AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

Annual Report

1971 - 1972

Amnesty International,
Publications

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

Annual Report

1 June 1971 - 31 May 1972

Contents

PREFACE BY THE CHAIRMAN OF THE INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The continued success and growth of Amnesty has brought also many new problems. In order to service the National Sections and Groups of our growing organisation we have had to expand our Secretariat. We also had to ensure greater efficiency in our operation and professionalism while at the same time maintaining the essential voluntary character of our organisation. Business efficiency is now absolutely essential and it should be our top priority in the coming year; however, we must avoid becoming a bureaucratic machine without a soul. The achievement of a proper balance between these two tendencies is no simple matter.

We have been greatly assisted in our work by the firm of McKinsey and Company, Inc., who, free of charge, generously put the services of their expert staff at our disposal to help us to plan our expansion so as to ensure maximum efficiency. Their understanding, acumen and brilliant analysis of our problems have been of tremendous assistance to the International Executive. Concurrently the Long Range Planning Committee appointed by the International Executive conducted a Long Range analysis of Amnesty's development and problems over the next five years. The work of this Committee has been of the greatest assistance to the International Executive, to McKinsey and Company and to the Secretariat. To all those who have thus devoted so much of their time and skills on these important tasks, we owe a debt of gratitude. It was particularly satisfactory to find that in most areas, the views of the McKinsey team, of the Long Range Planning Committee and of the International Executive coincided.

We are also conscious of the tremendous financial burden imposed on our National Sections and Groups. This increase has been necessitated by the essential expansion of our Secretariat and premises. The International Executive is most grateful to National Sections and Groups for their unstinting generosity and co-operation. Mindful of the burden involved, the International Executive will insist on the maximum economy consistent with efficiency.

An examination of the Annual Report for this year will reveal the extent of Amnesty's activities carried on even in existing circumstances. We hope that, with the expansion and streamlining which is now in train, National Sections and Groups will receive a better service and that our work will be expanded in the coming year. Implementation of the planning undertaken will be one of our top priorities in the coming year.

The year 1973 will be the 25th Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. A special effort will be made by the United Nations and the non-governmental organisations to secure the ratifications of the two U.N. Covenants on Human Rights and further adherences to the Convention for the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination. The reluctance and slowness of Governments to ratify International Conventions for which they

spoke, voted and signed is a public scandal. The two-faced attitude of Governments in such matters is one of the principal causes for the credibility gap which disheartens the idealistic youth of our countries.

The most horrifying feature of the present era is the continued escalation in violence and brutality in the world. Brutality is always contagious and inevitably leads to counter brutality. In Amnesty we continue to receive constantly complaints of ill treatment and torture of prisoners under the indirect, and sometimes even the direct, authority of Governments. This leads to a degradation of human values and is contrary to all standards which promote the dignity of human beings. Because of the continuing widespread use of torture, Amnesty International proposes to organise a major international conference on torture of prisoners towards the end of 1973. It is hoped that this conference will coincide with the introduction of proposals at the United Nations which Amnesty originated and which have now been accepted by all leading non-governmental organisations.

The tasks that face Amnesty International are as large and as complex as ever. The growth of Amnesty throughout the world is in itself an indication that public opinion is becoming more aware of the importance of Amnesty tasks. The expansion of our Secretariat is a necessary and fitting response to the public support we are getting.

Some Governments may not like Amnesty. But no Government can now ignore Amnesty or disregard its views.

Seán MacBride, S.C.

INTRODUCTION
by the Secretary-General

Any Amnesty International Annual Report is a chronicle of human suffering, relieved at intervals by news of releases but intensified by news of new arrests, detentions and trials. The reports of torture in various parts of the world continue to preoccupy the International Secretariat and the movement as a whole and an attempt has been made recently to draw together all the current reports of countries where torture allegations seem most persistent. A draft convention has been prepared by Amnesty International and endorsed by some 30 other international non-governmental organisations in consultative status with the U.N. Support is also being sought from governments with a view to their introducing the convention and appropriate resolutions on treatment of prisoners, at the United Nations General Assembly.

Every effort is being made to encourage governments to implement the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners and to obtain appropriate international machinery at the regional and U.N. level to ensure that the human rights of prisoners are protected. There is still widespread ignorance about the existence of these U.N. rules and, working in conjunction with other international non-governmental organisations, Amnesty aims to disseminate the rules widely among prison visitors, magistrates, courts, prisons and the prisoners themselves.

The Chairman of the International Executive Committee, Mr. Seán MacBride, S.C., represented Amnesty International at the conference called by the International Committee of the Red Cross in May 1972 to review and revise the existing Red Cross conventions and to prepare new safeguards for the protection of prisoners in times of armed conflict and internal strife.

During the past few years Amnesty International Secretariat and the Research Department have been expanding in terms of staff and resources. Most of the expansion has been concentrated on the Research Department itself and eleven new posts were created in the current year. The headquarters in Turnagain Lane have however become cramped beyond the point of overcrowding and working conditions have deteriorated. New appointments have had to be postponed. A decision to move office premises was taken in 1971 but it has taken a very long time to find accommodation which was suitable both in terms of price and location. There will be a substantial increase in expenditure on the new headquarters in Theobalds Road, London, the lease on which can only be guaranteed for a period of 4½ years before they are scheduled for demolition. An international property committee has therefore been established by the International Executive Committee to study and make recommendations on the site of a permanent building as from December 1976. It is anticipated that the move to new provisional headquarters will take place in September 1972.

In order to strengthen the administration and the office of the Secretary General it was decided to recruit a new staff member who would primarily be appointed to assist the Secretary General and be charged with streamlining

the administration and implementing the recommendations made by the Long Range Planning Committee and the McKinsey consultants, once these had been accepted by the IEC. As in all cases of staff recruitment, national sections were invited to make suggestions as to persons from their countries who might be appointed, and advertisements were placed in the international press, resulting in several hundreds of applications being received. Interviews were held in Paris, Geneva and Stockholm but the problems of recruiting persons direct from Asia and Latin America and Africa who are not within reasonable travel distance from London have still not been resolved. The international nature of the Secretariat and staff is of major importance and, if geographical and cultural equilibrium is to be obtained, recruitment costs will have to rise. There are nevertheless staff members of 12 different nationalities now employed in the Secretariat.

For the first time an item was included in the budget for assistance to National Sections and the new Executive Director of the American Section, Dr. Amy Augustus, was invited to London to work for a brief period with the International Secretariat. Similarly, arrangements were made for the Nigerian and Ghanaian Sections to be represented at the International Assembly in Luxembourg in September 1971, and offers have been made to other sections to take advantage of the limited amount available to help them to establish themselves and to expand.

The organisation is still dependent for its support on too few European countries. The steady progress in the USA is encouraging and it is to be hoped that this will be followed in the coming years in other of the countries where Amnesty is either non-existent or has been slow to develop. It is this potential for expansion which has encouraged the Long-range Planning Committee to envisage with confidence a much larger and stronger Amnesty International in the future. New resources must however be found, both financial and human, to make this expansion possible.

Another aspect of expansion must also be faced. The participation in our work of sections and groups in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Middle East is crucial to our effectiveness in working for the release of prisoners of conscience and for the prevention of torture and the death penalty for political offenders. Great care must be taken that in expanding the secretariat and the budget, small sections, in countries where financial stringency is inevitable, must not be excluded because they cannot pay a proportional contribution to the International Secretariat. No-one must feel that they cannot afford to work for Amnesty International.

We need more groups and committees in more countries. Each section will have its own type of problems which may require particular solutions. Provided the basic principles of Amnesty International are recognised and adhered to, the techniques of work for prisoners may have to be varied according to the circumstances. The concept of political balance in our work is one such basic principle which cannot, I believe, be departed from, without changing substantially the nature of the organisation itself. Some new sections may work only through the card campaign, some only through a national

committee with individual members. Some may, for political reasons internal to their country, be unable to write to the USSR about prisoners of conscience but be able to write to others in the same broad political spectrum represented by the phrase "political balance". Israelis cannot write to Arabs, Formosans cannot write to Chinese on this type of sensitive subject. But the principle of political balance must be accepted and respected and applied by the entire membership.

During the next two or three years, the same type of effort which has gone into strengthening the International Secretariat must be applied to the strengthening of the movement as a whole. In doing so, we must show a flexibility both in our organisation and financial structure, which will enable the maximum number of countries to play their part in proving that human rights of individuals are a human responsibility of individuals which countenances no frontiers.

Martin Ennals

INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

(*See page 54 for a list of IEC members*)

The International Executive Committee met four times between October 1971—after its election at the International Council Meeting—and the end of May 1972. Seán MacBride (Chairman), Lothar Belck (Treasurer), Eric Baker and Thomas Hammarberg were able to be present at all four meetings. Herman van Geuns and Kari Poppe attended three; and Carola Stern attended two. On three occasions members sent alternates: Herbart Ruitenberg attended for Herman van Geuns, Helga Wandschneider for Carola Stern, and Kevin White for Seán MacBride during part of a meeting Gerd Ruge, who was co-opted early in 1972, attended the only meeting for which he was eligible; Ivan Morris was unfortunately only able to attend once.

A considerable amount of time was spent on the increasing number of missions. The discussion of staff questions and office premises has also figured largely on the agenda, due to the rapidly expanding Secretariat which has outgrown not only premises but the organisational methods and procedures formerly employed. Much re-organisation has been considered, including financial problems. A report on torture was also discussed resulting in the preparation of material.

The Director of Research presented to the Committee a document on categories of prisoners, explaining the difficulties encountered with the two categories of adoption and investigation cases. The idea of creating a new category was discussed but this was finally not thought necessary. It was agreed in principle that groups working on investigation cases should be able to send relief and financial help for defence costs to the families of their prisoners. This should depend, however, on every effort being made to ensure adequate safeguards against the funds being used for purposes other than relief and defence.

At the April meeting the question of specialist groups was raised and

it was agreed that the specialist groups combined three specific functions: one was the co-ordination of group activities within their own countries with regard to a particular country; the second was to provide action programmes and initiatives in their own country; and the third was to obtain information for the International Secretariat. In exercising these three functions there was a risk of confusion of role and responsibility. Because of this it was decided that the three functions should be separated in future and that specialist groups would be responsible to the Executive Committee of the National Sections for co-ordination of group activity and for action programmes within their own country. Research information on prisoners and background information with regard to the country concerned would be sent to the International Secretariat, which would handle the information as from any other source without any direct accountability to the group for the use made of the information. New specialist groups would not be established except at the request of the Research Department and in collaboration with the staff members concerned. It was agreed that the whole question of specialist groups would be included on the agenda of the International Council in September.

The meeting on 28 November 1971 was a special meeting called specifically to discuss Northern Ireland. A report was received from Kevin White, of the Irish Section, and Michael Williams, of the British Section. It was agreed to consider future activities under four headings: 1. Work for release of prisoners considered to be prisoners of conscience. 2. Work to improve conditions of detention and internment. 3. Submission to the Lord Parker Committee on interrogation methods. 4. Action related to the suspension of the Special Powers Act. It was on the basis of the decisions of this meeting that all further activity on Northern Ireland was undertaken.

NATIONAL SECTIONS

There are now 31 National Sections of Amnesty International (addresses are listed on page 56). Under the new budget arrangements every National Section commits itself to a share of the International Secretariat budget, based on the number of its groups. The German Section, which covers nearly 40 per cent. of the budget, remains the largest section, with over 400 groups, but most sections have developed during the year and this has been particularly notable in the Netherlands, where individual membership has increased from 200 in 1970 to 7000 in 1972. In Sweden, Denmark, Norway and Britain the organisation remains strong and in some of the countries with smaller sections, e.g., France and the United States of America, there has been an encouraging growth of interest in Amnesty, which is reflected in increased publicity and a rise in membership and the number of groups. The widely attended 1971 International Council meeting and Assembly was organised by the Luxembourg section, which has only six groups. A new section has been formed in South Korea and there are plans for one in Nepal. Talks have been held to discuss the possibility of establishing a section in Egypt.

A fuller report of National Section activities has been duplicated and is available on request.

RELIEF PROGRAMME

Providing relief and assistance to the families of adopted prisoners, where this is needed, is another of Amnesty's activities. Regular donations are sent to pay for education, to provide food and clothing and, in some circumstances, to help prisoners re-establish themselves after their release. Relief is an important factor in reassuring a prisoner that his family is not totally neglected in his absence.

In most cases relief is sent directly by the groups without passing through the International Secretariat. It is difficult, therefore, to give an accurate overall assessment of the extent of the aid provided. Many groups send £5 per month or more. For others this would be prohibitive, and attention is paid when allocating prisoners to groups to the need for financial help and the capacity of the group to assist in this way. Some national sections provide support for groups who send relief funds and others pay from central funds for the distribution of relief in a particular country or for fares when children are sent abroad for education.

In some countries it is easy and safe to send funds direct to families. In others it is necessary to organise a central distribution system which necessitates a special programme within the International Secretariat. For example, in Rhodesia special arrangements have been made with the British Treasury to permit the transfer of funds for relief purposes and distribution within the country is made on our behalf by Christian Care. We were pleased to welcome to London in April the Rev. Stephen Manguni, who has been largely responsible for the administration of our relief programme in Rhodesia. Amnesty International transferred 28,701.14 Rhodesian dollars (approx. £17,000) to Rhodesia during 1971-72 to help the families of prisoners of conscience and to assist in rehabilitation programmes. It is possible in this case to give the amounts involved because the programme is centrally controlled.

In Greece too there has been a centrally administered programme, supported by funds raised in several countries, in addition to direct group donations which are sometimes lost when sent through the post. Not everyone is willing to receive money from abroad for fear of incurring official disapproval so a distribution system has been organised within Greece. This has helped many families who have been deprived of any regular income due to the political situation. Amnesty groups also send parcels to some of their adopted prisoners in the Soviet Union, and carry out officially acceptable relief activities in eastern Europe.

In special circumstances, such as exist in Sri Lanka (Ceylon), where many thousands are detained and individual adoptions of prisoners are relatively few, money is transferred to organisations within the country which have been able to ensure effective and politically impartial distribution where the need was greatest. These local organisations have a heavy responsibility and in some cases risk official disapproval. Funds are sometimes raised by national appeals in newspapers or by radio, but where we are advised against publicity they have to be raised privately through trusts or individuals.

During the past year systematic relief has been channelled to Brazil, Greece, Paraguay, Portugal, Rhodesia, South Africa and Sri Lanka. On some occasions assistance has also been provided for legal aid but this is not normally covered by the relief programme. In the future it can be anticipated that the Amnesty programme will need greater central administration and a relief officer may be required.

