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In a worldwide and coordinated effort, the national sections, groups and members of Amnesty International will increase public awareness and concern about the ongoing violations of Human Rights.

Amnesty International's campaign is designed to bring greater support to prisoners of conscience throughout the world.

More support from more people in more countries also means growth for our movement and increasing efficiency in our work for the victims of political persecution and torture.
Preface
by Dirk Börner, Chairman, International Executive Committee

Open your newspaper any day of the week, and you will find a report from somewhere in the world of someone being imprisoned, tortured or executed because his opinions or religion are unacceptable to his Government.

This quote, though of burning actuality, was written 15 years ago by Peter Benenson in that famous article "The Forgotten Prisoner" in the British newspaper The Observer, which started the worldwide campaign for Amnesty International. This campaign, faintly recognized at first and taken up by but a few in those days of 1961, has since become a strong and dynamic international movement embracing membership and support in all five continents - a movement united to work on behalf of those imprisoned, tortured or executed because their opinions or religion are unacceptable to their government.

Amnesty International is unique in its structure and working methods. Close to 100,000 members throughout the world not only contribute financially for others to do the actual work, but they participate actively in campaigns to create public awareness and pressure on those governments which violate fundamental human rights. This large number of non-professionals has done more than any professional organization could ever have hoped to achieve within 15 years. They have made Amnesty International the largest international organization for human rights opposing, irrespective of political considerations, adamantly and unrelentingly, oppression and persecution for reasons of race, religion or conscientiously held belief.

During the past year the close cooperation between the staff of our International Secretariat in London and the many volunteer workers worldwide has been strengthened and refined successfully in many areas. Meetings of specialists from national sections for certain countries or specific campaigns with the responsible staff in London improved the effectiveness of our work. Coordination groups for specific countries within national sections have assumed additional work for research, for the planning of campaigns, and for supporting individual adoption groups on their particular cases, thus relieving the workload of the Research Department in London. National sections have also strengthened their own internal structure to cope with the increased need for major campaigns on countries which have not responded in the past to public opinion appealing on behalf of the persecuted. This has made such campaigns launched by the International Secretariat more international, more widely noted, more effective.

Amnesty International, thus firmly based on both a highly professional and competent staff at its International Secretariat, and an actively working membership throughout the world, continues to expand, maintaining this unique and
highly effective structure.

AI has also continued to gain international recognition and reputation. More and more governments find that they cannot identify Amnesty International with their ideological opponents, thus having an easy excuse to disregard the AI appeal. Missions from Amnesty International have been received by governments more than in the past to discuss soberly and constructively ways and means to improve conditions for prisoners of conscience in their country and the possibilities for their release.

The independent work of Amnesty International is the more important since it becomes more and more evident that in spite of growing international awareness of violations of human rights, institutions composed of governments rather than individuals, such as the United Nations Commission of Human Rights, are not immune from political pressure and thus are sometimes unable to cope with such problems. In view of this and the reluctance by governments to submit to effective international control of their behaviour on human rights, it must be particularly appreciated that the Campaign for the Abolition of Torture was successful in initiating and obtaining unanimous adoption by the UN General Assembly, of the Declaration on Torture, by resolution 3452 (XXX) on 9 December 1975 – its most important human rights document since the adoption of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights on 10 December 1948.

The International Council in St Gallen in 1975 by acclamation elected Eric Benenson to be the Honorary President of Amnesty International. With Peter Benenson, Eric Baker was one of the founders of the movement and served on the International Executive Committee from 1968 to 1975. The growth of AI is in itself a tribute to the work of Eric Baker whose name appears at every stage in the development of the organization. The International Council wished to pay tribute to him for 15 years of imaginative, rugged and courageous leadership.

In its 15 years, Amnesty International has grown from five to 33 national sections, from 70 adoption groups after one year to more than 1,600 groups today. Yet it is still far from coping adequately and conclusively with all the problems it is confronted with. Therefore, after many campaigns on behalf of individual problem areas, Amnesty International, in its 16th year, will now launch an all-out campaign to promote its aims and objectives throughout the world, opening on Human Rights Day 10 December 1976 an unconditional "Prisoner of Conscience Year". This new campaign shall bring and must bring Amnesty International closer to its ultimate aim which its founder Peter Benenson called for 15 years ago: to "succeed in making a Government relent".

Introduction

by Hans Ehrenstrale, Deputy Secretary General

In a world of controversies and conflicts which is increasingly interdependent and where government and anti-government forces work at cross purposes and often clash openly or secretly, Amnesty International's role has become more and more important and has expanded considerably, without losing its distinct mark of specific concern for prisoners of conscience.

The original forgotten individual prisoner has become something of a rarity today, happily, and largely thanks to AI and to the media. Nonetheless, the number of prisoners of conscience adopted by AI groups has remained fairly constant around 5,000, with a turnover dependent on releases and new arrests.

