative will prepare information for the states which have achieved prohibition and are significantly engaged in development aid, identifying which of their partner countries have still to achieve prohibition. We aim to prepare a briefing and other materials to encourage discussion and action on the issue in the international development aid context. We would welcome comments and ideas: email triona@endcorporalpunishment.org.

Resources


Based on our experience of working with government and non-government actors in the promotion and achievement of law reform, the site aims to be a key resource for all advocates for prohibition of corporal punishment. It includes the following sections:

**Prohibiting corporal punishment** – read FAQs about prohibiting corporal punishment, learn about relevant human rights law (the human rights treaties and the UPR) and national high-level court rulings, understand what it means to draft laws which achieve prohibition, and see what current opportunities for law reform there are in every state

**Global progress** – see the latest facts and figures on progress towards universal prohibition, global and regional tables of legality in all settings, reports on legislation relating to corporal punishment in every state and territory, and information on states which have achieved prohibition

**News** – keep up with the latest developments worldwide

**Implementing prohibition** – learn about how prohibiting legislation is implemented, and find links to resources on positive discipline

**Research** – read about research on prevalence of and attitudes towards corporal punishment, its negative effects, and the positive impact of prohibition

**About us** – read about the Global Initiative and what we do, and subscribe to our newsletters

**Supporters** – sign up to support prohibition and see who other supporters are

**Resources** – download reports, briefings and other resources for free

The Global Initiative is now on social media:

Facebook /Glendcorporalpunishment

Twitter @Glendcorpun
Growing faith-based support for prohibition

Religious leaders and members of faith-based communities and organisations are increasingly working in solidarity with others, taking action towards prohibition and elimination of all corporal punishment of children and speaking out as powerful advocates for children.

In May 2015 UNICEF held a Pacific Islands Countries conference in Nadi, Fiji, which called for violence against children to be brought out of the shadows. Reporting on the conference in the Fiji Times, President Ratu Epeli Nailatikau referred to the Old Testament Book of Proverbs, 13:24 – “Whoever spares the rod hates their children, but the one who loves their children is careful to discipline them” – often used to justify corporal punishment, and called for a transformation in the Christian perspective on violence against children. He contrasted the quote from Proverbs with the New Testament passage Mark 10:13-16, explaining that here Jesus affirms that the Kingdom is child-centred and “offers the possibility for a paradigm shift in the understanding of loving our children”. The President stated:

“The children of the Pacific cannot wait to be free of violence, wherever they are. We may have limited resources and competing concerns – but if we are to protect our beautiful children, then this must be a priority.”

During October 2015 the Global Initiative partnered with Save the Children at the Parliament of the World’s Religions in Salt Lake City, Utah, attended by people from 80 nations and 50 faiths. An interactive exhibition and workshop were held on “Ending legalised violence against children”, connecting with the Parliament theme of “Reclaiming the Heart of Our Humanity – Working together for a world of compassion, peace, justice and sustainability”.

On 19 November the Global Network of Religions for Children (GNRC) and the NGO Coalition for Children in the Dominican Republic marked the 26th anniversary of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child and the World Day of Prayer and Action for Children with an interfaith breakfast in Santa Domingo (Dominican Republic). The aim was to engage religious and spiritual leaders to support prohibition of corporal punishment of children in all settings. The event concluded with the signing of a declaration in which religious and spiritual leaders stated:

“… the adoption of legislation explicitly prohibiting corporal punishment of children in all settings, including the family, is necessary and urgent and a crucial step towards a compassionate and non-violent society… We reject all forms of violence against children and adolescents, including corporal punishment, and commit to taking the lead in working with other sectors of society, communities, religious networks, NGOs, government agencies and the Congress to ban corporal punishment of children in all settings.”

For further information on all aspects of faith-based advocacy for prohibition of corporal punishment, see the website of the Churches’ Network for Non-violence, www.churchesfornon-violence.org.
Mounting research on corporal punishment

The most common form of violence against children

UNICEF data published in 2014, found violent “discipline” to be the most common form of violence against children, experienced by children in all regions. On average, six in ten (almost a billion) 2-14 year olds had been physically punished at home in the past month.1

In countries with high prevalence of physical punishment, however, research consistently finds that, in contrast to its actual prevalence, significantly fewer caregivers say they support physical punishment in childrearing. Recent research from Viet Nam, for example, found 43% of 1-14 year olds had been physically punished in the past month, but only 15% of mothers or caregivers said they believe physical punishment necessary in order to raise a child.2 But researchers are increasingly recognising that prohibition in law is necessary to achieve the attitudinal and behavioural change required to eliminate corporal punishment.