RELATIONS WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

The International Executive Committee attaches great importance to the cultivation of constructive and close relations with other international organisations both governmental and non-governmental.

At the United Nations in New York permanent representation of Amnesty International has been assured by Professor and Mrs. Gidon Gottlieb who have made every effort to inform delegations about the range of activities covered by the organisation and have taken up individual problems with governments from time to time. In April 1972 Dr. Amelia Augustus, Director of the American section, was also invited to represent Amnesty, in particular in our relations with the UN Secretariat and with non-governmental organisations in consultative status. In Geneva Dr. Lothar Belck has accepted a similar responsibility but his duties as Treasurer have led him to ask to be replaced in the coming year. Mr. James Beckett has agreed to take his place.

The Secretary General visited the United Nations, New York, in March 1972 at the invitation of the Special Committee on Apartheid and spoke to a seminar attended by many other delegates from non-governmental organisations and specialist groups. Some of his suggestions relating to treatment of prisoners and the establishment of special tribunals to register complaints and prepare a register of known torturers were taken up in the final report of the seminar which was presented to the UN committee. The Secretary General also spoke to the UN Committee of 24 on Decolonisation with particular reference to the problems of prisoners in Namibia and the Portuguese controlled areas of Africa, and was received by the new Secretary General of the UN, Mr. Kurt Waldheim. During the same mission the Secretary General visited the Washington headquarters of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and discussed problems particularly relating to prisoners and their treatment in Paraguay and Brazil. Close contact is maintained with the Commission.

At the non-governmental level, Amnesty International continues to be a member of the Bureau of the Standing Conference of Non-Governmental Organisations in Consultative Status with the Economic and Social Council. The Bureau meets in parallel committees in New York and Geneva where there also exist Special International Committees on Human Rights and Disarmament. The Chairman of Amnesty's International Executive Committee has been unanimously elected as the Chairman of the Geneva Special

Committee on Human Rights. It gave specific endorsement to the two resolutions prepared by Amnesty on the Treatment of Prisoners and the establishment of independent tribunals to investigate allegations of torture. Dissemination of the UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners has been a central part of the programme of Amnesty in its relations with international organisations both governmental and non-governmental. It is regrettable that these rules which have been in existence since 1955 and were confirmed by the 5th UN Congress on the Prevention of Crime and Treatment of Offenders, held in Kyoto Japan in 1970, have still not received wide publicity and support and are rarely if ever available from UN information centres or even from the headquarters of the UN Secretariat.

The Standard Minimum Rules were also the subject of discussion with the Council of Europe at a special meeting of organisations specially interested in Human Rights questions held in Strasbourg in May 1972. These meetings are held regularly and the Amnesty representative to the Council of Europe during the past year has been M. Roland Fischer who is secretary of one of the Strasbourg Amnesty groups. The Council of Europe has been studying the UN Rules for the treatment of prisoners but has so far not taken any positive decision with regard to the establishment of implementation machinery, nor in regard to their widest possible dissemination among those mainly concerned; i.e. welfare organisations, prison officers and the prisoners themselves. The International Secretariat has taken this matter up with the Secretary General of the Council of Europe and with the Legal Committee. In addition to being the Chairman of the Special International NGO Committee on Human Rights, Seán MacBride is also a member of the Bureau of the Special Disarmament NGO Committee.

The Secretary General of Amnesty attended the Parliamentary Conference on Human Rights called in Vienna by the Council of Europe in the autumn of 1971. One of the results of the Conference was the re-introduction of the subject of the right to conscientious objection to military service in the programme of the Council. A resolution on this passed by the Consultative Assembly of the Council of Europe in 1967 has never been implemented but the whole issue has now again been placed on the agenda of the Legal Committee.

The report on ill-treatment of prisoners in Northern Ireland was distributed to members of the Human Rights Commission of the Council of Europe and a special report on the treatment of prisoners under interrogation in Turkey was also made available to some interested members of the Consultative Assembly and through these channels delivered to the Foreign Minister of Turkey. Special efforts have also been made to draw the attention of the European governments to the infringements of human rights in certain countries wishing to have a closer relationship with the Common Market countries.

During the past year Amnesty International has been granted observer status on the Organisation for African Unity Co-ordinating Committee on Refugees; a branch of the OAU secretariat in Addis Ababa. No permanent

representative has yet been appointed but it is hoped to develop our relationship with the OAU in the future.

It is clear that there is much more work that could be done through the channels of the intergovernmental organisations at the UN and regional levels.

Among international non-governmental organisations, Amnesty has worked closely with those with particular interest in the rule of law and the administration of justice, such as the International Commission of Jurists, the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, the International Peace Bureau, the International Association of Catholic Jurists, the International League for the Rights of Man, and others in the same field. Common missions of observers to trials have been arranged and information shared.

Much closer co-operation, including common programmes in defence of the rights of prisoners, could be and should be established in the future. The international trade union and youth movements, religious organisations, journalists, doctors, psychiatrists, and other professional groups are all deeply concerned about their own members and associates who suffer from intolerance and violence throughout the world. Amnesty International should make increased efforts to work with them. In some cases they have the information which we need to work for individual prisoners of conscience and in others they could be supplied with the information which could permit them to work in support of their colleagues who are in detention in many parts of the world. At both the national and international levels of our movement other non-governmental organisations provide an opportunity for broadening our approach to our own mandate of working for the release of prisoners of conscience.

The International Executive Committee appreciates the work which has been done by the various Amnesty members who have represented the organisation at conferences and in organisations throughout the year.

REPORT BY THE INTERNATIONAL TREASURER

The encouraging growth of our membership, and the continuous expansion of our activities, require a substantial increase of the services provided by the International Secretariat. Our finances in budget year 1971/72 reflect the emphasis which was placed on providing the International Secretariat with a basis which would ensure increased output and a streamlined operation. The primary objective during this year was to strengthen the Research Department.

Compared with previous years, this year's expenditure shows a dramatic increase:

1969/70	£28,741
1970/71	£52,747
1971/72	£76,558

It is gratifying to note that over 100% of the projected income was received. On the one hand, this is the result of the constructive response of our membership to this financial challenge; on the other, the Joseph Rowntree Social Service Trust had very generously made an increased grant of £15,000 per year for the period of the next five years.

Staff costs represent the lion's share of 1971/72 expenditure, up substantially over 1970/71 (£48,775 vs. £36,358). The transition from an operation which had relied heavily on volunteers to an office staffed by professionals required an adjustment of all salaries. Adoption of the UK scale for local government employees (NALGO scale) raised the average annual gross salary from £1,381 (April 1971) to £1,693 (April 1972). Furthermore, staff at the International Secretariat was increased from 23 (April 1971) to 34 (April 1972), most of the expansion taking place in the Research Department. The increased scope of operation resulted in higher operational cost as well as in higher expenditures for missions and other travel.

The surplus of £21,171 results from delays, for reasons beyond our control, of the anticipated move to larger office premises. Not only were expenditures for office premises below forecast; due to the extremely cramped condition in the present office (34 staff plus volunteers on 2,300 square feet) it was not practical to hire immediately all the additional staff although such posts had been authorised and provided for in the budget. Subject to International Council approval, part of that surplus will be carried over into the operating budget for 1972/73, the rest transferred to our capital reserves.

Efforts to secure a sound financial basis for the International Secretariat were paralleled by developing and, whenever practical, implementing procedures which would improve the operating efficiency.

During the past two years, considerable efforts have been made to provide an integrated budget for the Secretary-General's Office and for the Research Department, and to rationalise the administration of both by separating their functions and costings. This is reflected in the budget as presented in the current annual report. The principle that National Sections make their contributions on the basis of the number of groups in each country has now been generally accepted and has proved its practical value. Modifications are still needed to avoid any one National Section contributing an excessive share to the total budget; on the other hand, more flexibility will have to be provided to ensure that financially weak National Sections contribute a share which is fair in relation to their potential resources.

The rapid growth of the budget does not mean that Amnesty International is now a rich organisation—on the contrary. Further increases of the budget will be necessary for the foreseeable future to finance a continually expanding operation. This will necessitate even greater emphasis on fund-raising, both nationally and internationally.

Lothar E. Belck.

INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT
Income and Expenditure Account for year ended 30 April 1972

INCOME

	1971/72 £	*1970/71* £
National Section Contributions	79,078	33,236
Other Individual Contributions	612	1,789
Donations	19,474	14,882
Literature, Publications and Sundry Receipts	3,490	2,840
TOTAL INCOME	102,654	52,747
EXPENDITURE		
Salaries	9,161	8,217
Travel	6,600	4,540
Missions	4,038	
Sundry	1,070	620
Audit	150	105
	21,019	13,482
Printing and Sationery	2,510	3,157
Telephone	918	980
Postage	1,862	1,244
	5,290	5,381
Rent and Rates	749	751
Light and Heat	121	129
Cleaners	122	141
Repairs	27	427
Depreciation	139	139
	1,158	1,527
Publications Department	—	649
Development of National Sections	168	—
	168	649
Provision for Capital Expenditure	2,000	—
Provision for Dilapidation	—	2,500
Maintenance of Research Department	44,180	24,500
Emergency Fund	900	—
	47,080	27,000
Excess of Income over Expenditure carried down	27,939	4,708
	102,654	52,747
Surplus brought down	27,939	
Carried forward to 1972/73	5,500	
Surplus for the year transferred to Accumulated Fund	22,439	

Balance Sheet at 30 April 1972

ASSETS

		1971/72 £	*1970/71* £
Cash in Hand		75	25
Cash at Bank		16,944	15,745
Sundry Debtors and Prepayments		13,739	6,734
Loan to Publications Department, less Reserve		1	1
Office Equipment at Cost	1,371		
Less: Depreciation	218		
		1,153	718
Loan to Prisoner of Conscience Fund		33,078	13,078
Loan to A. Marreco		1,000	—
Total Assets		65,990	36,299

LESS LIABILITIES

Earmarked Monies	670		2.234	
Loan from British Section	—		1,500	
Creditors and Accruals	9,489		6,673	
Provisions for Dilapidations and Capital Expenditure	4,500		2,500	
		14,659		12,907
Surplus of Assets		51,331		23,392

REPRESENTED BY

	1971/72 £	*1970/71* £
BALANCE OF FUND AT 30TH APRIL 1971	23,392	4,347
OTHER RECEIPTS	—	14,337
SURPLUS FOR THE YEAR	22,439	4,708
RESERVED FOR 1972-73	5,500	—
	51,331	23,392

I have audited the above accounts and certify that, subject to my recommendations as to accounting controls and procedures, they show a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the International Secretariat, and of its income and expenditure for the year ended 30th April, 1972.

London, 23rd June, 1972.

G. A. W. LOCK, F.C.A.

RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
Income and Expenditure Account for year ended 30 April 1972

EXPENDITURE

	1971/72	*1970/71*
	£	£
Salaries	39,614	20,005
Travel	1,104	175
Missions	19	—
Sundry	804	461
Audit	150	105
Newspapers	716	464
	42,407	21,210
Printing and Stationery	1,979	1,456
Telephone	1,545	862
Postage	2,201	285
Background Papers	1,318	—
	7,043	2,603
Rent and Rates	968	989
Light and Heat	227	166
Cleaner	206	192
Repairs	26	113
Depreciation	71	71
	1,498	1,531
Cost of Maintaining the Department	50,948	25,342
Transfer from International Secretariat	44,180	24,500
Deficit for the Year	6,768	842

Statement—30 April 1972

	1971/72		*1970/71*	
	£		£	
Balance at the beginning of financial year	(4,537)		(3,695)	
Add: Deficit for the year	(6,768)		(842)	
	(11,305)		(4,537)	
Represented by:				
Creditors	7,626		1,496	
Adverse Bank Balance	4,396		3,955	
	12,022		5,451	
Less: Cash in Hand	75		37	
Prepayments	66		230	
	141	11,881	267	5,184
Office Equipment	718		718	
Less: Depreciation	142		71	
	576		647	
		(11,305)		(4,537)

I have audited the above accounts and certify that, subject to my recommendations as to accounting controls and procedures, they show a true and fair view of the state of affairs of the Research Department, and of its income and expenditure for the year ended 30th April, 1972.

London, 23rd June, 1972.

G. A. W. LOCK, F.C.A.

INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT AND RESEARCH DEPARTMENT

Summary of Income and Expenditure for the year ended 30th April 1972, and Budget comparison

EXPENDITURE

	Int. £	*Research* £	*Total* £	*Budget* £
Salaries	9,161	39,614	48,775	48,016
Travel	6,600	1,104	7,704	6,500
Missions	4,038	19	4,057	5,000
Sundry	1,070	804	1,874	1,650
Audit	150	150	300	250
Newspapers	—	716	716	600
	21,019	42,407	63,426	62,016
Printing and Stationery	2,510	1,979	4,489	5,500
Telephone	918	1,545	2,463	3,000
Postage	1,862	2,201	4,062	4,000
Background Papers	—	1,318	1,318	4,000
	5,290	7,043	12,333	16,500
Rent and Rates	749	968	1,717	7,712
Light and Heat	121	227	348	600
Cleaner	122	206	328	450
Repairs	27	26	53	750
Depreciation	139	71	210	—
	1,158	1,498	2,656	9,512
Provision for Capital Expenditure	2,000	—	2,000	—
AID	—	—	—	500
Development of National Sections	168	—	168	2,000
Prisoner of Conscience Week	—	—	—	1,000
Emergency Fund	900	—	900	—
	3,068	—	3,068	3,500
TOTAL EXPENDITURE	30,535	50,948	81,483	91,528
Surplus carried down	27,939	(6,768)	21,171	—
	58,474	44,180	102,654	91,528
Surplus brought down	27,939	(6,768)	21,171	
Less: Carried forward to 1972/73	5,500	—	5,500	
	22,439	(6,768)	15,671	

INCOME

	Actual £	*Budget* £
National Section Contributions	79,078	78,746
Other Contributions	612	
Donations	19,474	12,782
Literature, Publications and Sundry Receipts	3,490	
	102,654	91,528

THE RESEARCH DEPARTMENT

Foreword by the Director of Research

The key document on the development of the Research Department was presented to the IEC and approved at its meeting on 28 November 1970. The document suggested a considerable growth of the Department over the years 1971-1974. The expansion proposed then will have been carried out well before the end of the year 1972. The growth of the Amnesty organisation and of its financial resources have made the expanded Research Department both necessary and possible. More than ever before the work of the organisation depends on accurate information.