But if this to some degree represents an improvement, numerous are the instances where the fundamental relationship between constitutional government and human rights are affected.

Concern is felt today about the detention or restriction of liberty of vast groupings of political prisoners, often anonymously, particularly in Asia and South Africa. The emergency regulations imposed in India a year ago constitute another drastic assault on freedoms of belief and expression. Such moves, affecting hundreds of thousands in the AI catalogue of concern, approach that ambiguous region where measures of rational organization for the benefit of whole populations sometimes are invoked to justify infringements of the rights of the individual. The tragic and bizarre phenomena of disappearances and death squads in Latin America have also escalated during the year and resemble, as does the frequent use of torture, an inquisition not only against individuals but entire sections of the population.

The concept and validity of agreed standards of human rights depends obviously in first instance on the governments of the world. The past year has seen this concept put to a test within the United Nations framework: at the General Assembly, the Human Rights Commission and, specifically, at the Fifth United Nations Conference on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders.

In the year the international covenants on human rights came into force, with their ratification by 35 governments. The covenants are intended to provide the legal framework for the protection of the human rights which were universally proclaimed in 1948 but, in 1976, are still ignored by and large. Amnesty International has campaigned persistently for the implementation of the covenants because it is better to prevent imprisonment than to release the prisoners. In the process of the campaign, more people and more governments will learn that, in a world of poverty and riches, human rights are not the mere dreams of idealists but everyone's fundamental entitlement. Deprived of these rights, people will struggle to achieve them. Yet, in the name of, stability and national development, governments continue to trample on human
rights - the end purpose of stability and development - sowing the seeds of violence.

A degree of success was noticeable during the year on this long and laborious road to improvement through international legislation, but we have also witnessed how majority decisions have comprised urgent cases of appeals under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights - as happened on a complaint against Indonesia. On balance, however, probably more significant were the clear signals from certain governments to give weight and urgency to human rights issues. Wherever it was appropriate for AI, as a non-governmental organization, we have made use of the platforms of the United Nations for transmission of information and presentation of proposals and, as is obvious, for lobbying.

Governments being the constant correspondents in AI work, great efforts have been deployed this last year in cultivating this relationship at all levels and in all directions with a view to building understanding for the various methods and uncompromising character of AI.

Instances of abuse of power, repression, political imprisonment, torture and death sentences have in the year under review also attracted greater attention in the media in all parts of the world. AI concerns have often been front page news in leading papers and the role played by the press, radio and television and by the major news agencies must be recognized as of primary importance when assessing the overall human rights situation. Symptomatic of this interest was the unparalleled attraction by political commentators in all major languages for the Al report, published in November 1975, *Prisoners of Conscience in the USSR*. As concerns publicity for AI itself, the name of the organization has in the past year been referred to by all the media more often than during the preceding five years put together.

This expanding and highly publicized movement has during the year also seen an unprecedented quantitative growth of its membership which is now close to 100,000, comprising 74 nationalities and representing an increase of almost 30% in the one year period. Recognized national sections exist now in 33 countries.

A few years ago AI was a typical western organization in spite of its universal claim. This contradiction is today less apparent. The active membership is today spread over all six continents and reaches all the major regions of the globe. In fact caution has been the key word for the geographical expansion and this for two reasons: anxiety that the expressed interest should be specific in AI terms and not merely a generalized human rights orientation and the recognition that the creation of new sections or groups should not lead, as may have been the case recently in two countries, to persecution of the members.

At the time of writing this report, the development of the movement is passing through a problematic but promising phase in Pakistan and in certain European countries like Greece, Portugal and Spain. In the third world where the demand for information is pressing, two field secretaries in Asia and Latin America have provided advice. The need for a similar information service in Africa is urgent and a priority for the future.

Made up of national sections, each with a large degree of autonomy, of groups - whether for adoption of prisoners or with specialized tasks - and of individual members, the AI movement is possibly today the most viable human rights organization in the world. From the small groups of dedicated, enthusiastic and energetic individuals to the boards of the sections and the nine member
From time to time an adopted prisoner after being released gets in touch with
the adoption group or with the International Secretariat.

The highlights of any year's work are these visits from ex-prisoners. The
past year was highlighted by many such calls.

AI is not an organization of names. But as one of the earliest researchers,
Stephanie Grant probably did more than anyone else to shape the work of
the Research Department and ensure the standard of accuracy and integrity
which is now expected of it and even taken for granted. At difficult periods
she was responsible for research in Europe, Africa and Asia. More recently,
she was deputy head of the department and, in January 1974, was appointed
Head of Research. This Annual Report reflects much of her work. She has
decided to leave the International Secretariat but her advice is still available
and the impact of her work for prisoners of conscience will remain a part of
the organization.

As one of those who entered, only two years ago, through the door of the
obscure Victorian building in London's Bloomsbury where the International
Secretariat is accommodated, I was very soon impressed by the compassion for
prisoners, the search for the truth in controversial issues and the dialectical
tension of the pros and cons which are characteristic of AI.