Researchers call for legal prohibition of corporal punishment to promote and support its elimination

A review of the evidence on physical punishment of children, commissioned by a number of children’s charities and the Children and Young People’s Commissioner in Scotland and published in November 2015, found evidence in many countries that public attitudes have shifted, with physical punishment becoming less acceptable and a majority of parents expressing negative feelings about its use. It also identified accumulating research associating corporal punishment with detrimental child health and developmental outcomes, including increased aggression and antisocial behaviour, as well as poor health and well-being in later life. The report recommended that all physical punishment of children be prohibited by law: “Children should be afforded more, not less, protection from violence than adults.”3

Also in 2015, UNICEF and Young Lives published longitudinal evidence of corporal punishment in schools in Ethiopia, India, Peru and Viet Nam. Over half of 8-year-old children in Peru and Viet Nam, three quarters in Ethiopia and more than nine in ten in India had witnessed a teacher administering corporal punishment in the last week. Younger children were at greater risk than adolescents – the rate of corporal punishment at age 8 was more than double that reported by 15-year-olds in all four countries. Boys from disadvantaged backgrounds were significantly more likely to be physically punished at age 8, and violence at school was the main reason given for children disliking school, ranging from over a quarter of children in India to over a half in Viet Nam. The report identified prohibiting legislation as “an important first step in eradicating the use of corporal punishment”.4

A team of researchers from the University of Florida is calling for an immediate end to “paddling” of students in all state public schools, citing its new study of classroom disciplinary trends that depicts corporal punishment as violent and outdated and a source of increased dropout rates and lawsuits. Corporal punishment was found to have no positive long-term effect on students, but can lower their self-esteem and instil hostility and rage without curbing the undesired behaviour.5

Call for information: moving from prohibition to elimination of corporal punishment

The Global Initiative is conducting research in all states that have achieved prohibition of all corporal punishment, to identify how the ban has been implemented, and its impact. The purpose of the research is to support states that have achieved prohibition in moving towards elimination. We would welcome any information or contacts that you may be able to provide – please email triona@endcorporalpunishment.org.

5 Gagnon, J. C., Kennedy-Lewis, B. L. & Gurel, S. (2014), Corporal Punishment in Florida Schools: Trends in Reactive, Punitive, and Ineffective Approaches to Youth Behavior; Florida: Southern Poverty Law Center
Prohibition of corporal punishment has historically been piecemeal, being achieved in the penal system first, gradually extended to other settings and, finally, the home. This in part reflects how societies have inched towards appreciating children as holders of human rights, but from children’s perspective there is no justification. The table lists for each state the law that eventually extended prohibition to the home (in some, further law reform has since reiterated prohibition). We hope future prohibiting legislation will comprehensively address all the settings of children’s lives.
Progress in states still to complete law reform

The following information has been compiled from many sources, including reports to and by the United Nations human rights treaty bodies. Information in square brackets is unconfirmed. We are very grateful to government officials, UNICEF and other UN agencies, NGOs and human rights institutions, and many individuals who have helped to provide and check information. Please let us know if you believe any of the information to be incorrect: sharon@endcorporalpunishment.org. For further details on all states see the individual state reports at www.endcorporalpunishment.org.

Corporal punishment unlawful by Supreme Court ruling

In the following states, Supreme Court rulings have declared corporal punishment to be unlawful in all settings including the home but prohibition has not yet been enacted in legislation. Nepal is committed to law reform; Italy is yet to make a public commitment to enacting prohibition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Prohibited in the home</th>
<th>Prohibited in alternative care settings</th>
<th>Prohibited in day care</th>
<th>Prohibited in schools</th>
<th>Prohibited in penal institutions</th>
<th>Prohibited as sentence for crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>NO¹</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal²</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ 1996 Supreme Court ruling prohibited all violence in childrearing but this not yet confirmed in legislation
² Commitment to prohibition in all settings, including the home, made at July 2006 meeting of South Asia Forum, following 2005 UN Study on Violence against Children regional consultation; 2005 Supreme Court ruling removed legal defence for corporal punishment by parents, guardians and teachers
States expressing commitment to law reform in the UPR and other contexts