It should, however, be said that in December 1971 it was established that the Researchers were spending only about 40 per cent of their time on the production of new information. Follow-up action on existing cases, briefing of missions, enquiries from the press, and dealing with the "specialist groups" made heavy demands on their time. It is hoped that the institution of new posts in the Secretariat, including those of four Executive Assistants who will cope with enquiries from Amnesty groups and with follow-up action, and of an Information Officer, will make it possible for members of the Research Department to give more time to their principal work.

The increased expenditure has been reflected in the many achievements of Amnesty as a whole, as well as of the Research Department. In 1969, 883 new cases were adopted or investigated: in 1970, 1,050; and in 1971, 1,271, an increase of 44 per cent, while releases of Amnesty prisoners have gone up over the same period from 520 to 700 and then to 727 in 1971. In the first four months of 1972 the same development continued on an even more impressive scale: 700 new case sheets have been constructed in the Research Department, and 335 releases have taken place. It is evident that not all these releases result exclusively or even partially from Amnesty action, but the regularity and proportion of the increase is a factor in assessing our achievements. During the same period the amount and quality of background information on the various countries where Amnesty works has grown; the *Survey of Political Imprisonment*, an account of the human rights situation and of political imprisonment in ten countries was completed in May 1972.

In the subsequent pages the activities of Amnesty International as seen by the members of its Research Department are described in some detail, and it will become apparent that those activities have been more varied and more intensive than in any other year in the past.

I should like to thank the Researchers and the staff of the Department for their dedicated work in the past year: the compilation of this report was only a very small part of it.

Zbyněk Zeman.

AFRICA

Important political trials took place in 1971-1972 in several African countries, notably Sudan, Kenya, Morocco, Guinea, Rhodesia and South Africa. Attempts at violent political change, some successful and others not, led to the arrest of large numbers of civilians in Ghana, Sudan, Madagascar, and Zanzibar. Large-scale political detention was used for the first time in some countries, such as Zambia, which had previously avoided that expedient. In other states, such as Malawi and Rhodesia, there is the continuing problem of long-term detentions. In Guinea political trials continued to give rise to death sentences, and in Uganda there have been disturbing reports of the summary execution of military detainees. In Tunisia and Ethiopia, student unrest has led to widespread imprisonment. On the other hand, states which a few years ago held a large number of political detainees, such as Kenya, now have very few such prisoners, and long-term prisoners of conscience have been released in Sierra Leone, Liberia, and Lesotho. In Sudan and Lesotho many prisoners have benefited from large-scale amnesties.

While continuing its traditional work in the countries of Southern Africa (where a new researcher has been appointed to cover Namiba) Amnesty has attempted to expand its operations in the states north of the Zambezi, both anglophone and francophone. In the francophone areas especially, Amnesty has made continuing efforts to ensure that its work is better known and understood by the governments and peoples. To this end contacts have been made in West Africa, and a working group on sub-Saharan francophone countries has been established in Paris with the co-operation of the French Section, to collect data and establish channels of information.

Although Amnesty's field of interest covers all the countries of Africa, the following report includes only those states where we feel we have been able to act effectively, in cases of some importance, during the past twelve months.

During the summer of 1971 Amnesty's attention was drawn to the plight of Rhodesian refugees in BOTSWANA, some of whom were faced with repatriation to their own country, where it was feared they would face political persecution. The International Secretariat raised the question of their predicament with the British government, the Botswana authorities, and the Organisation of African Unity. Some of the refugees involved were given extensions of their residence permits, and others were released from jail (where they were being held after returning to Botswana illegally), but in spite of Amnesty efforts many of them were returned to Rhodesia in January 1972.

Amnesty's major concern in BURUNDI has been the political trial which took place in Bujumbura between October 1971 and January 1972. The trial, which resulted from the political tensions between the two principal tribal groupings, the Hutu and the minority Tutsi, involved about thirty persons, including the head of the army and a number of ex-ministers. They were accused of plotting to overthrow the government and assassinate the

president, and the trial resulted in severe sentences, including 9 death sentences and 7 life imprisonments. After the intervention of several national and international organisations, the Burundi government commuted the death sentences to life imprisonment, and released some of the prisoners who had been given life sentences. The International Secretariat and the French Section of Amnesty International took part in these interventions by addressing letters and telegrams to President Micombero. Amnesty is continuing its activities by adopting some of the prisoners.[1]

Amnesty has been in touch with sources inside ETHIOPIA during the past year concerning the imprisonment of students and the fate of 14 persons sentenced for political crimes during 1968. According to information reaching the Research Department early in May 1972, between 400 and 800 university and secondary school students were arrested and detained following disturbances at Haile Selassie I University in February and March. Amnesty appealed to the Emperor to grant an amnesty for these prisoners: a large-scale amnesty of political offenders was announced on 5 May, but it is not known how many, if any, of the imprisoned students were released on that date.

In January 1972 the government of GHANA was overthrown by a military *coup d'état*; five days later a Preventive Custody Decree was published, which notified the detention of 265 individuals, including Members of Parliament, cabinet ministers, and branch members of the ruling Progress Party. Since that time there have been a number of releases, but Amnesty is seeking arrangements for an official representative to visit Ghana to discuss the situation of the detainees with the Ghanaian authorities.

Political trials took place throughout practically the whole of 1971 in GUINEA. About 100 persons accused of complicity in the abortive invasion attempt of November 1970 were sentenced by a People's Tribunal. These prisoners included 13 former cabinet ministers, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Conakry, and several foreigners, including Germans, French and Italians. Unfortunately, the extremely tense political situation in Guinea has not allowed Amnesty to work effectively in the cases of individual prisoners. The Chairman of the International Executive Committee has had talks with the Guinean Ambassador and it is hoped that further discussion on behalf of prisoners in Guinea will result.

In KENYA 12 men were sentenced to terms of imprisonment ranging from 7 to $9\frac{1}{2}$ years in June 1971 after pleading guilty to conspiring to overthrow the government. Due to the violent nature of the political crimes for which they were convicted they have not been adopted. Amnesty continues to press for the release of 3 long-term detainees, all former members of the banned opposition Kenya People's Union (KPU), and Amnesty groups continue to support the detainees' families. Most of the prisoners whom Amnesty adopted after they had been sentenced for the possession of Maoist literature have since been released. Amnesty has also taken up the cases of 4 Zanzibari exiles arrested in Mombasa in February and held without trial.

[1] The recent reports of massacres in Burundi came in after this report was prepared.

In August 1971 Amnesty sent a special representative, Miss Joan Lestor, M.P., to LESOTHO to discuss the continuing political detention of members of the Basutoland Congress Party (BCP), some of whom had been held since January 1970. Miss Lestor spoke to members of the Lesotho government about this situation, and reported on her return that between 90 and 100 persons remained in detention. In addition, released detainees were being placed in restriction. The Research Department began to produce case sheets on the remaining detainees at once, and early in January 1972 the Lesotho government announced that the last BCP detainees had been released. However, Amnesty received information that the released detainees were placed under restriction, and efforts are now being made to persuade the Lesotho government to lift these restrictions, and to find a channel through which financial aid from the groups might reach the restrictees and their families. At present Amnesty is working on 15 cases in Lesotho.

In LIBERIA, Mr. Henry Fahnbulleh, a long-term prisoner adopted by Amnesty, was released by decree of President Tolbert in December 1971, and his confiscated property was restored to him.

The peasant revolt which took place in the Tuléar region of southern MADAGASCAR in April 1971 provoked serious political tensions and a fierce repression by the authorities. Several hundreds of persons are thought to have been killed during the disturbances, although the official toll is 40. About 1,000 persons were subsequently arrested and held without trial, many at Tuléar Prison. Many of the peasants detained belonged to the former opposition party MONIMA (Mouvement National pour l'Indépendance de Madagascar) which was blamed for the rising and subsequently banned. Simultaneously, a number of influential political figures, including the former Vice-President, M. A. Resampa, were accused of complicity with MONIMA and imprisoned in June 1971. None of them have yet received a trial. Amnesty has already adopted several of these cases, and the Research Department is continuing its efforts to identify cases of political imprisonment in Madagascar, in particular those relating to the rising of April 1971.[1]

In December 1971 the Research Department received detailed information concerning prison conditions for political detainees in MALAWI, where the number of such prisoners is thought to be close to 300. Information on individual prisoners, however, has been difficult to obtain.

In MALI, Amnesty has been concerned with the cases of about 40 political prisoners during the past year. These persons were detained following the change of government which took place in 1968. Since that time a number of prisoners have been held without trial. Notable progress has been made in the Research Department's efforts to obtain substantial information on the circumstances of political detainees in Mali.

In 1971, Amnesty's activities in MOROCCO were concentrated mainly on the important political trial held at Marrakech. This trial involved 193 persons, the majority of whom were members of the Union Nationale des

[1] There was an amnesty for all political prisoners in June 1972.

Forces Populaires (UNFP), one of the main Moroccan opposition parties. The prisoners were accused of crimes against the state. Three Amnesty observers attended different portions of the trial; they were Mr. Lennart Aspegren, Assistant Judge at the Stockholm Appeals Court, Professor Werner Sarstedt and Dr. Horst Woesner, both of the West German Federal Court. These observers reported disturbing aspects of the trial, including the reported use of torture against prisoners in the pre-trial period. The trial resulted in 5 death sentences, 6 life imprisonments, a large number of prison terms of varying lengths, and some acquittals. We intervened at once to protest against the death sentences and to ask for an amnesty. Some of the prisoners have now been adopted by groups.[1]

Political tensions in NAMIBIA (South West Africa) rose sharply at the end of 1971. Several European church workers and clergymen were expelled, or refused renewal of their residence permits, 4 of them following a strike of more than 14,000 Ovambo migrant workers who were protesting against the labour system regulating the employment of Africans. Twelve of the strikers were charged with non-violent offences, and they have been adopted by Amnesty. The rest of the workers were repatriated to Ovamboland, where disturbances immediately broke out. South Africa declared the area to be in a state of emergency, and although it has been completely sealed off for some weeks, government announced that more than 200 persons had been held. Amnesty reports have reached the outside world of police brutality and the erection of makeshift prisons to hold large numbers of detainees. The South African has adopted an Anglican clergyman detained under the Emergency Regulations, and continues to investigate imprisonment in Ovamboland, as well as in the Caprivi Strip. Ten case sheets have been made out on men arrested in the Caprivi Strip in 1964-1965, detained, and in 1969 indicted under the Terrorism Act. However, charges were dropped, although there has been no information about the men's release. The 10 detainees have been the subject of recent petitions to the United Nations. Amnesty has also started to investigate conditions under which Namibian prisoners are held, both at Robben Island and at Pretoria Central Prison in South Africa.

In November 1971 the NIGERIAN government issued a statement announcing the reintegration into the Nigerian armed forces of certain officers who had fought on the Biafran side during the Nigerian civil war; the same statement also confirmed the continued detention of 30 persons, including some former Biafran civilian leaders and a number of officers allegedly involved in the pre-war *coup* of January 1966. During the year Amnesty raised the cases of all these men in letters to the Nigerian head of state, General Gowon. Dr. Pius Okigbo is one of the former Biafran leaders who was released from detention during the year. Amnesty also adopted two leaders of the Nigerian Trades Union Congress who were detained in Feb-

[1] In June 1972 there were some releases, including at least one prisoner who had been sentenced to death.

ruary 1971 following a series of go-slows and strikes. The two men were released in May 1972.

In spite of constant pressure from Amnesty, the British government was not prepared to make the revocation of the Emergency Regulations and the release of all political detainees a condition of any settlement with the regime in RHODESIA. Consequently, about 70 of the African men detained during the 1960's are still in prison without charge or trial. In addition, Amnesty has received official confirmation that some prisoners convicted of offences against the state are being detained on completion of their sentences.

We continue to work closely with Christian Care, an organisation in Rhodesia which distributes relief to families of prisoners and others in need, and many groups have paid for the education of detainees' children. As educational facilities for Africans in Rhodesia decline, the need for groups to help will increase. Some groups have also paid for legal representation for their adopted detainees at the hearings of the Review Tribunal on Detainees. Finally, groups continue to aid financially those detainees who have been released but placed under restriction, and, as a consequence, find themselves unable to get employment. A scheme initiated by Christian Care to enable these men to become self-supporting was handicapped through lack of funds; an appeal by Amnesty brought in £1,000 for this purpose.

About 2,000 Africans were arrested during the visit of the Pearce Commission for taking part in a campaign to oppose the terms of the proposed Anglo-Rhodesian settlement. Some were released without charge, some were detained and many were charged, the alleged offences including such crimes as "showing disrespect to a chief" and "shouting the slogan of a banned organisation in public". The Legal Aid organisation in Salisbury struggles to obtain defence counsel for those accused on such charges, since sentences, when imposed, have been most severe. It is hampered by lack of funds, however, and Amnesty has consequently asked groups to contribute towards legal defence if they wish to, even though the accused persons are not adopted prisoners of conscience.

Amnesty has been concerned with the fate of several persons charged with political crimes in connection with the establishment and maintenance of military rule in SIERRA LEONE during the years 1967-1968. Following the imposition of death sentences and prison terms on the accused during the spring and summer of 1970, the appeals of those convicted were upheld by the Sierra Leone Court of Appeal in May 1971. However, the defendants were immediately re-detained, and the government stated its intention to try them a second time. The International Secretariat approached the Sierra Leone government and pressed for the release of these men on humanitarian grounds. In December 1971 all but three of the accused were released, and Amnesty was notified of this by letter from President Stevens. During June 1971 4 army officers were executed for allegedly plotting to overthrow the government by violence—the first use of the death penalty for political crimes since Sierra Leone gained its independence. Amnesty continues to handle the cases of 32 members of the opposition United Democratic Party (UDP), who are detained

under the Emergency Regulations first imposed in September 1970. Two of the leaders of the party have been prisoners chosen for the monthly Postcard Campaign. Releases are continuing at a slow pace.

During 1971-1972 Amnesty groups conducted investigations into the cases of former members of the SOMALI government imprisoned after the coup of October 1969. The Research Department is still seeking information on other prominent Somalis reported to be detained without trial in Mogadishu. In addition, several adoption cases have been taken up, mostly individuals charged under the Somali National Security Law of September 1970 with offences such as "spreading false rumours against the government".