The Membership

There are now more than 97,000 members of Amnesty International, 33
national sections and 1,665 adoption groups spread over Africa, North and
South America, Asia, the Middle East and Europe. For practical reasons it
is impossible to give a comprehensive survey of the activities of AI's member-
ship throughout the world.

In the established sections, there has been a general emphasis during the
past year on strengthening internal structures. This attention to improved internal
organization is due to the greater demands being made upon the organization
as a whole, by the increased amount of material being distributed by the
International Secretariat (IS), via the Coordination Unit, and by efforts to
improve the use of this material for greater effectiveness. The report of a
structure committee, established by the International Council at Askov, in
September 1974, provided a basis for individual national section initiatives
to consolidate their internal organization.

This consolidation has taken place at all levels of national sections. Members
of national section boards have been given specific tasks and responsibilities:
for relations with the news media, relations with national government, Cam-
paign for the Abolition of Torture (CAT) activities, group and membership, etc.
CAT has continued to play a vital role in stimulating membership and new
techniques. At the same time, the demands of CAT activities, such as urgent
action appeals, has led to the development of special structures within sections
to coordinate and organize these activities (see section on Campaign for the
Abolition of Torture). Several sections have also formed action groups which
undertake general campaigns, fundraising and publicity. Coordination groups
or coordinators have been established to assist and support the work of adop-
tion groups and to advise the national section executive on particular geo-
ographical regions or countries.

The Netherlands Section remains one of the "model" traditional sections,
with a sophisticated network of action, adoption, CAT and coordination groups.
In the United States Section, the major membership drive of 1974-75 has given
way to efforts to consolidate the existing membership and groups and to estab-
lishing more coordination groups and CAT structures. The Swiss Section has
also concentrated on strengthening its structures for CAT activities. In the Swe-
dish Section, which has up to now confined its membership to adoption groups
and individual members, a number of action groups have now been formed.
As a result of this diversification of structures many regional meetings and
national seminars have been held to improve coordination and communication
within the national sections. The section in the Federal Republic of Germany
(FRG) is to set up a separate national structure committee to advise on possible
ways of improving internal organization and communication. In Australia
the six separate branches of the section came together for the first meeting of the national council in May 1976 in an attempt to achieve greater nationwide cooperation. On the other hand, the national sections in Lelumon and Gambia, which had been inactive for several years, were finally closed by decision of the NEC in January 1976.

Throughout the movement there has been an impressive increase in membership – from 70,000 to over 97,000 during the past year. This growth has taken place in the established sections, the developing sections and in countries and regions where there is no formal AI organization. For example, in the French Section, adoption groups have grown by 50% during the past year and 300 new members have joined every month since the beginning of 1976. Membership has doubled in the sections in both Norway and Italy. Membership in Britain has increased by 25%. The Netherlands Section now has a membership of more than 20,000, and this is increasing daily. Outside Europe, the Japanese Section has seen a growth of 30%, and the Mexican Section has tripled its membership.

These figures testify to – among other things – the impressive amount of news media coverage throughout the world that AI has received during the past year, in particular surrounding publication of the report on the Soviet Union and the international campaign on Uruguay. All sections, however small, have benefited from this increased public awareness of AI. Some sections have employed more direct methods to increase their membership. For example, the Faroe Islands Section celebrated its 10th anniversary by distributing an AI leaflet to every household in the country. Ireland and Australia, both established sections with a steady membership, have made special efforts to attract members from outside the urban centers in the rural regions. The Israeli Section is also attempting to increase its membership, and the Nigerian Section has organized a membership drive.

There has been an increasing amount of communication and cooperation between the national sections and the IS and between the national sections themselves. Members of the Coordination Unit and other IS staff have been able to visit several sections, not only in Europe, and have attended national and regional section meetings. The coordination groups provide a valuable link between the adoption groups and the national section executive and the IS. The important role of coordination groups, or individual coordinators, was the consensus of the first meeting of national section executive members responsible for coordination groups, which was held in London in March 1976. This meeting showed the value of exchanging experience between sections, sharing difficulties and working together towards appropriate solutions to the various problems.

The importance of inter-section meetings was even more evident at the CAT coordinators meeting in April 1976. It was fortunate that representatives of the sections in Mexico, Pakistan and Sri Lanka were able to attend for the valuable contributions from these non-European sections placed the discussion in a more international context.

A further international meeting is to take place of national section campaign organizers and publicity officers at the beginning of July to review campaign techniques and to consider the most effective use of resources for future action. Organizational consolidation has also meant financial consolidation. The substantial increase in the annual group fee decided by the International Council at St Gallen is in part the reason for the closure of several groups.
activities generated around events such as International Women's Year and Holy Year.