Governments in the following 51 states have expressed a commitment to prohibition of all corporal punishment of children. In the majority of cases this has been through unequivocally accepting recommendations to prohibit made during the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) of the state concerned. Some states have formally confirmed a commitment to prohibition in a public context outside of the UPR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Prohibited in the home</th>
<th>Prohibited in alternative care settings</th>
<th>Prohibited in day care</th>
<th>Prohibited in schools</th>
<th>Prohibited in penal institutions</th>
<th>Prohibited as sentence for crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[SOME]</td>
<td>[SOME]</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>SOME</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Commitment to prohibition in all settings, including the home, made at July 2006 meeting of South Asia Forum, following 2005 UN Study on Violence against Children regional consultation.
4 Prohibited in preschool provision.
5 Lawful under Shari'a law.
6 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in all settings (2012).
7 Government accepted UPR recommendations to prohibit all corporal punishment (2014).
8 Government accepted UPR recommendations to prohibit (2010, 2015); draft legislation which would prohibit under discussion (2015).
9 Unlawful in care institutions.
11 Commitment to prohibition in all settings, including the home, made at July 2006 meeting of South Asia Forum, following 2005 UN Study on Violence against Children regional consultation; Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit (2009).
12 Unlawful under 2011 Supreme Court ruling, still to be confirmed in legislation.
13 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit (2009).
14 Prohibited in residential care facilities.
15 Prohibited in day care centres.
16 Prohibited in “Youth Hostel” detention centre.
17 Commitment to prohibition in all settings, including the home, made at July 2006 meeting of South Asia Forum, following 2005 UN Study on Violence against Children regional consultation.
18 Code of Conduct and ministerial directives state corporal punishment should not be used but no prohibition in law.
19 Possibly prohibited in Child Care and Protection Act 2011.
20 Government accepted UPR recommendations to prohibit (2015).
21 Prohibited in Republic of Srpska.
22 Prohibited in Republic of Srpska.
23 Prohibited in Republic of Srpska.
24 Draft legislation which would prohibit under discussion (2014).
25 Prohibited in preschool settings.
26 Prohibited in primary schools.
27 But law permits use of force “in case of apathy following orders”.
28 Government accepted UPR recommendations to prohibit in all settings (2014); prohibiting legislation under discussion (2015).
29 Government accepted UPR recommendations to prohibit in all settings (2014); draft legislation which would prohibit possibly under discussion (2014).
30 Government adopted Central American Regional Roadmap on Violence against Children (2011) which recommends full prohibition.
31 Possibly prohibited in care institutions.
32 Possibly prohibited in preschool institutions.
33 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in all settings (2009); Government adopted Central American Regional Roadmap on Violence against Children (2011) which recommends full prohibition; prohibiting legislation being drafted (2015).
34 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in all settings (2012).
35 Prohibited in preschool provision.
36 Lawful in indigenous communities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Prohibited in the home</th>
<th>Prohibited in alternative care settings</th>
<th>Prohibited in day care</th>
<th>Prohibited in schools</th>
<th>Prohibited in penal institutions</th>
<th>Prohibited as sentence for crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[SOME]</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea-Bissau</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[NO]</td>
<td>[NO]</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>SOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Islands</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>SOME</td>
<td>SOME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palau</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 Government accepted UPR recommendations to prohibit in all settings (2010); Government reaffirmed commitment to prohibition at Directing Council of the Inter-American Children’s Institute meeting (2014)
38 Prohibited in preschool provision
39 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in all settings (2014)
40 Ruled unconstitutional in 2002 High Court ruling but legislation still to be amended
41 Government accepted UPR recommendations to prohibit (2015)
42 Possibly prohibited in care institutions
43 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in all settings (2015)
44 Commitment to prohibition in all settings confirmed in third/fourth report to UN Committee on the Rights of the Child (2011); Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in all settings (2012)
45 Prohibited in care institutions except in Jammu and Kashmir; bill which would prohibit in all childcare institutions under discussion (2014)
46 Bill which would prohibit in anganwadi centres and play schools under discussion (2014)
47 Prohibited for 6-14 year olds except in Jammu and Kashmir; not prohibited in religious schools
48 Bill prohibiting law not applicable in Jammu and Kashmir
49 Permitted in traditional justice systems
50 Government accepted UPR recommendations to prohibit in all settings and repeal “reasonable punishment” defence (2015)
51 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in all settings (2015)
52 Prohibited in residential institutions
53 Government stated intention to prohibit to UN Committee on the Rights of the Child (2006); Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in the home (2011); draft legislation under discussion (2015)
54 Prohibited in preschool provision
55 Bill which would prohibit under discussion (2015)
56 Possibly unlawful in preschool provision
57 Government adopted Central American Regional Roadmap on Violence against Children (2011), which recommends full prohibition; prohibition included in General Law on the Rights of Children and Adolescents 2014 but further reform needed
58 Prohibited in institutions
59 Prohibited in institutions
60 Government accepted UPR recommendations to prohibit (2015)
61 Public School System Act 2013 prohibits corporal punishment but Criminal Code 2011 provision authorising use of force by teachers to maintain discipline still to be repealed
62 Government accepted UPR recommendations to prohibit (2010, 2015); prohibiting legislation under discussion (2015)
63 Possibly prohibited in preschool settings
64 Government accepted UPR recommendations to prohibit (2013)
65 Prohibited in the provision of preschool education
66 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in all settings (2012)
67 Ministerial direction advises against corporal punishment but no prohibition in law
68 Draft legislation which would prohibit under discussion (2014)
69 Ministerial Order states corporal punishment should not be used but no prohibition in law
70 Commitment to prohibition in all settings, including the home, made at July 2006 meeting of South Asia Forum, following 2005 UN Study on Violence against Children regional consultation, confirmed in 2014 with launch by Government of national campaign for law reform; Bill which would prohibit under discussion (2014)
71 Prohibited for 5-16 year olds in Islamabad Capital Territory, Sindh province and Punjab
72 Prohibited in Juvenile Justice System Ordinance 2000 but this not applicable in all areas and other laws not amended/repealed
73 Lawful under Shari’a law
74 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit (2011)
### States expressing commitment to law reform in the UPR and other contexts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Prohibited in the home</th>
<th>Prohibited in alternative care settings</th>
<th>Prohibited in day care</th>
<th>Prohibited in schools</th>
<th>Prohibited in penal institutions</th>
<th>Prohibited as sentence for crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME77</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME79</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samoa</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME53</td>
<td>SOME84</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sao Tome &amp; Principe</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
<td>[NO]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME87</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME52</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO83</td>
<td>SOME94</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME56</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES98</td>
<td>YES99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES101</td>
<td>YES102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO103</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME105</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES106</td>
<td>YES107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