Less than one fifth of SOUTH AFRICA's political prisoners serving sentences on Robben Island are adopted by Amnesty groups. Of the many hundreds arrested in the early 1960's, most have completed their sentences of 3, 5, or 7 years, been released from prison, and sent to "Resettlement Camps". The majority of those still in prison, sentenced to longer terms, were not considered eligible for adoption at the time of their imprisonment.

Of the 33 alleged members of the Non-European Unity Movement, and APDUSA, mentioned in last year's Annual Report, 13 were finally brought to trial in June 1971, and sentenced in April 1972 to terms of between 5 and 8 years in prison. Several made affidavits of having been severely tortured while in detention. They have been adopted.

Amnesty also adopted the Anglican Dean of Johannesburg, detained in January 1971, charged the following August, and sentenced in November to 5 years' imprisonment. He was acquitted on appeal in April 1972. He had been charged with distributing funds for relief to the families of political prisoners and banned persons. The Dean's trial appears to be part of a government campaign against the Anglican Church, which has become more outspoken against detention without trial and *apartheid*. Three leading churchmen have recently been put under house arrest. All are adopted by Amnesty groups.

In October 1971, following massive police raids on private homes, 49 persons were detained under the Terrorism Act. After 4 to 6 months in solitary confinement and *incommunicado* 9 were charged: one was acquitted, one fined, 3 fled the country, and 4 will be tried in May 1972. These 4 are now adopted. One detainee, Ahmed Timol, fell to his death from the top floor of the Police Security Headquarters, 3 days after his arrest. He is the twentieth detainee in recent years to die while in police custody. The rate of alleged suicides at this interrogation centre has now become a public scandal. In March 1972 the Secretary General addressed a special United Nations Seminar on *apartheid* in New York on the subject of prison conditions and political imprisonment in South Africa.

An attempted *coup d'etat* involving members of the SUDANESE armed forces and some elements of the Sudanese Communist Party took place in Khartoum in July 1971. Following its failure there were widespread arrests of persons thought to be sympathetic to the Communists, and a number of persons were executed after summary trials by military tribunals. Amnesty

was concerned at these sentences and at the large number of detainees—running into thousands—who were reportedly held by early August 1971. Attempts to send an Amnesty representative (Mr. John Platts-Mills, QC) to the Sudan in August 1971 and January 1972 in order to negotiate with the Sudanese authorities concerning the detainees were abortive since on both occasions the Sudanese government failed to give any indication that they were prepared to receive such a mission. Meanwhile the Sudanese government has been releasing detainees in small numbers, although between 200 and 400 are still thought to be held. Late in 1971 the Sudanese government released members of the Ansar Sect of the Mahdists, imprisoned since the unsuccessful rising on Aba Island in March 1970, and also leaders of the Moslem Brotherhood. In March 1972 President Numeiry announced an amnesty covering all persons who had taken arms against the government during the lengthy civil war in Southern Sudan.

Amnesty's interest in TANZANIA continues to be threefold:

The trial for crimes against the state of 7 persons, which ended in January 1971; 4 of the defendants received life sentences, 2 received 10 years and one an acquittal. All of those convicted carried their cases to the East African Court of Appeal, which in July 1971 upheld the appeals of three of the accused and dismissed those of the other 3. Two of the persons whose appeals were upheld were released at once, but the third, Mr. Gray Mattaka, was immediately detained under the Preventive Detention Act. He has been adopted. One of those whose appeal was dismissed, Bibi Titi Mohamed, was released in February 1972 on grounds of ill-health.

Secondly, several Amnesty adoptees held without trial on the mainland of Tanzania under the Preventive Detention Act were released during 1971-1972. These included the 2 brothers of the former Tanzanian cabinet minister, Oscar Kambona, who now lives in voluntary exile in England.[1] Amnesty is now trying to help the brothers to rejoin their families outside Africa. Amnesty groups continue to press for the release of other mainland detainees, including 3 ex-Zanzibari ministers and a number of refugees from Rwanda who have been detained since 1968.

Finally, on the island of Zanzibar, which forms part of a union with mainland Tanzania, there are continuing reports of arbitrary arrests. In January 1972 the island's ruler, Sheikh Abeid Karume, announced the closure of all prisons on the island. A large number of common criminals were released, in addition to a few political prisoners, but most political detainees continued to be held. Following the assassination of Sheikh Karume in April 1972, large numbers of persons, especially members of the left-wing Umma Party, were arrested on Zanzibar and on the mainland, and there were reports of summary executions on the island. The International Secretariat and the Dutch and Swedish Sections have urged President Nyere to intervene in order to protect human rights. Meanwhile Amnesty groups in many countries continue to adopt and investigate numerous cases on Zanzibar. For the first time in many years, groups are having some success in establishing contact with the families of their prisoners.

[1] The brothers were re-detained on 12 June, 1972.

In TUNISIA, Amnesty groups continue to give moral and material support to a number of ex-detainees (mostly students) who benefited from measures of clemency on the part of the Tunisian government in March 1970. Although theoretically free, these students have not been accorded an amnesty; they remain under constant police surveillance and are not able to secure employment. Several of them are restricted to regions far removed from their home areas. Some, such as M. Ahmed Ben Othman, were re-arrested in April 1971 and have been held without trial. Early in 1972 strikes and public demonstrations, centred on Tunisian universities and secondary schools, led to the arrest and detention of large numbers of students and workers. M. Ben Salah, the ex-minister, continues to be detained.

In TOGO, Amnesty continued to work on the cases of 3 prisoners sentenced to long prison terms in December 1970 after their trial before a special tribunal on charges of plotting against state security. In October 1971 another Togolese, detained without charge or trial, was adopted by Amnesty. It should be noted that there has been a relative improvement in the treatment of political detainees in Togo since the end of 1971. On 13 January, 1972, on the anniversary of the seizure of power by the Togolese army, a number of political detainees were freed.

Following the promulgation of a detention decree in UGANDA in May 1971, large numbers of persons—mostly members of the Ugandan armed forces—remained in detention in Uganda throughout 1971. A new detention decree was issued in September, but in spite of the provisions of the May decree, no list of detainees was ever published by the Ugandan government. In November 1971 Amnesty produced its first case sheet on a Ugandan prisoner under the present Government. The following month it was reported that several hundred military detainees were being removed from Kampala to face courts martial at locations outside the capital. This was followed in February 1972 by claims on the part of Ugandan refugees in Tanzania that large numbers of detainees had been summarily executed at the border village of Mutukula. Further evidence appeared to contradict the Ugandan government's claim that only 15 detainees were held. Amnesty has approached the Ugandan authorities through the Ugandan representative at the United Nations to express its concern at these developments and to press for an impartial judicial enquiry into the events at Mutukula, but has not received a satisfactory reply, and continues to be concerned at the situation in Uganda.

In September 1971 President Kaunda of ZAMBIA announced the arrest and detention of 100 members of the opposition United Progressive Party (UPP). This was followed in February 1972 by the banning of the party and the arrest of more of its members and leaders, including its head, Mr. Simon Kapwepwe. Amnesty has raised these arrests, and the question of the

detention of Rhodesian refugees in Zambia, with the Zambian Deputy High Commissioner in London. Preparations are now being made for adoption of the detainees.

Portuguese Africa

The Jehovah's Witnesses from MOZAMBIQUE under adoption since 1970 were released upon completion of their sentences, with the exception of 2 Witnesses due for release in September of this year. A new religious law adopted in Portugal in July 1971 provided that all religious groups of more than 500 members be accorded equal legal status to that previously held only by the Catholic Church. The apparent liberalism of the new provision is somewhat abrogated by the clause which states that the new recognition can be refused or revoked by the State when the doctrines or actions of the organisation in question are considered as contradictory "to the fundamental principles of constitutional order or the interests of Portuguese sovereignty".

Unfortunately, the practices followed by Jehovah's Witnesses are apparently still considered dangerous to the state and arrests of Jehovah's Witnesses continue. Eleven new adoptions have been made in ANGOLA. No formal trials have been held; "fixation of residence" measures have been applied, and the prisoners transferred to Biaia dos Tigres work camp in Southern Angola.

Amnesty International is also investigating cases of Portuguese and Spanish priests arrested after criticising Portuguese colonial policy in Mozambique, and we continue to work for the release of Father de Andrade and Dr. Domingos Arouca.

We are waiting to see how other new legislation and the "new" constitution presented by the Portuguese authorities as a means of granting increased autonomy to the Portuguese-administered territories will affect conditions related to political liberties in Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea.

In addition to the prisoners already mentioned, it is known that many prisoners are held in camps within the territories or on off-shore islands. It is, however, difficult to obtain information, particularly with the chronic shortage of research staff available to work on this area, and in view of the disturbed political situation within the country.

ASIA

In January, a research officer was appointed to work on India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Nepal; this is a new post and has already led to more systematic work on this important area. For the first six months of the year, the Department was very under-staffed and this explains the small number of cases adopted in Asian countries both in comparison with other regions, and with the large numbers of prisoners to be found in, for example, Ceylon or Indonesia.

During the year only one mission took place, to Ceylon. Plans are well advanced for delegates to visit Taiwan, the Indian sub-continent and Indonesia within the next few months. A decision has now been taken to

begin research on the People's Republic of China, and a preliminary report has been commissioned on the general issue of political imprisonment; the decision on individual adoptions will be taken later.

SOUTH ASIA

After the PAKISTAN army had occupied East Bengal in March 1971, most Bengalis who did not support the military administration were killed, went underground or sought asylum in India. There were few prisoners. Amnesty's work therefore concentrated on the small number of Bengalis known to be detained in (West) Pakistan; Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, now Prime Minister of Bangladesh, and Kamal Hussain, his Minister of Justice, were adopted. In July, in response to reports that a secret military trial was imminent, Seán MacBride travelled to Islamabad to represent Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, instructed by a London law firm, in his capacity as a member of the Irish Bar. On his return, Amnesty published the text of a letter written to the then President Yahya Khan, in which he explained why he felt it important that there should be an open civilian trial with free choice of defence counsel:

> "Every State recognises that it is bound by the Rule of Law and that, save in very exceptional circumstances, no civilian should be tried by a Military Tribunal. This is not to imply that military officers are less fair than civilian judges; but military courts are by their nature intended to be summary. The rules and procedures of civilian courts in criminal cases were devised with care to ensure that the highest degree of fairness and objectivity would be assured in the trial of persons accused of crime.
>
> . . . It can be said in retort that there are very exceptional circumstances in existence in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan which would justify the use of military tribunals. Even if this were so, it does appear to us that the true test of this case is not 'Can military courts be used?' but is 'Are the Civil Courts capable of functioning?'. If the answer to this question is, as I think it must be 'Yes', the justification for the trial being held before a military tribunal vanishes. . . .
>
> Furthermore, the trial of a democratically elected leader of a vast section of the people of Pakistan is of no small consequence. It is bound to raise issues of grave constitutional importance which should be determined by the highest civilian courts in the land and not by a military court."

In January 1972, the Secretary General wrote to Sheikh Mujibur Rahman congratulating him on his release and return to Bangladesh; he also expressed Amnesty's concern over the widespread arrests of alleged collaborators and asked that international observers should be present at the trials of those charged as war criminals. A letter was written to President Bhutto congratulating him on his decision to return PAKISTAN to civilian rule, and raising the case of a Bengali economist still detained in Rawlpindi; he was later released. In April, Thomas Hammarberg, a member of Amnesty's International Executive Committee, visited Dacca and had talks with Kamal Hussain.

The INDIAN government recently released 2 detainees who had been held without trial in Kashmir as advocates of increased autonomy for the state; one had been adopted and the other had been featured in the monthly Postcard Campaign. Six Pakistani citizens, arrested by the Indian government in the period after March 1971, have been taken up as investigation cases.

In March 1971, a State of Emergency was imposed in the Republic of SRI LANKA (Ceylon) in response to a violent revolt organised by the Janatha Vimukthi Peramuna, a radical Marxist youth movement. There was considerable loss of life and 14,000 people were subsequently detained under Emergency Regulations, which remain in force. Amnesty recognised that the Government had faced a grave emergency and decided to take no action for a period of 6 months. In its statements, the Government freely admitted that although some detainees had been perpetrators, or at least advocates, of violence, many of those in detention were not implicated in the rising. An Investigation Unit was set up and by July 7,000 cases had been processed, of whom 2,500 had been recommended for release. Amnesty's interest in this situation was threefold: that all detainees suspected of criminal offences should be tried by normal legal procedures; that all other detainees should be released; in the meantime, that there should be adequate conditions in prisons and detention camps. Particular concern was felt at the fact that detainees were being denied customary rights of legal access.

In September, Lord Avebury, a British parliamentarian, was sent to Colombo as a delegate; he was asked to report on the position and legal rights of those in detention. Although initial plans for this mission had been made with the knowledge and agreement of the government, no official meetings or facilities were arranged; at the end of his visit, only a few hours before leaving, Lord Avebury's visa was formally withdrawn. On his return to London he prepared a detailed report which was sent to the Prime Minister accompanied by specific recommendations relating to legal rights, prison conditions, information to families about arrest and detentions, and the employment of released prisoners. It was noted that the number of detainees had risen to 16,000. There was no response from the government and in March the report was published.

In March, new legislation was tabled; the Criminal Justice Commissions establishes special tribunals to hear the cases of 3,000 detainees due to be charged; in the interests of expedience, some important legal safeguards have been dispensed with, to the serious concern of Ceylonese lawyers. Releases are gradually taking place, but by the end of May about 10,000 remained in detention.

SOUTH EAST ASIA

In the middle of 1971, shortly after the July election, the INDONESIAN Government again announced its intention of reducing to 23,000 the number of political prisoners held without trial since 1965/6. At the same time the Foreign Minister announced that restrictions would gradually be relaxed for the 10,000 prisoners held in penal settlements on Buru Island. One of

the Research Department's main tasks has therefore been to establish how far this impressive release programme has been implemented, and to decide whether or not it signified a fundamental change in official policies.

There seems no doubt that some thousands of prisoners have been freed in the last nine months, but it is impossible to believe that the total numbers remaining in detention are not far in excess of 23,000. Two factors hamper any precise assessment: the indistinct line between detained prisoners and men who, though technically free, remain *de facto* prisoners as members of compulsory labour forces; the Government's own statistical uncertainties, which were summed up by the Attorney General late in 1971 when he told journalists that the exact number of prisoners was not officially known as it was " a floating rate, like the yen *vis-à-vis* the dollar; every day it changes". In January, the *Asian* newspaper assessed the total at 71,905; this may well be a realistic figure.