The campaign potential of AI members and supporters throughout the world emerged during 1976 with the Uruguay campaign in particular. This campaign was planned carefully in advance by the Campaign for the Abolition of Torture department and the Research Department of the IS. Extensive background information was prepared, together with publicity leaflets and a recommended program of action with detailed guidelines. There has been a full assessment of this campaign because of the many new experiences which it brought to light. Leaving aside the national and international implications of the campaign on a political level, there are also several conclusions which can be drawn with regard to membership and development in the context of AI.

The Uruguay campaign, together with other major country campaigns during 1976, provided the opportunity for new and developing sections, and for individual members throughout the world, to participate fully in an international AI activity. (Other important campaigns were those on the Soviet Union, Africa, and China.)

The response in the media and in the number of signatures to the petition to the Uruguayan government was impressive in all countries, regardless of the actual size of formal membership of AI, if any. For example, the sections in Greece, recognized only in February 1976 by the IEC, and in Iceland each collected more than 1,000 signatures. In Italy 20,000 signatures were collected. The extensive publicity coverage generated by the Uruguay campaign and the publication of the report on the Soviet Union resulted in a 50% increase in the sections' membership. The sections in Finland, Ghana, Israel and Nigeria also took an active part in the campaign.

In countries where the members are organized into adoption groups only, as in the Soviet Union, Cuba and Curacao, the Uruguay campaign provided a valuable opportunity for the members to expand their usual group activities and to participate in an AI activity on an international scale. In particular the group in the Soviet Union, which has continued to function in Moscow despite the arrest of three of its members and the imprisonment of two of them, obtained signatures to the Uruguay petition from 40 prominent Soviet defenders of human rights, including several former prisoners of conscience.

The Japanese Section was particularly active in the USSR campaign, and the Indonesia actions, such as on the occasion of Kartini Day (Indonesia Women's Day) in April. The Austrian Section conducted a year-long campaign on behalf of Indonesian prisoners of conscience with a carefully planned and coordinated program of action. These campaigns and the publicity surrounding them attracted many new members to AI, and close contacts were established with many more professional groups and national and international organizations. These people and organizations who have been introduced to AI through the campaigns have an experience and enthusiasm for this kind of activity. Likewise many AI members of adoption groups and individual members were able to expand their experience outside of normal adoption work or participation in regular campaigns and thus feel themselves more fully part of an international movement.

In order to exploit and to develop further this new expertise and interest, there is a need for equally careful planning and coordination of all international campaigns. This situation has led to discussion about the possibilities of establishing a more coherent campaign structure within the IS, to match the sophisticated structures which have been developed in other branches of the organization.

The organization has gained in international prestige during the past year due to the substantial increase in the amount of publicity – at the international, national, regional and local level. This is true in countries where there are highly developed sections. It is also true in countries where the few members, whether organized into a formal section or not, have considered publicity and media contacts to be a priority in their work in order to increase public awareness of AI and its aims in their own community. Most of the established sections have developed extensive contacts with the media, at the national and local level, and the British Section in particular has reported great progress in this respect.

To meet the increasing demands of the media and the public, the sections have produced more and more material for publicity purposes, with greater efficiency and flair: posters, leaflets, postcards, badges, etc. The activity of the South Asia Publications Service is of particular significance for the sections in the region.

The process of dissemination of information takes many forms. In the Swiss Section there is a highly successful CAT Information Bus which has toured the country. The bus is being "leased" to the FRG Section during the coming year. An important tool of publicity is audio-visual material, and this is especially true in the smaller developing sections, such as Mexico and Italy. The IS is meanwhile intensifying its efforts to establish a proper audio-visual library within the Documentation Center during the next two years.

Involvement in educational programs has also become an integral part of the work of the organization. Many national sections have produced material for use in schools and colleges about the work of AI, CAT and human rights in general. For example, the Swiss and FRG Sections have produced an information dossier on CAT. Both the Austrian and the Netherlands Sections have produced extensive lesson plans for secondary schools which will be or have already been introduced into school curricula throughout the country. Educational projects including audio-visual material, separate kits for teachers and students, reading lists, etc., have been prepared also by the US Section. The Swedish Section has devised a training course for potential new AI members and supporters.

The International Council meeting in St Gallen in September 1975 reaffirmed its recognition that AI's work for prisoners must take place on a truly international basis. This was seen as a challenge to the movement as a whole: to find the ways and means to accomplish this goal despite the political, social, economic, linguistic and cultural differences involved. The need for flexible forms of membership and new efforts towards multilingualism were stressed. The report of the South Asia Regional Conference was accepted by the council...
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in St Gallen as a policy statement for the development of activities by AI supporters in that specific region.