75 Government accepted UPR recommendations to prohibit (2010, 2015)
76 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in all settings (2011)
77 Lukautim Pikinini (Child) Act 2009 prohibits corporal punishment of children “in the care of the Director”
78 Draft legislation which would prohibit under discussion (2013)
79 Prohibited in shelter homes
80 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in the home and other settings (2012); bill which would prohibit under discussion (2015)
81 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit and to repeal the “right of correction” (2011, 2015)
82 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in the home (2011)
83 Prohibited in early childhood centres
84 Prohibited in government schools for children aged 5-14
85 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in all settings (2011)
86 Government accepted UPR recommendations to prohibit (2008, 2013)
87 Prohibited in day care which forms part of the education system
88 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in all settings (2009); prohibition under discussion (2014)
89 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit (2010); draft legislation under discussion (2013)
90 Prohibited in educational day care and in residential schools
91 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in all settings (2012); prohibition under discussion (2015)
92 Commitment to prohibition in all settings, including the home, made at July 2006 meeting of South Asia Forum, following UN Study on Violence against Children regional consultation
93 Ministerial circular states corporal punishment should not be used but no prohibition in law
94 Prohibited in prisons
95 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in all settings (2011); Government stated legislation is being improved to prohibit corporal punishment in the family and education settings (2012)
96 Prohibited in preschool education settings
97 Government accepted UPR recommendations to prohibit in all settings (2012)
98 But some legislation possibly still to be amended
99 But some legislation possibly still to be amended
100 Government accepted UPR recommendations to prohibit (2011); draft legislation which would prohibit in all settings under discussion (2013)
101 Government accepted UPR recommendations to prohibit (2010, 2015)
102 Bill which would prohibit all corporal punishment under discussion (2015)
103 Ministerial circular advises against corporal punishment but no prohibition in law
104 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in all settings (2012); draft Constitution would prohibit in the home, schools and other institutions (2015)
105 Prohibited in preschool provision
106 Ruled unconstitutional by Supreme Court in 1991 but some legislation still to be repealed
107 Ruled unconstitutional by Supreme Court in 1991 but some legislation still to be repealed
108 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in all settings (2011)
109 2014 High Court judgment declared judicial corporal punishment unconstitutional but this has yet to be confirmed by the Constitutional Court
The following 97 states have yet to make a clear commitment to prohibiting all corporal punishment. Some of these states have accepted UPR recommendations to prohibit but have also indicated that they consider existing legislation adequately protects children from corporal punishment, in conflict with information collected by the Global Initiative. Some states have accepted some UPR recommendations to prohibit corporal punishment but rejected other similar recommendations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Prohibited in the home</th>
<th>Prohibited in alternative care settings</th>
<th>Prohibited in day care</th>
<th>Prohibited in schools</th>
<th>Prohibited in penal institutions</th>
<th>Prohibited as sentence for crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antigua &amp; Barbuda</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME110</td>
<td>SOME111</td>
<td>SOME112</td>
<td>SOME113</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahamas</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME114</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[YES]115</td>
<td>[NO]116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahrain</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME117</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belarus118</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[YES]118</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME119</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei Darussalam120</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME121</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[YES]123</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[SOME]124</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>[SOME]125</td>
<td>YES126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>NO127</td>
<td>SOME124</td>
<td>SOME125</td>
<td>YES126</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad127</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[SOME]128</td>
<td>[SOME]129</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>[YES]130</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>NO130</td>
<td>[NO]</td>
<td>SOME131</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>[YES]132</td>
<td>[SOME]133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