During the year more arrests have been reported, while attempts to purge the armed forces and government service of suspected communists continue. A few trials took place, and death sentences were reported. Amnesty's hope that detention procedures would be brought closer to a judicial framework once elections were over has therefore been disappointed; policy on detention continues to be dominated by military and security considerations, and prisoners remain without legal protection.

In December, journalists visited Buru Island; their reports make it clear that no real change of policy is contemplated, and that prisoners will remain restricted on the island for the foreseeable future. In May 1971, a new detention camp for several hundred women prisoners was opened at Plantungan, in Central Java. Early in 1972, Bukit Duri prison in Djakarta was closed, and many prisoners moved to Plantungan; as most are from the Djakarta area, the move will make it difficult for families to go on subsidising official rations.

On 12 August, 1971, a fortnight before the release programme was announced, Amnesty published the Memorandum written by Seán MacBride after his mission to Djakarta in 1970, and sent to President Suharto in February 1971. In a press statement, Amnesty asked the newly elected Indonesian government to review existing policy for all those detained in the period since 1965, and to release those not due for trial; the total number was estimated at between 70,000 and 90,000.

As an immediate step, the Memorandum asked that full lists of all prisoners should be published so that families might know that a relative was alive, though detained. The Government was also urged to implement those United Nations Standard Minimum Rules—hitherto in complete abeyance—which concern provision of adequate food and medical treatment, contact with families both generally, and specifically in the event of serious illness or death, the prohibition of 'cruel and degrading treatment' and the right to reading matter and to legal access.

Discussing the 'A' group of detainees due to be tried, the Memorandum suggests that those charged with less serious crimes should be released on the grounds that they had purged their offence by more than 5 (now 7) years' imprisonment. For group 'B' (10,000 to 15,000) scheduled for indefinite detention, the Memorandum proposed 'a complete revaluation of policy', commenting that the 'resettlement' of 10,000 on Buru Island was 'completely contrary to the norms of the rule of law' in that it meant detaining indefinitely without trial or charge, persons suspected of being communists; this would lead to the creation of 'vast penal settlements' and was thus no way to eradicate past bitterness.

During the year, the Research Department has laid more stress on adoption and, for the first time, there was some official response. In April, 2 groups received letters from the Commandant of Buru, the first time this had happened. At the same time, the Indonesian Ambassador in Canberra met Australian members at his request. In May, a New Zealand group obtained permission to send letters and parcels to their adopted prisoner on Buru, a precedent we hope will prove effective and be extended. Fifty-five prisoners are now adopted, and we plan to increase their number in the coming months.

During the year, comparatively little work has been done on MALAYSIA. Some new adoptions were made in Sabah, East Malaysia, and early in 1972 all Sabah detainees except two were freed; efforts are being made to establish identity of both. A few releases were also reported in West Malaysia, but no official figures have been published. Unfortunately, there has been no change in the position of about 20 people deprived of their nationality for political reasons, who are held under the Banishment Ordinance awaiting the chance, often remote, that asylum will be found for them elsewhere. Early this year a report appeared in the *Asian* newspaper that visits by Amnesty to detention camps would be officially allowed, but this has not been confirmed.

Four long-term detainees were released in SINGAPORE; at least one had been in custody since 1963, and another was from the group of *Nanyang Siang Pau* newspapermen arrested in 1971. But this handful of releases does not appear to signify a change in policy, even though no new detentions under the Internal Security Act have been reported. We have reports of increased pressure on detainees to obtain their release by making public "confessions" of past political connections. One adopted prisoner, Lim Hock Siew, when told that a public statement was a condition of release, refused on the grounds that this was "a form of public repentance", and that his opposition to the Malaysian Federation remained as strong as it had been when he was arrested in 1963. It seems possible that refusal to confess publicly is a major reason for the continuing detention of many long-term Singapore detainees. Their total is probably just under 100; Amnesty groups are working on 26 of these cases.

EAST ASIA

In August, talks began in Panmunjom between the two Red Cross Societies of KOREA. This was the first direct contact between North and South since 1953 and raised hopes that it might be the start of a wider relaxation in tension.

But, although the talks have continued, the situation in SOUTH KOREA has not improved as far as political imprisonment is concerned. "Threats from the north" and the insecurity engendered by China's entry to the UN were given in December as reasons for imposing a State of Emergency: it was followed by a number of arrests.

During the year, Amnesty's action has focused on trials of students and others charged with 'espionage' and having contacts in North Korea. As in other divided countries, the term espionage has a wide interpretation under South Korean law. Where details of the prosecution case are known, it is often possible for Amnesty to adopt these prisoners, despite the formal charges against them.

In July, a mass resignation of judges took place; they complained that the Government was trying to influence court decisions, especially in cases involving the anti-communist and national security laws. They later resumed their duties.

A few weeks later a case opened against seventeen students charged with espionage and with leading protests against the re-election in April of President Park to a third term of office; this had been made possible only by a special amendment to the Constitution, the legality of which was widely questioned. At the first trial the two main defendants, Soh Sung and Chong Shik-Il, received death sentences; in court Soh had been unable to speak in his own defence as a result of severe burns to his body, head and mouth caused, according to prosecution explanations, by a suicide attempt during police questioning. Confessions made during interrogation formed the main prosecution evidence against the defendants.

In view of the espionage aspect, these cases were allocated for investigation rather than full adoption. The South Korean Red Cross Society was asked to ensure that Soh Sung received adequate medical attention.

An Amnesty observer attended the Appeal Court. Acting on a brief from the International Secretariat, he spoke with the judge and asked for commutation of the death sentences. The Court later commuted the death sentence on Chong Shik-Il, postponed its decision on Soh Sung until he was well enough to appear in court, and cut by half several other sentences.

Despite continued attempts to clarify the position of 11 South Koreans who were in an aeroplane hi-jacked to NORTH KOREA in December 1969, we still have no definite information as to whether they are restricted—as the Seoul government claims—or living freely as maintained by Pyongyang. Most groups have given their cases back to the International Secretariat. For practical reasons little new research has been possible, and there is now only one adopted case, that of a Frenchman. This creates an unsatisfactory

imbalance of action between North and South Korea, which we hope can be redressed.

During the year, government policy in TAIWAN towards prisoners has been influenced by international events. On 24 October, the day before the United Nations General Assembly vote on the admission of the People's Republic of China, 35 political prisoners were released and 6 had their sentences reduced by Presidential Decree. Among the released was Chen Yu Hsi, a student sentenced in 1968 to 7 years' imprisonment for "spreading communist propaganda"; he had been adopted by Amnesty. Although the timing of the releases makes it clear that their purpose was political rather than humanitarian, there are indications that the release of prisoners at this time was at least in part influenced by Amnesty International. More recently, some Amnesty groups have received letters from the Taiwanese government telling them that further amnesties are being contemplated.

More than 100 prisoners are now adopted in Taiwan; but group work is difficult and unrewarding in that official responses are rare and there is no contact between Amnesty and the prisoners, who are held in 10 prisons in Taiwan itself and on a few off-shore islands. The total number of prisoners is now estimated at between 4,000 and 8,000. Most were sentenced by closed military courts; many on charges of alleged communist association often as much as 25 years earlier on the mainland; the majority are prisoners of conscience.

In May, three adopted prisoners who had been sentenced to death, were the subject of a concerted appeal by national sections, the death penalty was later commuted to sentences of 10, 12 and 15 years.

Two missions to VIET NAM were planned: unfortunately neither of them materialised. In June 1971 the Saigon government formally refused to issue a visa to the Chairman, Seán MacBride, for a mission which would have included visits to both North and South Viet Nam. Once Saigon's refusal was public, the Hanoi government, which until then had given tacit approval to the mission, followed suit. Mr. MacBride's terms of reference included the release of prisoners of conscience in both parts of the country, and an examination of the treatment and possible release of civilian prisoners "detained as a result of the existing armed conflict". The mission was again discussed when an American congressman made a speech early in 1972 drawing attention to Saigon's refusal. This was followed by a State Department comment that it would support any effort by Amnesty to conduct an investigation in North and South Viet Nam. After discussion at its January meeting, the International Executive Committee decided against renewing efforts to arrange the mission at that time.

In 1971 there was also an unsuccessful attempt to arrange a visit by a delegate to SOUTH VIET NAM alone. This was a German Section initiative: after lengthy discussions and apparent official agreement, Professor Freudenberg was refused a visa to visit adopted prisoners in Saigon and elsewhere.

At the level of group adoption, however, a considerable amount of

constructive practical work had been done. This has been due to a continuous flow of reliable and detailed information on individual prisoners of conscience from inside South Viet Nam.

But any developments in Amnesty's own work should be set against the general situation in the country. At the time of the re-election of Nguyen Van Thieu as President, 61 students were arrested: as far as we know none has been released or tried. Closure or confiscation of newspapers continues. Students and leaders of the movement for "the right to live", who have pressed for an end to the war, continued to be convicted under the State of War Decree and found guilty of "breach of peace" or "breach of security". Five hundred Buddhists, Taoists and Caodaists are imprisoned under the Military Code of 1951 for refusing to serve in the Army. Trials, if they take place at all, are conducted by military field courts, with wide ranges of sentences. One issue of special concern to Amnesty is the degree to which sentences are extended on non-judicial grounds. In one case, typical of many more, a prisoner having completed a 5-year sentence in a prison on the mainland, was not released but instead transferred to Con Son island shortly before the end of his term; he had refused to salute the South Vietnamese flag, had been termed a hard-core communist by the authorities, and so, on the basis of an administrative decision, his sentence was indefinitely extended. In response to the large number of prisoners and the comparatively small number—29—of adoptions and investigations, we have turned to general action through National Sections and other concerned organisations in order to publicise bad prison conditions or treatment. The question of American construction work on new isolation cells in Con Son was taken up in that way.

We continue to experience great difficulty in obtaining factual information on arrests in NORTH VIET NAM. At the moment there are only 8 adopted prisoners, all members of a music band sentenced on charges of "spreading infectious, imperialist culture" through playing western-style music. Despite considerable frustrations, the groups continue to pursue their investigations.

The much publicised situation of prisoners of war, whether American or Vietnamese, does not fall within Amnesty's concern.

EUROPE

Amnesty continued working in Greece, Spain and Portugal; Turkey as well as Northern Ireland were added to our major European concerns this year. In Eastern Europe a new appointment made it possible considerably to extend our work in Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia when the occasion arose towards the end of last year. In June 1972 Bruce Laird, who has worked on East European countries for many years, left the Research Department. He will be much missed by all his friends in Amnesty.

Western Europe

Although Article 10 of "The Constitution of 1968" (freedom from arrest) has remained in force, citizens in GREECE continue to be arrested and kept in custody without being charged or tried.

The government have officially denied that there are any political prisoners in the country, but trials under Law 509 (sedition) continue. In April 1971 the government announced that in future some offences under this law would be dealt with by civil courts; the remaining offences continue to be tried by military courts. Many Amnesty groups have encouraged prisoners tried by military courts under Law 509 to appeal for re-trial by civil courts; in some cases where this has been done sentences have been reduced.

The last of the people detained without charge or trial since 1967 were released in December 1971. The practice of deportation was suspended in February, and resumed in May, 1972.

Amnesty International has also on several occasions approached the Greek government on behalf of prisoners who were in need of medical treatment. On the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the Greek regime, the chairman of the International Executive Committee appealed in a letter to the Greek Regent and Prime Minister, Mr. Papadopoulos, for a general amnesty for all political prisoners. A list of names of all political prisoners (not all of them prisoners of conscience) was attached to the letter.

Amnesty has recently asked the Greek government to institute an impartial enquiry into the many allegations of torture and ill-treatment made during the year. Relief work for the political prisoners and their families continues.

There has been considerable concern in ITALY about an anarchist, Pietro Valpreda, arrested in December 1969 on suspicion of having planted bombs in a Milan bank which killed 22 people. Over two years later he is still awaiting trial, the proceedings in Rome in February 1972 having been abandoned after the court declared itself territorially incompetent. Malcolm Tigerschield, a member of the board of the Swedish Section of Amnesty, attended the Rome trial in order to collect information about the case. M. Jean-Claude Luthi, a Geneva lawyer travelling to the trial on his own initiative, was accredited by the International Secretariat as an official observer. Both have reported on their visits. Our view is that Valpreda's innocence—or the prosecution's lack of official evidence against him—can be established only through a trial. He cannot be registered as a prisoner of conscience on the basis of the information available at present. Representations have been made to the Italian government concerning the excessively long period of remand custody.

On 9 August, 1971, 337 men were arrested in NORTHERN IRELAND under the provisions of the Civil Authorities (Special Powers) Act (Northern Ireland) 1922. Two days later 230 of these men were interned for an indefinite period without trial. During the next six months hundreds more internment orders were made, although in this period some internees were released. On 16 and 17 August Amnesty's Director of Research visited Belfast and talked to politicians, lawyers, representatives of the minority, and to the civil and military authorities. As a result certain rights were guaranteed to the prisoners, and the authorities undertook to supply the Research Department with lists of people detained and released.

At its annual meeting in September the International Council of Amnesty International adopted a resolution expressing its concern at the situation in Northern Ireland and requesting the British government to release or bring to trial all persons detained under the Special Powers Act. The International Executive Committee was instructed to collect and evaluate information regarding the treatment of prisoners and to adopt such of them as might be prisoners of conscience. Since the end of October 1971, 90 internees have either been adopted or their cases have been sent to groups for investigation. In many cases it was not possible to obtain reliable information about whether or not the prisoner had been involved in violent activities.

Shortly after the introduction of internment, reports appeared in the press that prisoners were being subjected to various forms of ill-treatment, sometimes amounting to torture, during interrogation. Many individual statements by detainees and ex-detainees alleging ill-treatment during and after arrest were received by the Research Department and this material was examined and evaluated by an American lawyer whose report was published by Amnesty on 9 November, 1971.

On 31 August, 1971, the Home Secretary appointed a Committee of Inquiry, under the chairmanship of Sir Edmund Compton, to investigate allegations of physical brutality made by those arrested on 9 August. The terms of reference for the Committee were so limited that in effect it was only authorized to consider treatment of detainees during the 48 hours immediately following their arrest. For this reason and because the complainants had expressed a lack of confidence in the Compton Committee the International Executive of Amnesty decided to establish an independent, international Commission of Enquiry to investigate all complaints of ill-treatment. The Commission met in Belfast between 16 and 20 December, 1971. Its members were Mr. Thomas Hammarberg, a Swedish journalist; Mr. Gunnar Lind, a Norwegian lawyer; and Dr. Herman van Geuns, a Dutch doctor. It received no cooperation from the authorities, but on the basis of its examination of complainants, where possible, and of the medical evidence, which was available for most cases, the Commission found that persons arrested under the Special Powers Act "had been subjected to brutal treatment by the security forces during arrest and transport" and that "there were cases where suffering had been inflicted on those arrested to obtain from them confessions or information". The report of the Commission was published on 13 March, 1972, after it had been sent to the British government.