The smaller and developing sections have been given extra impetus by their participation in the international campaigns as described above, and in Asia and Latin America, they have received support and assistance by AI’s field secretaries. The Mexican Section has had a membership drive, stimulated by the Uruguay campaign, and its membership and income have increased to enable it to participate more fully in AI activities, in particular the Campaign for the Abolition of Torture. Audio-visual material is a specially important publicity tool in Mexico. The section produced a striking poster for the Uruguay campaign. It is also publishing a regular AI periodical. The Peruvian Section is hampered by the language barrier: its difficulties emphasize the need for a program of multilingualism within the organization, which was endorsed by the International Council at St Gallen. In Venezuela a number of AI supporters have met to discuss ways in which they can organize themselves to participate in the work of AI.

The South Asia Regional Conference of AI, which was the first AI regional conference of national sections to be held outside Europe, took place in New Delhi in March 1975 with participants from the five national sections in the region: Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. A major outcome of the conference was the establishment of the South Asia Publications Service in Colombo, Sri Lanka, which is under the direction of the IS Information and Publications Department. The service has consultants in each of the national sections of the region. Part of its work is to provide translations of basic AI documents into Bengali, Hindi, Sinhala, Tamil and Urdu.

Since December 1975, the South Asia Publications Service has reprinted the Amnesty International Newsletter and currently distributes it to over 800 members and subscribers in the region. Explanatory leaflets on AI have been printed and will be translated into the various languages. A CAT Information File has been designed and will be distributed throughout Asia.

The establishment of the South Asia Publications Service means that the members in the region receive the Newsletter directly from Colombo with little delay. The main focus of activity for the members is participation in the Prisoner of the Month campaign and the CAT Bulletin. The Indian Section has made arrangements to hire a full time secretary to coordinate the section activities. The Pakistan Section, which was formally recognized by the IEC in November 1975, has produced a general AI leaflet in English and will be issuing an Urdu edition. Membership has grown steadily, mainly among professional groups.

The Nepalese Section has translated basic AI information into Nepali and efforts are being made to increase membership in order to diversify the base of AI support in the country. The Bangladesh Section maintains a stable membership. The Sri Lanka Section has greatly expanded its activities by establishing an effective distribution structure so that urgent actions and campaign material are passed on to coordinators for immediate action. A national poster competition is being planned in order to familiarize the Sinhala-speaking public with the concept of AI. A CAT medical action group has been formed.

The Amnesty Korean Committee has increased its membership to 150. The Newsletter is translated and circulated to the members, who send appeals on behalf of the Prisoner of the Month. They have organized some fundraising activities and are anxious to participate in other international campaigns, like the Uruguay campaign.

The International Council decided to continue the field secretary programs in Asia and Latin America. In Latin America, the field secretary, Eduardo Marro, returned to the region in March 1976. On the way he spent some time in Spain to meet with AI members in Madrid and Barcelona. There is an increasing amount of public interest in AI in Spain, and in particular for the campaigns, such as that on Uruguay.

In Latin America, the field secretary has visited Venezuela, Costa Rica, Panama and Ecuador to follow up on the contacts he made during his first visit and to consolidate and develop organizational and cooperative structures. An important aspect of development in Latin America is multilingualism. Fortunately an increasing number of words are being translated or originally produced in Spanish each month. The Spanish edition of the Prisoners of the Month campaign and the CAT appeals was launched in April 1976. These are now being widely circulated in Spain and Latin America. The possibility of making arrangements for the publication in Spanish of a number of AI reports is being investigated, as well as possibilities for the establishment of a Spanish language publications service.

Throughout the region, the Uruguay campaign attracted the attention of a considerable number of people and efforts were made to channel these expressions of support into practical actions. Because of the sharp political polarization in the countries of the region, many of whom are prime targets for the criticism of AI, it is necessary to try to prevent as much as possible the politicization of AI work in the region.

As elsewhere, AI organizational policy must continue to be flexible in order to satisfy the needs of the region and to make use of local talents and experience. In many cases individual membership and subscription are more appropriate than formal group or section structures. Cooperation with professional individuals and organizations is essential: Latin American lawyers, medical doctors and military veterans have been invited to join AI teams of experts. Mass membership by proxy is being organized through relations with the trade union movement and church organizations in the region.

In Asia the positive results of the South Asia Regional Conference gave encouragement to plans for the first AI Pacific Regional Conference. The scope and character of the conference — originally proposed by the Japanese Section at the International Council meeting in Assek in September 1974 — were reviewed in September 1975 by the Japanese Section and the IS. The conference, which took place during the first week of June, was a small working meeting of representatives from the AI national sections in Australia, Japan, Republic of Korea and New Zealand, and of AI members and supporters from Hong Kong, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam.

Observers were invited from the other Pacific national sections in Canada, Mexico, Peru and the United States. In preparation for the conference the field secretary in Asia, Richard Reoch, travelled in the region from January 1976, visiting Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, Hong Kong and Japan. In addition to discussing the conference program with the prospective participants, he was able to assess the possibilities for AI activities and appropriate structures for the political and social context of the various countries.