110 Prohibited in all residential centres and foster care in all states/territories except Northern Territory, Tasmania, Victoria and Western Australia
111 Prohibited in all states/territories except Northern Territory and Tasmania; prohibition in childminding unconfirmed
112 Prohibited in all states/territories except Northern Territory, Queensland and Western Australia
113 Prohibited in all states/territories except Australian Capital Territory and Western Australia
114 Prohibited in residential institutions
115 But some legislation possibly still to be repealed
116 Judicial corporal punishment prohibited in 1984 but reintroduced in 1991
117 Prohibited in day nurseries
118 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit (2010) but stated it had already been implemented and all corporal punishment unlawful
119 Prohibited in institutions in Flemish community
120 Government accepted some UPR recommendations to prohibit but rejected others (2009)
121 Prohibited in childcare centres
122 Possibly prohibited in nursery education
123 2004 Supreme Court ruling limited but upheld parents’ right to physically punish children
124 Prohibited in state provided care in Alberta, British Colombia and Manitoba and in foster care in Alberta, British Colombia, Manitoba and Ontario; in Ontario prohibited in provincially licensed childcare programmes and in foster homes for children receiving services from provincially licensed/approved child protection agency or other service provider
125 Prohibited in all states/territories except New Brunswick
126 2004 Supreme Court ruling excluded corporal punishment from teachers’ right to use force but this still to be confirmed in laws relating to private schools and to all schools in Alberta and Manitoba
127 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in 2009 but rejected recommendation to prohibit in 2013
128 Possibly prohibited in institutional care settings
129 Possibly prohibited in institutions
130 But corporal punishment of girls prohibited in Shenzhen Special Economic Zone
131 Prohibited in nurseries and kindergartens
132 Possibly unlawful in care institutions
133 Application of law in indigenous communities unconfirmed
134 Application of law in indigenous communities unconfirmed
135 Lawful in indigenous communities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Prohibited in the home</th>
<th>Prohibited in alternative care settings</th>
<th>Prohibited in day care</th>
<th>Prohibited in schools</th>
<th>Prohibited in penal institutions</th>
<th>Prohibited as sentence for crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cook Islands</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME¹³⁶</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO¹³⁷</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME¹³⁸</td>
<td>SOME¹³⁹</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME¹⁴⁰</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPR Korea¹⁴¹</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[NO]¹⁴²</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR Congo</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[NO]¹⁴³</td>
<td>[YES]¹⁴⁴</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO¹⁴⁵</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[NO]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia¹⁴⁶</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME¹⁴⁷</td>
<td>SOME¹⁴⁸</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France¹⁴⁹</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES¹⁵⁰</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME¹⁵¹</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO¹⁵²</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO¹⁵³</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana¹⁵⁴</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO¹⁵⁵</td>
<td>SOME¹⁵⁶</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenada</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME¹⁵⁷</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO¹⁵⁸</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala¹⁵⁹</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO¹⁶⁰</td>
<td>[NO]</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME¹⁶¹</td>
<td>SOME¹⁶²</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME¹⁶³</td>
<td>SOME¹⁶⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>NO¹⁶⁵</td>
<td>[YES]¹⁶⁶</td>
<td>[YES]¹⁶⁷</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