Following the publication of the Compton Report, the Home Secretary appointed a committee under the chairmanship of Lord Parker to "consider authorized procedures for the interrogation of persons suspected of terrorism". Amnesty submitted a written memorandum to this committee and oral evidence was given by the Secretary General and the Director of Research. Lord Gardiner's minority report from the Parker Committee, which was accepted by the government, incorporated many of the recommendations made to the committee by Amnesty.

On 24 March, 1972 the Northern Ireland Parliament was prorogued and

direct rule from Westminster was imposed. The new Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, Mr. William Whitelaw, is reviewing the cases of all internees and, according to figures published on 26 May, 1972, had ordered the release of 377 internees and detainees. At that date, 413 internees and 139 detainees were still imprisoned.

After the acquittal in November 1970 of 7 out of 9 defendants accused of encouraging the growth of an opposition movement in PORTUGAL, hopes grew for increased liberalisation under Mr. Caetano. Trade unions were allowed to elect their own officials for the first time, but their activism resulted in a government move against them, as well as against others who began to work for a more open political life.

A wave of arrests of trade union, religious, and student leaders from May to November 1971 resulted in the imprisonment of some 200 people, 70 of whom were taken as investigation cases by Amnesty International.

One of the most prominent of those arrested in the summer of 1971 was Senhor Daniel Cabrita, the head of the Bank Employees Union. Cabrita was arrested after having signed a letter to the International Labour Organisation protesting the fact that the Portuguese delegation to a recent ILO trade union conference had been selected without consultation with those elected by the Portuguese trade union movement. An Amnesty observer mission was sent to his trial, originally scheduled for 7 December, 1971, but postponed immediately after it opened. Amnesty International was jointly represented with the *Ligue Belge pour la Defense des Droits de l'Homme*, at a postponed trial held in January 1972, at which Cabrita and other prisoners were sentenced to terms ranging from 20 months to 2 years.

Amnesty International was also represented at the trial of 12 other Amnesty cases, held from 2—12 May, 1972. Charges once again related to membership of the banned Communist Party and defendants stated that the only evidence against them was contained in confessions extracted after "sleep" and "statue" torture. Information concerning the sentences of these and other defendants is still being received.

Prisoners and their families have continually expressed appreciation for the presence of Amnesty observers at trials and for the aid which they received from Amnesty members.

New legislation, revised prison regulations, and a new constitution which appears to alter the "security measures"—a prisoner after serving a fixed sentence can be held in continued detention for periods of six months to three years with these additional periods indefinitely renewable—were passed during the year. However, the "state of siege" declared in November of 1971 has meant the suspension of these new laws for the time being: arrests continue. A group of some 30 students is currently being held incommunicado under 90 days – 90 days detention without trial legislation.

Amnesty International has repeatedly called attention to the fact that Portugal's move towards closer integration in the Common Market should be carefully considered by the EEC countries: a report on the position of Portugal in regard to the EEC is being prepared, and will be presented

to the appropriate bodies.

Amnesty sent observers to three trials—involving Communists, Socialists, and members of *Hoal*, the Catholic workers' organization—in SPAIN's Public Order Court.

In addition, a top-level meeting took place between Mr. Seán MacBride and the Minister of Justice in November 1971, to discuss long-standing issues of particular concern to Amnesty: the torture of prisoners in police stations during interrogation; the existence of special courts and the very wide jurisdiction of the military tribunals; prison conditions; discrimination in application of conditional liberty (release for the last quarter of sentence) against prisoners sentenced because of their political beliefs; and the lack of legislation on conscientious objection. So far, little progress has been made towards the solution of any of these problems.

The International Secretariat has on a number of occasions over the year protested to the Spanish government against specific violations of human rights, such as the approval of amendments to the Law of Public Order (July 1971), under which persons involved in unauthorised meetings or demonstrations may be imprisoned for up to three months without trial; more recently, the killing of two workers by the armed police during the March 1972 strike at the national shipyards in El Ferrol, Galicia.

Considerable effort in the first half of the year was put into appeals for a general amnesty for political prisoners; a telegram to that effect was sent to the Spanish government from the International Council in September. On 1 October 1971, General Franco decreed a general pardon, which resulted in the release of 36 Amnesty adopted prisoners. Nevertheless, Amnesty expressed its concern that the measure did not apply to those who were convicted for acts committed before July 1965, thus excluding prisoners with the longest sentences.

The government's second draft-law on conscientious objection was withdrawn from the *Cortes* (Parliament) in July 1971 because of the excessive limitations added to the original provisions in committee debate. The situation of over 280 Jehovah's Witnesses and two pacifists who must serve recurring sentences for refusing to bear arms, therefore, remains the same. In April 1972, Francisco Diaz Moreno, a Jehovah's Witness who has spent more than 12 years in prison, was released on a special pardon, but another general initiative from the government—hoped for after the withdrawal of the draft-law—has not been forthcoming. One of the major Amnesty actions here was a broad campaign of letters, organised by German groups, urging support both within Spain and internationally for Spanish recognition of the right of conscientious objection.

Amnesty groups are now working for over 350 prisoners of conscience including Communists, Socialists, Libertarians, Basque nationalists and conscientious objectors. During the past months in Spain, the increased volume of illegal trade union activities, the organisation of support for workers on strike, the criticism of the government in books and the press, and protests against the restrictive new Law of Education have led to con-

tinual arrests and trials of workers, students, journalists, priests, lawyers, teachers—and added to the list of prisoners adopted by Amnesty. Group work, through action on behalf of individual prisoners, has been involved with a wide variety of related problems, ranging from the lack of adequate medical facilities within the prisons to the difficulties faced by former prisoners in finding employment after release. Prison visits by group members have increased throughout 1971.

Since the intervention of the High Command of the Armed Forces in political affairs in March 1971 and the declaration of martial law in 11 of the country's 67 provinces in April of the same year, widespread political arrests have been taking place in TURKEY. Military tribunals are reported to have dealt with some 900 cases already, and many death sentences have been passed.

On 29 November, 1971, Mr. Seán MacBride wrote a letter to the Turkish Prime Minister, Mr. Nihat Erim, asking him to use his influence to prevent executions and also lending Amnesty's support to the campaign going on within Turkey for the abolition of capital punishment. A telegram following up the letter was sent later in the year, and in January 1972 Amnesty released the letter to the press: it received front page publicity in Turkey. Mr. Muir Hunter, Q.C., a member of Amnesty's British Section, made representations to the Minister of Justice when he visited Turkey as Amnesty's representative at the end of January 1972. The main objects of Mr. Hunter's visit were to explain Amnesty's aims and working methods to the Turkish government and to approach the government on such specific subjects as torture allegations and capital punishment. Telegrams to the Turkish President and Prime Minister were sent by Mr. MacBride and Mr. Hunter in March this year, requesting clemency for three members of the Turkish people's liberation army who were sentenced to death; a similar action was taken by most of Amnesty's National Sections. National Sections have also approached their countries' delegates to the meeting of the political committee of the Council of Europe, which took place in Ankara in April 1972.

Amnesty has adopted 8 prisoners in Turkey and the Secretariat is collecting information on many other cases.

A dossier on torture allegations, compiled by Mr. Muir Hunter, has been put before the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs for their consideration.

Eastern Europe

In November 1971, just before the general elections, a number of prominent people in CZECHOSLOVAKIA were arrested on suspicion of producing and distributing leaflets calling on Czech citizens not to vote. Since then, many other known opponents of the Husák regime, active in the reform period of 1968, have been arrested. To date none of them have been put on trial, except for Ludek Pachman, sentenced to 2 years' imprisonment and released because of ill-health. Of those arrested, some have been released without trial, but the case against them has not been closed. An international committee was established in London in April 1972 to watch the Czechoslovak situation and to send observers to trials of prisoners of

conscience. Amnesty International is in close touch with the committee.

The principal method of repressing the opposition, who are mainly members of the intelligentsia, is to deprive them of employment altogether, or to force them into menial work. Many are without income and a fund has been established abroad to help them.

In the GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC the accession of Herr Erich Honecker to the post of Chairman of the State Council following the retirement of Walter Ulbricht in May 1971 was initially not expected to produce any substantial change in official policies. However, West Berliners were granted passes to visit East Berlin and the rest of the GDR at Easter and Whitsun this year, for the first time for six years. Furthermore the Federal Republic and the GDR signed an agreement on 26 May on questions relating to traffic over their border. This includes the provision that GDR citizens will be allowed to travel to West Germany for family reasons. It remains to be seen whether this development will work in practice and whether it will affect the number of Amnesty cases in the GDR. A large number of Amnesty prisoners in the GDR were imprisoned for attempting to leave the country illegally, or for helping others to do so.

Work on HUNGARY has been slow over the last four years, partly because of the obdurate lack of response from the authorities and partly because of the apparently declining number of prisoners of conscience. However, the prison sentences passed on four Roman Catholic priests in May 1971 for giving spiritual counselling to young people necessitated a fresh approach, and some preparatory work has been done to try and assess what kind of special action is needed in addition to adoption.

In POLAND, those imprisoned in the "Mountaineers" Affair of 1969 were all released by September 1971. September also saw the release of Jacek Kuron and Karol Modzelewski, arrested during the student revolt of 1968. The remaining political prisoners in Poland seem to fall into two categories—Jehovah's Witnesses (mainly conscientious objectors) and the members of the opposition movement *Ruch*, whose trials took place in the second half of 1971. Adoptions, however, have not yet been made owing to difficulties attached to both categories of prisoner. The prisoner of conscience status of the *Ruch* members has not yet been established.

In RUMANIA, the only prisoner of conscience currently under adoption is Konrad Lehrer, a chemist of German origin, arrested in September 1971 for attempting to leave Rumania. There appear to be no new arrests as a direct result of the ideological tightening up which followed President Ceaucescu's visit to Peking. The names, however, of several imprisoned priests, both Catholic and Orthodox, are known to Amnesty, but at present there is insufficient information for adoption purposes.

The confinement of prisoners of conscience in Soviet mental hospitals has continued to be a dominant feature of work on the USSR over the last year. Happily, the considerable task of collecting and translating the relevant documents arriving from the USSR has been carried out by a working group set up for this purpose in London in 1971. A member of the Research Depart-

ment attends its meetings to ensure effective liaison. The group also undertook the task of alerting psychiatrists and obtaining their support, and was aided in this task by individual Amnesty members. Some of the most important documentation translated by the working group consisted of written "diagnoses" on people considered to be healthy by relatives and friends but forcibly committed to psychiatric hospitals. The diagnoses were sent abroad by Mr. Vladimir Bukovsky with an appeal to Western psychiatrists to express their opinion about them. In January 1972 Bukovsky was sentenced to a total of 12 years' deprivation of freedom for having done this. The Soviet authorities refused to give a visa to Professor Feldbrugge, Dean of the Law Faculty of Leiden University to visit the USSR as Amnesty International's representative to discuss the case.

There was some disappointment that the conference of the World Psychiatric Association held in Mexico from 28 November to 4 December 1971 did not have the Soviet use of the mental hospitals on its agenda. Nevertheless, the appropriate documentation was distributed among the delegates, and some of them were able to discuss the question with their Soviet colleagues privately. On 24 October 1971, the Soviet newspaper, *Izvestiya*, published an article in anticipation of the conference, mentioning the circulation abroad of alarming allegations about the confinement of healthy Soviet citizens in mental hospitals and denounced Amnesty International and other organisations as "zealots of falsehood". Despite this, it is a fact that Soviet psychiatrists have confirmed the existence of malpractices in private conversation with psychiatrists abroad. It may be a good sign that of the six best-known cases of prisoners of conscience in psychiatric hospitals, five have been released during the last year. The sixth who remains in the prison psychiatric hospital of Chernyakhovsk is the civil rights campaigner, Major General Grigorenko, arrested in July 1969 while trying to attend the trial of Crimean Tatars in Tashkent.

One of the three prisoners of the year elected in 1969, Mrs. Larissa Daniel, sentenced to four years' exile in Siberia for demonstrating against the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, was allowed to return to Moscow in December 1971. Her return from exile came eight months earlier than expected.

The number of adoption and investigation cases in the USSR is just under three hundred at the time of writing.

The student strike of November 1971, in Zagreb, the capital of Croatia, staged in protest against the economic policies of Belgrade *vis-à-vis* Croatia, brought in its wake expulsions from the party and arrests throughout YUGOSLAVIA. There was an upsurge of nationalism, not only in Croatia but also in Serbia, and among the Albanian and Hungarian minorities in Kosovo and Vojvodina respectively. By the end of January, it was reported that nearly 800 Party officials had "resigned" or been expelled from the League of Communists, and "preliminary investigations" were being carried out against 112 people arrested. So far Amnesty has adopted the 11 intellectuals, arrested in January 1972, who were closely linked with the Croatian cultural organisation, *Matica Hrvatska*. The trials of these 11 have not taken place as yet. As regards the arrests made elsewhere, information is being collected, with a view to further adoptions being made if possible.

July 1971 saw the release of Vladimir Mijanovic, the student leader sentenced to 20 months' imprisonment for "hostile propaganda" in October 1970.

LATIN AMERICA

Due to staff shortages we have been forced to delay expansion of our work in Latin America and have, thus far, worked primarily in Paraguay, Brazil, Cuba and Mexico. However, reports of possible Amnesty cases have come in from several other countries and we hope to expand into a number of new countries shortly. We have, on occasion, appealed against torture, death sentences, disappearances and large-scale arrests in countries where we do not have a full-scale adoption programme under way. Staff members, including the Secretary-General, have conferred with several bodies, including the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and the World Council of Churches, whose continued co-operation should contribute to our planned expansions in Latin America work.

The situation in BRAZIL has not changed during the past year. *Habeas corpus* has not been restored and reports of arbitrary arrest and torture of those considered dangerous to national security continue to be received.

Also discouraging was the fact that the death penalty, abolished in 1891, two years after Brazil became a republic, but re-introduced in 1969, has been passed against three defendants. One previous death sentence was commuted to life imprisonment in May 1971, and Amnesty groups have been directed to appeal against these new sentences, in the hope that they too will be commuted. A press release issued by Amnesty on 14 Janury 1972, praising Brazil's previous humanitarian traditions and pleading for commutation of the death sentences, was reported in the Brazilian newspaper, *O Estado de Sao Paulo*.