An increasing number of AI members in Hong Kong participate in the Prisoners of the Month campaign and other international campaigns, including
CAT. On the occasion of Kartini Day in April 1976 (Indonesia Women's Day) the members coordinated their activities and obtained a great deal of publicity in the national and international media for the plight of Indonesian women prisoners of conscience.

The International Secretariat:
One Prisoner's Case

The graph which we produce on the page overleaf describes a division of the International Secretariat budget according to department. The figures give an idea of the emphasis given to the Research Department, for example. But what the graph does not indicate is the interdependence of the various departments of the secretariat.

Although there are some 4,000 prisoners of conscience under adoption or investigation at any one time, tracing the course of one such adoptee could serve to illustrate the dependent interaction of all departments in the International Secretariat.

News of Ana Rosa Kucinski's arrest and that of her husband, Wilson Silva, by security forces reached the Documentation Center on 9 July 1974. This information was confirmed by contacts of the Research Department and an urgent action campaign about Ana Rosa's disappearance was started on 29 July 1974. She and her husband became official adoption cases on 5 September and their cases were assigned to AI groups in Great Britain and the Netherlands by the Coordination Unit. Communication with those two groups has been maintained to date by the executive assistant for Brazil, including the sharing of information, such as that contained in Brazilian press clippings. In addition, the case of Ana Rosa Kucinski was discussed from time to time at the weekly meetings of the Latin American division of the Research Department.


The disappearance of Ana and her husband had become well known in Brazil after August 1974 when Archbishop Arns of Sao Paulo presented their names, along with 19 others, to a presidential aide. It became well known abroad partly due to the efforts of AI. On 6 February 1975 Brazil's Minister of Justice, Armando Falcao, was obliged to give an official version of circumstances surrounding these disappearances. Subsequently, the Research Department, using background information acquired over the years, prepared a document, dated 8 August 1975, giving AI's version of the histories of all 21 of the disappeared persons.

AI's Legal Officer presented this document, plus six other submissions regarding Brazil, to the 33rd Session of the United Nations Commission of Human Rights, which met in Geneva, Switzerland, in February 1976.

The International Secretariat has continued to publicize her situation. The Research Department, in cooperation with the British Section,
among others, made her case available to the National Executive Committee of the British Labour Party, shortly before the visit of President Ernesto Geisel of Brazil to Britain in May 1976. (Subsequently, the executive recorded a unanimous vote objecting to this visit.)

It needs only be added here that to maintain and equip the Amnesty International personnel capable of producing and disseminating to world public opinion all the materials and initiatives required for the case of Ana Rosa Kucinski has required the continuous support of the ADMINISTRATION DEPARTMENT.
INTRODUCTION
During 1975-76 two major events - a United Nations declaration on torture and an international campaign against torture in Uruguay - illustrated the methods which have featured prominently in Amnesty International's Campaign for the Abolition of Torture (CAT) since its beginning on 10 December 1972. Simultaneously, they underlined the need for AI to continue and intensify its program against torture.

First, the unanimous adoption by the United Nations General Assembly of a Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from being subjected to Torture, and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment on 9 December 1975 demonstrated further progress in AI's on-going efforts at the international level to improve international law. Despite this progress, the fact remains that too many governments subscribe to UN declarations and resolutions on human rights only on paper. AI will continue to press toward full observance of the 1975 UN declaration on torture.

Cooperation with governments toward the improvement of international law is complemented by direct approaches to governments with regard to the continuing flow of torture allegations from all parts of the world. In 1975-76 AI's CAT Department directed detailed inquiries to the responsible authorities in several dozen countries, including Libya, United States of America, Poland, Oman, India, Brazil, Zambia, Argentina, Iran and Peru, to cite but a few examples. In addition, AI missions have been briefed on the international legal aspects of torture. This was to enable such missions to seek governments' views on existing international law and to try to obtain their support for ongoing efforts to improve its implementation.

The second AI method - publicity about torture in particular countries - took on new dimensions in the intense, worldwide publicity campaign from February to April 1976 against the practice of torture in Uruguay. The Uruguay campaign demonstrated the potential of the AI movement as a whole for concerted international pressure on a government that systematically violates the fundamental human rights of its citizens. The relative success of the Uruguay campaign in mobilizing and concentrating international public opinion on an unprecedented scale calls for an increase in AI's campaigning capacity on the international level.

In organizational terms, the program of the Campaign for the Abolition of Torture has become increasingly interlinked with AI's overall work and structure. Internally, methods of action are continuously shared among the different segments of the organization. At the same time, continual efforts are made to ensure that the interest generated by the campaign against torture is extended to the other areas of AI's concern.