136 Prohibited in institutions providing early childhood education
137 Ministerial circular states corporal punishment should not be used but no prohibition in law
138 Unlawful in institutions
139 Prohibited in preschool provision
140 Prohibited in early childhood education facilities
141 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in all settings (2014)
142 Policy states corporal punishment should not be used but possibly no prohibition in law
143 Ministerial directive states corporal punishment should not be used but possibly no prohibition in law
144 Possibly lawful in social welfare institutions
145 Policy states corporal punishment should not be used but possibly no prohibition in law
146 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in all settings (2013) but made a general statement that acceptance did not necessarily imply a commitment to further action but could imply a commitment to continue existing efforts or maintain measures already in place
147 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in all settings (2013) but made a general statement that acceptance did not necessarily imply a commitment to further action but could imply a commitment to continue existing efforts or maintain measures already in place
148 But courts have recognised a “right of correction”
149 Prohibited in schools
150 Minimum standards for residential childcare institutions state corporal punishment should not be used but no prohibition in law
151 Ministerial directive advises against corporal punishment but no prohibition in law
152 Government accepted UPR recommendations to prohibit in all settings (2008, 2012) but also defended “reasonable” punishment and in the context of reviewing the Constitution (2012) asserted that existing legislation already adequately protects children
153 Ministerial directive possibly advises against corporal punishment but no prohibition in law
154 Prohibited in institutions
155 But courts have recognised a “right of correction”
156 Prohibited in prisons
157 Prohibited in childcare homes
158 Prohibited in Juvenile Justice Act 2012, not yet in force
159 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in the home (2008) and in all settings (2012) but has also said corporal punishment is prohibited under existing law
160 Ministerial circular possibly advises against corporal punishment but no prohibition in law
161 Prohibited in some but not all settings in Child Care and Services Development Act 2011
162 Prohibited in some but not all settings in Child Care and Services Development Act 2011
163 Lawful for persons over 16
164 Lawful for persons over 16
165 Bill which would prohibit under discussion (2014)
166 Prohibition in foster care unconfirmed
167 Prohibition in crèches and childminding unconfirmed

Ending legalised violence against children
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Prohibited in the home</th>
<th>Prohibited in alternative care settings</th>
<th>Prohibited in day care</th>
<th>Prohibited in schools</th>
<th>Prohibited in penal institutions</th>
<th>Prohibited as sentence for crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO168</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES169</td>
<td>SOME168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME170</td>
<td>NO171</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>NO172</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME173</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>NO174</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>SOME175</td>
<td>NO176</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>SOME178</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES179</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[SOME]181</td>
<td>[NO]</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[SOME]182</td>
<td>SOME183</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME185</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO186</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME188</td>
<td>SOME189</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME191</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME192</td>
<td>SOME193</td>
<td>[YES]194</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO197</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME198</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO199</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micrones</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