Leaders of the nominal opposition party have spoken out in Parliament against political repression and torture and have deplored changes in the regulations governing the operation of the Council for the Defence of Human Rights which will render it even more powerless than in the past. On the positive side, it does appear that the government has reacted to adverse publicity and pressure from abroad and has moved to control some of the official security groups and quasi-autonomous organisations which have been responsible for much of the reported brutality. An increasing number of replies have been received from the authorities, including the Minister of the Interior, Jose Costa Cavalcanti. Some of these letters have indicated a degree of support for Amnesty's objectives.

We have continued to develop case work in Brazil and have 160 cases under adoption with 50 investigation cases. Many recently adopted cases were religious figures: the Roman Catholic Church remains one of the few centres of opposition left in Brazil. Persons attempting to re-establish the banned Communist party have also met with much brutality and legal repression while journalists and editors have been persecuted for publishing items considered

contrary to the interests of the state. Amnesty has circulated information on imprisoned journalists to Brazilian newspapers and press associations, as well as to European press organisations who have expressed interest in learning of journalists imprisoned for upholding freedom of the press.

Consideration has also been given to a "fast-action" appeal programme, designed to protest the brutal interrogations, which apparently precede filing of charges, while not claiming in any way that the person involved is necessarily eligible for Amnesty adoption or investigation status.

A report has been commissioned regarding legal developments in Brazil, and progress has been made in evaluating the material on torture which continues to arrive in our office. A number of lawyers have been contacted regarding the general situation in Brazil, in the event that trials may come up to which they could be sent as observers. National Sections have been informed of relevant visits by officials to and from Brazil and asked to organise appropriate activities to call attention to the repressive political situation in Brazil. Progress has been made in establishing channels for aid to Brazil. A background paper has been prepared and distributed, as have several circulars regarding topics of interest to groups working on Brazilian cases. Several meetings have been held and much attention paid to co-ordination with national specialist groups concerned with Brazilian affairs. The Secretariat was represented at a meeting on Amnesty activities regarding Brazil, held in Cologne in November 1971.

Amnesty's work for prisoners of conscience in CUBA has been somewhat expanded during 1971 with more information becoming available on long-term cases. As a result, four additional prisoners have been taken on and the groups are active in contributing financial support to the families as well as trying to give publicity to their situation. Several of the other groups, which have been working for Cuban prisoners over a period of years, have been able to assist them in raising the funds necessary to leave the country after they are released and, in one case, to publish the prisoner's poems abroad.

Although details about Cuban prisons are extremely difficult to obtain, there have been unconfirmed reports that the penal regime has been modified to a certain extent and that prisoners are being allowed to work outside the prison and see their families more regularly, without having to renounce their political beliefs. Amnesty continues to appeal on humanitarian grounds for the release of those who are prisoners of conscience, many of them now old and ill, most of whom have not seen their families for ten years.

The last of the prisoners arrested in MEXICO in connection with the 1968 student movement were freed from Lecumberri Prison, Mexico City, in December 1971 (one of them, Fernando Granados Cortes, had been on the Postcard Campaign for that month, and the Mexican Minister of Justice has since then answered most of the appeals received on Sr Granados' behalf). Since the release, early in 1972, of trade unionist Carlos Esguerra Castro, arrested in 1967, Amnesty had had no adopted prisoners in Mexico. Many groups continue to maintain contact with their released

prisoners, however, and Professor Eli de Gortari—although he was unable to accept an invitation to speak at the opening of the International Assembly in September 1971—visited his adopting group in Denmark later in the autumn. Another former prisoner is now a member of the Mexican National Section of Amnesty International.

Reports reach us periodically about the treatment of other prisoners in Lecumberri. At the end of December 1971 Amnesty sent a telegram to President Luis Echeverria urging an investigation into alleged threats to political prisoners from prison guards and the death of Professor Pablo Alvarrazo Barreira while he was being questioned by the prison director. We now have more information about prisoners arrested before and after 1968, and a number of these cases will be taken up shortly.

Amnesty has basic information on some 100 long-term political prisoners held in police stations in Asuncion, PARAGUAY, of whom 25 are currently adopted cases. Seven political prisoners have been released in the first four months of 1972, of whom three were adopted by Amnesty. Three Communist prisoners adopted by Amnesty, Antonia Maidana, Alfredo Alcorta and Julio Rojas have been detained now for over 14 years. They are the only political prisoners who have been tried in Paraguay. They were returned to their cell (which they have never left since) when a judge granted their freedom on expiry of sentence in 1961. Prison conditions are extremely bad in Paraguay, with overcrowded cells, an absence of medical provisions, no food provision for political prisoners, and a complete absence of reading material in some police stations. Amnesty groups have been able to channel relief through families, who are thus able to buy food and clothing for prisoners. The Roman Catholic Church continues to concern itself with the plight of political prisoners and includes the release of prisoners in its human rights programme. The random arrest, torture and subsequent release of Paraguayan citizens continues to be almost a daily occurrence, although the government denies the existence of political prisoners both in the world press and in letters to Amnesty members.

In October Amnesty published a background report on Paraguay entitled *Paraguay in the Seventies*. Copies of the report have circulated widely within Paraguay; over 200 copies of the German edition were sent to prominent German-speaking Paraguayans by German Amnesty groups. In November Amnesty sponsored a press conference in London to publicize a report on political prisoners in Paraguay by the International Association of Democratic Lawyers, following a mission to Paraguay in May 1971. Amnesty has organized delegations to the Paraguayan Embassies in London, Bonn and Washington.

UNITED STATES

Most of Amnesty's adopted prisoners in America have been draft resisters. These young men are not usually recognised by the state as conscientious objectors because their objection is to the Vietnam War in particular and not to all wars as such, but some of the most dedicated pacifists are imprisoned because, although granted C.O. status, they refuse as a matter

of principle to do "alternative service". In the past Amnesty has not taken up these cases, but at the International Council Meeting in September 1971 a resolution was adopted to widen the definition of conscientious objection so as to include these "unconditionalists".

The Annual Report of the year 1970-71 stated that Amnesty would focus its efforts in the United States on persons imprisoned for political activities performed for reasons linked with their race or ethnic origin. Progress in this field has been slow because it has proved difficult to obtain a regular flow of reliable information. In cases where people are convicted on criminal charges according to properly constituted legal procedures it is questionable whether Amnesty can intervene effectively to prove that they were in fact sentenced solely on account of their political activities.

After the arrest of Angela Davis in October 1970, Amnesty received numerous requests asking for her adoption. The Borderline Committee ruled in April 1971 that her case did not seem suitable for adoption because of the nature of the charges against her. It was also felt that the arrangements for her defence were acceptable. In December 1971 some German Amnesty groups organised a petition to the International Executive Committee appealing against this decision. The IEC upheld the ruling of the Borderline Committee, but agreed that a German journalist who was attending the trial should be asked to act as an observer for Amnesty and that the Research Department should continue to follow the case.[1]

In January 1972 a federal district court in Houston ruled that Lee Otis Johnson, an organizer for the Student Non-Violent Co-ordinating Committee, sentenced to 30 years in prison in 1968 for passing a marijuana cigarette to an undercover policeman, had to be retried within 90 days or given his freedom. In ruling for a new trial the judge noted that the unusually long sentence indicated that some outside influences had affected the jury.

THE MIDDLE EAST

The collecting of information and the explanation of the aims of Amnesty to the various governments still remain major difficulties in the Middle East, although considerable progress has been made during the past year. A basic information network has now been formed and research work has started again on the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and on Bahrain after a lapse of several years.

In BAHRAIN a series of non-violent strikes and demonstrations in March 1972 led to the arrest of 500 people; about 100 are still detained. So far 23 of these have been adopted and more cases will follow.

In EGYPT the most significant event of the year was the trial of Vice-President Sabri and of 90 other leading politicians, writers and professional people on charges of High Treason. The trial, by a special three-man Revolutionary Tribunal, lasted from August to November 1971. The verdicts, which were announced in December, included four death sentences, all of which were commuted to life imprisonment with hard labour. In September

[1] Miss Davis was acquitted in June 1972 and is now free.

Mr. John Platts-Mills, Q.C., a distinguished British lawyer, went to Cairo on behalf of Amnesty. He had discussions with the President of the Revolutionary Tribunal and leading members of the government and was the first foreign observer ever to be admitted to a closed court hearing in Egypt. The Egyptian government released most of its existing political prisoners, apart from the Sabri group, but there remains one prisoner of conscience, Sayyed Loutfi, who has been detained since 1958. Special representations have been made on his behalf.

IRAN has been the subject of considerable international attention in the past year. The celebrations of the 2,500 anniversary of the Persian Empire not only successfully avoided mention of Iran's political prisoners and inadequate judicial system, but also resulted in many more people being imprisoned for their opposition, or suspected opposition, to the present government.

Detailed and accurate information on those arrested is hard to obtain, but it is certain that many have been sentenced to death, and executed after trials before a military tribunal without independent evidence or witnesses being heard and without effective defence.

In September 1971, a press statement was issued appealing to the Iranian government to release all prisoners of conscience as part of an amnesty to mark the 2,500 anniversary. The statement also recalled specific proposals made by Amnesty to the government in 1970 and 1971 which aimed to provide some protection for political prisoners during the period of pre-trial investigation. These proposals included visits by civilian magistrates, the use of civilian, rather than military, courts to try civilian defendants, the right of appeal in political cases to a civilian higher court, and an amendment to legislation relating to SAVAK (Iranian secret police) establishing penalties for officials responsible for physical mistreatment of prisoners under investigation.

In the event, no amnesty was announced, more than 2,000 people were arrested, and early in October, probably during the celebrations, Hossein Rezai was tried before a secret military court in Teheran. Mr. Rezai had been arrested while acting as interpreter to an Amnesty delegate in September 1970; he was sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment on general political charges. These included membership of the Confederation of Iranian Students, an organisation proscribed 3 months after Rezai's arrest.

At its November 1971 meeting, the International Executive Committee issued a statement commenting on Mr. Rezai's trial, and on recent arrests and sentences. It recalled official assurances that there would be a reform of the legal system for political cases, and that future political trials would be held in open court in the presence of foreign observers. It commented that "these new events cast fundamental doubt on such assurances and suggest that the Iranian government has now set aside its stated intention of treating political prisoners in accordance with the rule of law and the practice of responsible nations".

In January 1972, a series of political trials was announced at which 120 people who had been arrested during 1971 would be tried before the Teheran Military Tribunal. All were charged with violent offences against the govern-

ment. Although observers from international organisations attended some early sessions of the Tribunal, the court was closed after a report had appeared in *Le Monde* commenting adversely on the conduct of the trial. A large number of those on trial were sentenced to death, and 23 were executed.

In December, and again in February, Amnesty joined with other international non-governmental organisations in statements expressing concern at torture allegations and at the manner of trial.

On 1 March, the Secretary General signed a letter to the Iranian Prime Minister asking for death sentences to be commuted. He said:

> "We do not question your government's right to bring to trial individuals charged with violent or criminal offences, but the reports suggest that the defendants have been denied certain defence rights which are normally regarded as fundamental to the rule of law. . . . As civilians, the accused are being tried in military courts; this means that they are defended by military lawyers who would not necessarily have been their first choice as legal representatives. Perhaps most important of all, the Tribunal is reported to have accepted as evidence confessions of guilt which the defendants themselves had already repudiated in court on the ground that they were made after torture. . . . Although prison sentences can be reconsidered and amnesties granted after a certain time has passed, retrospective review of the death sentence is inherently impossible. It is a general feeling that the procedure followed by a court which passes such a sentence must therefore be beyond question."

In May/June 1972, the Secretary General visited Teheran, where he met the Prime Minister, to whom he expressed Amnesty's concern with continuing death sentences.

In October 1971, Mr. Ahmed Kamrani, an adopted prisoner who had been sentenced to death in 1965 and whose sentence had later been commuted, was released in a special act of clemency by the Shah. But in July 1971, one adopted prisoner was re-tried by a closed court martial and sentenced to death; the charges were not specified. Immediate protests were made by the adoption groups and he was later reprieved, though other defendants were executed.

Political detention in IRAQ had decreased over the last year, following the announcement in November 1971 of a National Charter which aimed to establish a broader based government. However, the Baathist regime remains probably the most repressive in the Middle East. It is very difficult to obtain information from Iraq about individual prisoners, as all political prisoners seem to be arrested outside any legal framework and are held incommunicado. The policy is one of intimidation; the majority of prisoners are detained for a short time only. Work on some cases of long-term prisoners has stopped because of the total lack of information, but we were encouraged to hear that one of two remaining Jewish prisoners, Akram Baher, was seen recently in prison. Other Amnesty adoptees belong to left-wing parties and to the Shia Moslem sect.

In ISRAEL we have concentrated this year on long-term Arab detainees

who have been held for over one year without trial. The review procedure for these cases does not seem to be satisfactory. The overall number of administrative detainees has however dropped. These points, together with three specific reports of ill-treatment of Arab detainees, were raised by the Secretary General at a meeting with the Israeli ambassador in London. In March we were informed officially that the cases had been investigated and that the torture allegations were unfounded. The prisoners themselves had been released.

Amnesty intervened, at the Secretariat level, on behalf of a member of the Israeli Black Panthers (a non-violent movement which works to improve the position of oriental Jews in Israel) who was remanded in a mental institution. He has now been released.

Amnesty also recently adopted a young conscientious objector who had been sentenced to five terms of 35 days. There is no right of conscientious objection in Israel, except for girls of Jewish Orthodox faith, although there are exemptions for religious groups, and Arabs are not still in general subject to military service.

The LIBYAN Ambassador received representatives of the Secretariat during the year and agreed to have individual cases examined. Amnesty group work continues for Guilio Hassan, a Jew, arrested in September 1969 "for his own protection" at the time of anti-Jewish demonstrations; he has still not been charged.

Because of the continuing war in OMAN we have been unable to adopt any new prisoners, but the Omani authorities have responded to inquiries about existing investigation cases.

Groups have still not received any response from the SAUDI ARABIAN authorities to inquiries on behalf of prisoners adopted in 1969. The situation in Saudi Arabia is difficult to analyse and there are contradictory reports about the number of prisoners and the reasons for their detention. Amnesty still has to convince the Saudi authorities of the impartial nature of Amnesty's work, with particular stress on the fact that Amnesty does not adopt prisoners who have committed violence. Recently the Chairman of the International Executive Committee visited Saudi Arabia at the invitation of the Government to discuss a number of human rights problems.