OTHER PUBLICITY AND PUBLICATIONS
Publicity, as a means of direct or indirect pressure initiated by the CAT Department, included news releases, special campaigns, occasional feature articles and the CAT Bulletin, which is issued monthly with the AI Newsletter. The bulletin provides information about the incidence of torture and about major events that contribute towards its abolition. It also includes one or more appeals on behalf of victims. These appeals receive a considerable response from
Examples of special publicity against torture in 1975-76 include campaigns concerning the torture of peasants in Latin America (May 1975), the situation of journalists in Brazil (October 1975), an imprisoned writer in Iraq (December 1975) and the well documented cases of Spanish worker Francisco Tellez Luna (February 1976) and Spanish trade union leader Maria Amparo Aranguez Satrustegui (May 1976). Special AI medical groups intervened on behalf of victims of torture in the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen whose long term effects of torture were compounded by lack of medical care. A campaign in May 1976 gave support to prisoners of conscience in Tunisia, many of whom had been subjected to torture during interrogation.

Most prominent among CAT publicity efforts were the Report of an Amnesty International Mission to Spain (published October 1975) and the international campaign against torture in Uruguay (February-April 1976). In July 1975 the CAT Department arranged a mission to Spain to talk with the government and to investigate allegations of widespread torture and extra-legal detentions by security forces in the Basque region. An account of the mission and its results can be found in the country survey of this annual report. The mission report formed the basis for a period of intensive campaigning by AI on behalf of political prisoners in Spain. The Uruguay campaign is described in more detail below in this chapter.

The CAT Department issued several publications with the purpose of informing a wide audience and generating support from certain professional, religious or social groups. In September 1975 a paper on the responsibility of the Christian churches to act against torture was published in connection with Holy Year. Earlier, in June 1975, a feature article was distributed on the subject of the torture of women. Regarding the latter, AI representatives presented proposals to the United Nations World Conference of the International Women's Year in June 1975 in Mexico City and to the World Congress for International Women's Year in October 1975 in Berlin, GDR.

In September 1975 the CAT Department produced a document entitled "Lawyers Against Torture", with the purpose of assisting national sections to inform and attract the support of legal bodies and individual lawyers in their countries. This document details the plight of lawyers who, as a result of their taking a stance against the practice of torture in their own countries, become themselves the victims of harassment, detention, torture and even death. It calls on the legal profession to come to the aid of persecuted colleagues and presents a draft code of ethics, formulated by AI in consultation with the International Commission of Jurists, for lawyers who become aware of the use of torture in their own country.

In the same context of arousing awareness and support from professional groups, joint publication of two essays was scheduled for early summer 1976. The first, by Dr Herman van Grua, a Dutch lung specialist and former member of AI's International Executive Committee, deals with the special position of health workers in relation to the problem of torture. The second, the text of a talk given by Professor Alfred Heijder, a Dutch penologist and current member of AI's International Executive Committee, at an AI seminar during the Fifth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders in September 1975 in Geneva, discusses the need for professional codes of ethics regarding torture.

**URUGUAY CAMPAIGN**

In addition to the continuation of the existing program and the undertaking of new initiatives, as summarized herein, the CAT Department coordinated AI's research and organizational resources in an effort to highlight and combat the practice of torture in a single country. In conducting the campaign against torture in Uruguay, which took place from February to April 1976, AI made use of extensive, detailed and reliable evidence of torture in order to bring pressure against a government that had proved to be unreceptive towards earlier approaches by AI and other international organizations. An account of the situation regarding political oppression in Uruguay can be found in the country survey of this annual report.

From October 1975 onwards, the International Secretariat introduced a series of background and briefing papers, as well as printed pamphlets in English and Spanish. They distributed them to the AI national sections and groups with adopted Uruguayan prisoners, as well as to other bodies. The campaign was launched on 19 February 1976 with a series of news conferences in major European and North American cities. Its central theme was the widespread and systematic use of torture in a country which was once known as the "Switzerland of Latin America". The theme was symbolized by a list of 22 persons who, according to information considered reliable by AI, died in Uruguay as a result of torture during the period between May 1972 and November 1975. Even before the campaign started, AI learned of the deaths of several more persons under torture in Uruguay. And as of May 1976, the number of deaths totalled 29.

A petition was circulated worldwide calling for an independent international investigation into allegations of torture. AI had sent the list of 22 victims to President Juan Maria Bordaberry in December 1975 requesting permission for such an impartial investigation, but no reply was received. Despite conditions of strict censorship in Uruguay, efforts were made to stimulate a dialogue about the human rights situation between AI and a broad spectrum of Uruguayan military and civilian authorities, informing them of the concern of the international community.

Support for the campaign was also sought nationally and internationally from a wide range of other individuals and organizations, including professional bodies, churches, trade unions, businessmen, teachers, students, parliamentarians and journalists. The International Secretariat made a coordinated effort to inform the European Economic Community (EEC) and its member states in view of the Uruguayan government's aspirations to establish closer relations with the EEC. During a debate in the EEC's European Parliament in May 1976, the EEC Commission expressed its concern about "the indefensible methods of the Uruguayan police against political prisoners in that country" and stated that the European Community had no intention of offering better terms for Uruguayan trade with the EEC.