168 National Standards of Care for Child Welfare Institutions state corporal punishment should not be used but no prohibition in law
169 Lawful under Shari'a law in Aceh province and in regional regulations based on Shari'a law in other areas
170 Prohibited in day care centres (kindergartens)
171 Government directive states corporal punishment should not be used but no prohibition in law
172 Possibly prohibited in Kurdistan
173 Prohibited in prisons and detention centres
174 Prohibition under discussion (2015)
175 Prohibited in early childhood centres (“basic schools”); prohibition in all settings under discussion (2015)
176 But see note on day care; prohibition in all schools under discussion (2015)
177 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit all corporal punishment (2008, 2012) but denied that the legal “right to discipline” allowed for corporal punishment and stated that the law adequately protects children from “excessive” discipline (2012)
178 Prohibited in Kawasaki City by local ordinance
179 Prohibited in School Education Law 1947 but Tokyo High Court judgment stated some physical punishment may be lawful in some circumstances
180 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in all settings (2009) but stated that laws do not prescribe any form of corporal punishment and subsequently amended but did not repeal the parental right to discipline children according to “general custom”
181 Possibly prohibited in institutions
182 Possibly prohibited in children’s villages
183 Prohibited in preschool education and training
184 Government accepted 2010 UPR recommendation to prohibit but subsequently stated corporal punishment is unlawful under existing law; government accepted 2015 recommendation to prohibit but appeared to defend “simple discipline”
185 Unlawful in early childhood education settings
186 Ministerial directive states corporal punishment should not be used but no prohibition in law
187 Government accepted UPR recommendation to abolish corporal punishment (2010), stating that it was in the process of implementation; subsequent law reform prohibited corporal punishment as a sentence for crime but not in the home or other settings
188 Children’s Law 2011 prohibits corporal punishment by child protection practitioners
189 Children’s Law 2011 prohibits corporal punishment by child protection practitioners
190 But provisions for corporal punishment in the Hinterland Regulations still to be repealed
191 Unlawful in preschool provision
192 Prohibited in state-run institutions
193 Prohibited in state-run day care
194 Prohibition in private schools unconfirmed
195 Government committed to prohibition of judicial caning for persons under 18 (2007); bill which would prohibit under discussion (2015)
196 Government expressed commitment to prohibition in all settings, including the home, at July 2006 meeting of South Asia Forum, following 2005 UN Study on Violence against Children regional consultation, but law reform in 2014/2015 re-authorised corporal punishment in all settings and Government rejected UPR recommendations to prohibit (2015)
197 Ministry of Education advises against corporal punishment but no prohibition in law
198 Prohibited in preschools and kindergartens
199 Ministerial Order states corporal punishment should not be used but no prohibition in law
States without a clear commitment to law reform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Prohibited in the home</th>
<th>Prohibited in alternative care settings</th>
<th>Prohibited in day care</th>
<th>Prohibited in schools</th>
<th>Prohibited in penal institutions</th>
<th>Prohibited as sentence for crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monaco</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO200</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO201</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[SOME]203</td>
<td>SOME204</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES205</td>
<td>YES206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[SOME]207</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO208</td>
<td>SOME209</td>
<td>SOME210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niue</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[SOME]211</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
<td>[YES]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qatar</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO213</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>SOME215</td>
<td>SOME216</td>
<td>SOME217</td>
<td>SOME218</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME219</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO221</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME222</td>
<td>[YES]223</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO224</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME225</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME228</td>
<td>SOME229</td>
<td>[SOME]230</td>
<td>SOME231</td>
<td>SOME232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Kitts &amp; Nevis</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[YES]233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Lucia</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

200 Government directive advises against corporal punishment but no prohibition in law
201 Government directive advises against corporal punishment but no prohibition in law
202 But some legislation still to be repealed
203 Unlawful in state-run childcare under 1991 Supreme Court ruling but some legislation still to be repealed; prohibited in Child Care and Protection Act 2014, not yet in force
204 Unlawful in state-run childcare under 1991 Supreme Court ruling but some legislation still to be repealed; prohibited in Child Care and Protection Act 2014, not yet in force
205 Unlawful under 1991 Supreme Court ruling but some legislation still to be repealed; prohibited in Child Care and Protection Act 2014, not yet in force
206 Unlawful under 1991 Supreme Court ruling but some legislation still to be repealed
207 Possibly prohibited in preschool education settings
208 But possibly prohibited in Lagos State
209 Prohibited in Child Rights Act 2003 but this not enacted in all states
210 Prohibited in Child Rights Act 2003 but this not enacted in all states and other legislation not amended; lawful in some areas under Shari’a law
211 Possibly prohibited in preschool provision
212 Government accepted some UPR recommendations to prohibit but rejected another similar one, stating that corporal punishment is already prohibited (2010)
213 Code of Conduct for schools states corporal punishment should not be used but no prohibition in law
214 Government accepted UPR recommendations to prohibit in all settings (2012) but was unclear on the need for complete prohibition in the home
215 Prohibited in Seoul
216 Prohibited in Seoul
217 Prohibited in Seoul
218 Law prohibits direct physical punishment (involving physical contact) but not indirect physical punishment (no contact, e.g. painful positions); fully prohibited in Seoul
219 Unlawful in preschool provision
220 Government accepted UPR recommendations to prohibit corporal punishment of children in schools and the penal system but stated that it was already prohibited in schools and care settings (2009); recommendations to prohibit in 2013 UPR rejected
221 Ministerial circulars advise against corporal punishment but no prohibition in law
222 Prohibited for 6-14 year olds
223 But law permits use of force “in the case of inertia to the orders given”
224 Policy states corporal punishment should not be used but no prohibition in law
225 Prohibited in childcare centres
226 Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in all settings (2011) but stated that the Penal Code was being reviewed to ascertain whether further provision or guidance is necessary to clarify when corporal punishment is lawful
227 But used in traditional justice
228 Prohibited in Somalia
229 Prohibited in Somalia
230 Possibly prohibited in Somalia
231 Prohibited in Somalia
232 Prohibited in Somalia
233 But some legislation still to be formally repealed