In SYRIA Amnesty has adopted several more of the leading members of the former Government, many of whom have been detained without trial since their fall from power in November 1970. During a visit to Syria the Secretary General was informed that these men were being held under a form of house arrest within the prison precincts, with privileged treatment in terms of visits and food.

Amnesty had worked, from Sepember 1971, for the release of 19 Syrian Jews who had been arrested at the end of last summer on charges of attempting to leave the country illegally. On his visit to Damascus the Secretary General was able to confirm the fact that most of the Jews had been released: four still remain in prison.

In March we adopted Osman Sabri, the Kurdish national poet and poli-

tician, who began a two-year sentence in January for attempting to establish the banned Kurdish Democratic Party in Syria. A special appeal for his release was made to the Syrian Minister of the Interior.[1]

Amnesty has been deeply concerned in the latter months of the period with the PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF YEMEN, formerly the British Protectorate of Aden. Initially 24 people were adopted, who were prominent in the pre-independence regime, but who have been in prison since November 1967 on charges of being anti-revolutionary and belonging to the "defunct era of Sultans". Only the former ministers and two of their officials have been tried. We recently confirmed a report that 18 of these prisoners, including 7 Amnesty adopted prisoners, have been killed. National Sections of Amnesty in countries maintaining diplomatic relations with the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen were asked to make representations to PDRY embassies expressing concern at the deaths, and information was sent to the United Nations. Group work began in March and response from the authorities has been encouraging. These first cases have now been followed by detainees from different political groupings; from an ousted faction of the ruling National Liberation Front, and from rival nationalistic parties. All have been detained for over two years without trial. The execution of two groups of prisoners, which has not been denied by the Government, has not received adequate international attention.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL PUBLICATIONS

Amnesty International continued to publish the English translation of the *Chronicle of Current Events*, which provides accurate information about civil rights in the Soviet Union. By the end of the year, when subscription renewals fell due, over 1,200 subscribers were on our list. At the moment, there are slightly over 1,000—a steady flow of renewals and new subscriptions continues to come in. Financially, we break even over the production.

Among subscribers are a considerable number of libraries and academic institutions. The German Section of Amnesty (who have been considering producing their own translation of the *Chronicles*) has over 80 subscribers. During the year every US academic institution with over 1,000 students was sent publicity material resulting in a steady inflow of requests for new subscriptions from this quarter.

There has been some excellent coverage of the *Chronicles* in the English-speaking press. I. F. Stone's recent long article in the *New York Review of Books* evoked many enquiries about how to subscribe. Several British left-wing periodicals have run series about the *Chronicles* in recent months, and the fact that Amnesty publishes the English translation was mentioned in the context of the many long reviews of *Uncensored Russia*, Peter Reddaway's annotated text of Chronicles 1-11.

[1] Some of this information derives from a visit by the Secretary General to Syria in the first week of June 1972, i.e. after the period for which this report is made.

In addition to the *Chronicles* there was also widespread public interest in the report of the Amnesty Commission of Enquiry into allegations of ill-treatment in Northern Ireland, and in other documents which appeared in the course of the year.

PRISONER OF CONSCIENCE WEEK 1971

Our request for information on Prisoner of Conscience Week—it concerned racial discrimination—brought reports from about 35 groups and sections, more than we have ever received before. Also, the ideas for action were extremely imaginative and covered a wider scope of activities than in the past. Although there was the traditional leafletting and candle-lighting many new schemes for fund-raising and publicity were devised and groups made close contact with the public.

The activities reported covered: street collections; letters to church ministers; lectures; a pop concert; canvassing people in the streets; a play based on prisoner's letters, music and poetry sessions; a teach-in on South Africa; a concert of church music; visits to priests; talks to youth groups; sales of candles; posters; television programmes; radio programmes; articles in local papers; talks to local organisations; exhibitions; film shows; public meetings; demonstrators sitting in a cage; circulation of sermon notes, prayers and other material to churches; sales of craftwork, jewellery and literature; candles in public squares; pamphlet distribution; information evenings; begging-letters; information stands, including one in a university canteen; references in school assemblies; displays in libraries and bookshops. An encouraging number of schools and universities involved themselves in some of these events.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

International Executive Committee 1971-72

Seán MacBride, S.C.	Chairman	Ireland
Lothar Belck	Treasurer	Switzerland
Eric Baker		Britain
Thomas Hammarberg		Sweden
Ivan Morris	Co-opted	U.S.A.
Kari Poppe		Norway
Gerd Ruge	Co-opted	Germany
Carola Stern		Germany
Herman van Geuns		Netherlands

International Secretariat

Office of the Secretary-General

Martin Ennals	Secretary-General
Sylvia Goldburg	Secretary to Martin Ennals
Martin Enthoven	Executive Secretary
Sue Loveless	Secretary to Martin Enthoven
Mary Grigg	Press Relations and Newsletter
Gillian de Wolf	Executive Assistant (Brazil and Portugal)
Barbara König	Executive Assistant (Africa and Middle East)
David Browne	Bookkeeper
Sally Rome	Receptionist/telephonist

Research Department

Zbyněk Zeman	Director of Research
Diana Townsend	Secretary to Zbyněk Zeman
Stephanie Grant	Deputy Director of Research, responsible for research on Asia
Yvonne Terlingen	Researcher—South Asia
Hillis Hinze	Researcher—half-time—South East Asia
Julia Beck	Secretary to above three Researchers
Bruce Laird	Researcher—Eastern Europe
Maxine Bradford	Researcher—Eastern Europe
Hilary Sternberg	Researcher—part-time—Eastern Europe
Wendy Browning	Secretary to above three Researchers
Christel Marsh	Volunteer Researcher—Europe
Becky Babcock	Researcher—Spain & Latin America
Maria Silva	Secretary to above Researcher
Bella Marshall	Researcher—Greece and Turkey
Pamela Cox	Researcher—part-time—Greece
Kathy Best	Secretary to above two Researchers

Tracy Ulltveit-Moe	Researcher—Latin America & Portugal
Maggie Beirne	Secretary to above Researcher
Anne Burley	Researcher—USA and Northern Ireland
Felicity Loxton	Researcher—Middle East
John Humphreys	Researcher—Africa
Traugott Kodjo	Researcher—half-time—Francophone Africa
Elaine Cole	Secretary to above three Researchers
Clara Olsen	Researcher—Namibia
Nancy Dick	Researcher—part-time—Rhodesia and S. Africa

Library and Documentation

Helen Sunderland	Librarian
Colin Leyland-Naylor	Part-time volunteer
Rhyl Andrews	Part-time volunteer

Publications

Pat Arrowsmith	*Chronicle of Current Events*—subscriptions and distribution

Since the end of the year covered by the Report a number of staff changes have occurred :
The following people have left :—
Sylvia Goldburg
Mary Grigg
Hillis Hinze
Bruce Laird
Maxine Bradford
Pamela Cox
Kathy Best
Felicity Loxton
Helen Sunderland
David Browne

The following new appointments have been made :—

Susan Montgomery	Secretary to Martin Ennals
George Gomez	Administrative Manager
Kathleen Mthethwa	Bookkeeper
Jackie Fisher	Secretary to Information Officer
Odile Garros	Librarian
Peter Harris	Researcher—S.E. Asia
Jane Ward	Researcher—Eastern Europe
Pauline Hughes	Secretary to Bella Marshall
Rona Briggs	Secretary—Research Department

GROUPS AND NATIONAL SECTIONS

Where no national section or group is listed, please write to the International Secretariat, 53 Theobald's Road, London, WC1X 8SP.

Australia*
New South Wales
Amnesty New South Wales Branch,
7 Isabel Avenue,
Vaucluse, 2030,
New South Wales.
South Australia
Mrs. Joan Bourne,
25 Greer Street,
Hyde Park,
South Australia 5061.
Tasmania
Mrs. Bertha Rolls,
194 Waterworks Road,
Hobart 7000.
Victoria
Mr. Peter McPhee,
23 Sherwood Street,
Richmond 3121,
Victoria.
Western Australia
Mrs. Hannah Downie,
39 Clifton Crescent,
Mount Lawley 6050,
Western Australia.
Austria
Mrs. Irmgard Hutter,
1180 Vienna,
Krenngasse 1.
Bangladesh
Mr. Hafizullah,
Orr Dignam & Co.,
195 Motijheel,
Dacca 2.
Belgium
Miss Anne-Marie Rodeyns,
Avenue Général Médecin Derache 131,
1050 Brussels.

Britain
Amnesty British Section,
55 Theobalds Road,
London, WC1X 8SP.

Canada*
Peter Warren,
348 Hickson Avenue,
St. Lambert,
Quebec.

Mrs. Kathleen Savan,
Amnesty International, Toronto Group,
Box 867, Station "F",
Toronto 5,
Ontario.

Dr. Laing Ferguson,
P.O. Box 892,
Sackville,
New Brunswick.
Denmark
Amnesty Danish Section,
Gyldenløvesgade 12, I.
DK-1369 Copenhagen K.
Faroe Islands
Mrs. Maud Heinesen,
P.O. Box 209,
3800 Torshavn.
Finland
Tom Grönberg,
Luoteisväylä 28 A,
Helsinki 20.
France
Amnesty French Section,
54 Rue de Varenne,
75 Paris 7e.
Gambia
Mrs. Joanna Kambona,
c/o The Land Office,
Local Government,
Bathurst.
Germany
Amnesty German Section,
2 Hamburg 52,
Beselerstr. 8.
Ghana
Dr. I. S. Ephson,
Ilen Chambers,
P.O. Box 6354,
Accra.
India
Amnesty Indian Section,
A-23 Kailash Colony,
New Delhi - 48.
Ireland
Mrs. Brigid Wilkinson,
c/o 39 Dartry Road,
Rathmines,
Dublin 6.

* No National Address.

Israel
Mrs. Bella Ravdin,
P.O. Box 6116,
Haifa.
Italy
Dr. Gustavo Comba,
Via Coppieri N. 15,
10066 Torre Pellice.
Japan
Mr. Kozo Inomata,
Inomata Law Office,
7th Floor,
No. 2 Namiya Building,
3-8 Ginza 7-chome,
Chuo-ku,
Tokyo.
Korea
Amnesty Korean Committee,
Rev. Hyun B. Yoon,
Room 306,
Shindo Buildings,
135-2, Do-ryum-Dong,
Chongo,
Seoul.
Lebanon
Maitre Joseph Rizcallah,
Rue Clemenceau,
Imm. Minkara,
Beyrouth.
Luxembourg
Amnesty International Luxembourg,
63 av. Gaston Diderich,
Luxembourg.
Mexico
Professor Hector Cuadra,
Norte 90 No. 6532,
Mexico 14, D.F.
Netherlands
Amnesty Dutch Section,
P.O. Box 6262,
Amsterdam.

New Zealand
Amnesty New Zealand Section,
Box 3597,
Wellington.
Nigeria
Amnesty Nigerian Section,
c/o Mr. Samuel Ade Oyewole,
133 Abeokuta Street,
Ebute-Metta,
Lagos.
Norway
Amnesty Norwegian Section,
Oscarsgt. 50,
Oslo 2.
Peru
Sr. Hernando Cortes,
Edificio Ambassador,
Colmena Izquierda 1131 - Of. 308,
Lima.
Sri Lanka
Edward de Silva,
79/15 Alexandra Place,
Colombo 7.
Sweden
Amnesty Swedish Section,
Barnhusgatan 4,
111 23 Stockholm.
Switzerland
Amnesty Swiss Section,
Postfach 17,
CH-8600 Dübendorf 2.
U.S.A.
A.I.U.S.A.,
Room 64,
200 West 72nd Street,
New York,
N.Y. 10023.

LIST OF PRISONERS ON THE POSTCARD CAMPAIGN DURING THE YEAR, NOW RELEASED

Month	*Name*	*Country*
August 1971	Eddison Zvobgo	Rhodesia
August 1971	Yap Pak Leong	East Malaysia (Sabah)
September 1971	Mohammed Maqbool Damnoo	India (Kashmir)

AMNESTIES OVER THE PAST YEAR

1.	Central African Republic	June 1971	Release of all women in prison on Mothers' Day
2.	Senegal	October 1971	Act of clemency
3.	Spain	October 1971	General pardon
4.	South Vietnam	28 October 1971	Inauguration President Thieu's 2nd term of office
5.	Pakistan	26 December 1971	Change of government
6.	Lesotho	3 January 1972	New Year Amnesty
7.	Bolivia	6 January 1972	No details
8.	Bangladesh	19 January 1972	Liberation of Bangladesh
9.	North Korea	24 January 1972	
10.	Burundi	January 1972	Act of clemency
11.	Sudan	3 March 1972	General Amnesty for political prisoners
12.	Togo	27 April 1972	Independence Day
13.	Madagascar	May 1972	Independence Day
14.	Bolivia	June 1972	No details.

MISSIONS OVER THE PAST YEAR

1.	June—September 1971	MOROCCO : trial
2.	August 1971	LESOTHO : trial
3.	August 1971	NORTHERN IRELAND : torture enquiry
4.	September 1971	CEYLON amnesty
5.	September 1971	EGYPT trial
6.	November 1971	SPAIN trial
7.	December 1971	NORTHERN IRELAND torture enquiry
8.	December 1971	PORTUGAL trial
9.	January 1972	TURKEY torture
10.	February 1972	EGYPT trial
11.	February 1972	PORTUGAL trial
12.	February—June 1972	U.S.A. (Angela Davis trial)
13.	March 1972	U.S.A. (UN)
14.	April 1972	SPAIN trial
15.	May 1972	EGYPT, SYRIA, IRAN, ISRAEL
16.	May 1972	PORTUGAL trial

The list excludes routine travel and representation by members of the IEC and the Secretariat.

INDEX OF COUNTRIES

Amnesty International is an independent organisation which has consultative status with the United Nations and the Council of Europe. It endeavours to ensure the right for everyone to hold and express his beliefs. Amnesty International works, irrespective of political considerations, for the release of men and women who have neither used nor advocated violence, and for the implementation of the provisions of Articles 5, 9, 18 and 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Universal Declaration of Human Rights

Article 5: No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 9: No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.

Article 18: Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship and observance.

Article 19: Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

Published by Amnesty International, Turnagain Lane, Farringdon Street, London, E.C.4.

Address from October 1972: 53 Theobald's Road, London WC1X 8SP.

Printed by T. B. Russell & Co. Ltd., 1/3 Ludgate Square, London EC4M 7NN