20 Ending legalised violence against children
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Prohibited in the home</th>
<th>Prohibited in alternative care settings</th>
<th>Prohibited in day care</th>
<th>Prohibited in schools</th>
<th>Prohibited in penal institutions</th>
<th>Prohibited as sentence for crime</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St Vincent &amp; Grenadines</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[SOME]234</td>
<td>[NO]235</td>
<td>[NO]236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Palestine</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME237</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[YES]238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO239</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>NO240</td>
<td>SOME241</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO242</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME244</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>[YES]245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonga</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad &amp; Tobago</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO247</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuvalu246</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME247</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME248</td>
<td>SOME249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME250</td>
<td>SOME251</td>
<td>YES252</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES [YES]253</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>SOME256</td>
<td>SOME257</td>
<td>SOME258</td>
<td>SOME259</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>SOME260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>SOME260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Sahara</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[NO]261</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>[YES]262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>[SOME]261</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes and References

234. Prohibited in UNRWA schools and in East Jerusalem; Ministerial direction advises against corporal punishment in public schools but no prohibition in law.
235. Possibly unlawful in East Jerusalem.
236. Possibly unlawful in Gaza.
237. At federal level Child Act 2010 prohibits cruel punishment but not explicitly all corporal punishment; prohibited in Khartoum State.
238. Possibly lawful under Sharia law.
239. Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in schools (2011).
240. 2003 Federal Court ruling stated repeated and habitual corporal punishment unacceptable but did not rule out right of parents to use corporal punishment.
241. Lawful as for parents in alternative care involving family placements.
242. Ministry of Education advises against corporal punishment but no prohibition in law.
243. Possibly prohibited in care centres under education legislation.
244. Prohibited in preschool institutions.
245. 2010 Court of Appeal ruling stated that “it might be argued” whipping is unconstitutional but did not declare it to be so.
246. Government accepted UPR recommendation to prohibit in 2008 but in 2013 accepted some UPR recommendations to prohibit and rejected others.
247. Prohibited in hospital mental health wing.
248. Corporal punishment by police officers prohibited.
249. Island Courts may order corporal punishment.
250. Prohibited in residential institutions and foster care arranged by local authorities or voluntary organisations throughout the UK.
251. Prohibited in day care and childminding in England, Wales and Scotland; in Northern Ireland, guidance states physical punishment should not be used but no prohibition in law.
252. But in 2014 Government confirmed legislation does not prohibit in “unregistered independent settings providing part-time education”.
253. Prohibited in residential institutions in Zanzibar.
254. Prohibited in approved schools and remand homes in Zanzibar.
255. Prohibited in Zanzibar.
256. Prohibited in all care settings in 31 states, and in some settings in other states and District of Columbia.
257. Prohibited in all care settings in 31 states, and in some settings in other states and District of Columbia.
258. Prohibited in public schools in 29 states and District of Columbia, and in public and private schools in Iowa and New Jersey; federal bill which would prohibit under discussion (2015).
259. Prohibited in 32 states.
260. Permitted in rural areas under customary justice systems.
261. Possibly prohibited in preschool provision.
This 10th report on global progress towards prohibition of corporal punishment, issued in the year that governments around the world have made a commitment to ending all violence against children under the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, provides a stark reminder that words are not enough. We celebrate the achievement of the now 48 states which prohibited all corporal punishment and the 52 committed to doing so – but really it is indefensible that more than a quarter of a century after the adoption of the Convention on the Rights of the Child still so many children lack this basic legal recognition of their rights to respect for their human dignity and physical integrity and to equal protection in law. In a world where recourse to violence seems ever more acceptable in the face of conflict, there can be no more urgent task than to take action against the legal and social acceptance of violent punishment of children and to work towards building a new norm characterised by peaceful, respectful and non-violent relationships.