The response to the campaign was encouraging. Extensive coverage in the news media ranged from Sri Lanka to Venezuela, from Finland to Morocco, and from Greece to Pakistan. The petition was signed by some 350,000 people in 70 countries, including Nobel Peace Prize winners, cardinals, former prisoners of conscience in the Soviet Union, high government officials, distinguished scholars, as well as representatives of trade unions and other large organizations. National sections, groups and individual members generated a virtually
The campaign received a new impetus during March when AI received an open letter from a Uruguayan military officer, accompanied by two photographs of actual torture. The officer, who for obvious reasons remained anonymous, denounced the systematic use of torture and other human rights violations in his country and called on the outside world for help.

The Uruguayan government reacted vehemently to AI's campaign. At a news conference in Montevideo on 18 February 1976, Foreign Minister Juan Carlos Blanco denounced the campaign as slanderous and stated that his government did not recognize the legal or moral authority of AI. The government-controlled news media started a campaign of denunciation, accusing AI of being in the service of communism.

Although, at the time of writing, it is still too early to assess the full effects of the campaign, it is clear that the campaign succeeded in drawing international attention to the human rights violations in Uruguay, and that this publicity created a considerable impact on the government.

It also boosted the morale of Uruguayan prisoners, as is indicated by the following letter from an exiled prisoner who was released from a Uruguayan prison shortly after the campaign began:

"Information about this sort of action does get into the prisons, and it is of immense value to raise the prisoners' morale. Even isolated acts of solidarity are received with enthusiasm and hope, but when it is a major campaign causing an hysterical reaction from the government, it helps tremendously. Prisoners can endure much better the military's hostility, or even disregard it and feel strengthened in spite of the circumstances."

This was useful.

Following the period of publicity and public action, AI renewed its efforts to encourage the authorities to discuss their policies with impartial outside experts. AI also undertook to ensure that international pressure against Uruguay would continue as long as the violations of human rights persisted.

**MEDICAL RESEARCH**

Considerable progress has been made with a research project that was started at the end of 1974 by a group of Danish AI doctors and research scientists with the purpose of gathering expertise in the examination of torture victims. During the pilot stage of the project, the group interviewed 67 torture victims among refugees in Denmark and former prisoners in Greece. By the spring of 1976, they had completed their work on standardizing examination procedures and had collated the data from 67 clinical interviews. The data were used to support recommendations for laboratory tests to identify more precisely the local and general symptoms and the possible long term effects of the severe stress caused by torture.

The most commonly found localized symptoms of torture were the results of *falanga* (beatings with rods on the soles of the feet). This method was the staple of the torturers in Greece: 28 of the 35 Greeks who were interviewed had experienced *falanga*. A report on the preliminary findings, including a comparison of complaints, symptoms and objective signs was begun with a view to presenting it to the Greek government and international health organizations in support of a recommendation that these torture victims be given full rehabilitation.

A further intention of the pilot study was to look for a pattern of symptoms in torture victims. In their clinical examinations, the doctors found few objective signs of torture. There were occasional scars, for example, from cigarette burns, but no longer were there visible scars on victims who had experienced electrical shock. From relatively coarse tests, the doctors found some hearing disabilities among the torture victims (a relatively high percentage of those examined have hearing problems), but it is unclear whether these disabilities are localized symptoms, resulting from beatings on the ears, or whether they are part of a pattern of general symptoms. Among the subjective signs, the doctors found frequent symptoms in the victims interviewed of sleep disturbances, headaches, loss of memory, problems of concentration and changes in mood.

It is hoped that a full scale research project can be undertaken on the basis of the pilot study. If so, it will include neurological and orthopaedic investigations, further tests for hearing deficiencies, psychological tests and endocrinological (hormonal) tests for evidence of long term effects of torture. One offshoot of the pilot study was research into the specific long term effects of electrical torture. This research, which is of an experimental nature, is continuing in Copenhagen with financial support from the Danish Research Council.

In a medically related field, the CAT Department, in consultation with the International Executive Committee, undertook to define AI's concern with regard to penal programs involving behaviour modification. In recent years, various penal reform groups and the news media have focused considerable attention on the development and use of intensive psychiatric and medical techniques designed to control and, in some cases, permanently to alter, the behaviour of individuals detained in penal institutions. Concerned by the increasing use of the technology of behaviour modification and by the implications of this technology for prisoners, AI submitted a paper in February 1976 entitled "Behaviour Modification: Standard Minimum Safeguards for the Protection of Prisoners" to the United States National Commission on the Protection of Human Subjects. This commission is in the process of recommending legislation to control the practice of behaviour modification in the US, where the main body of research, experimentation and actual use has taken place.

Rejecting the use of behaviour modification for penal discipline and denouncing experimentation with new, controversial techniques on prisoners, AI outlined safeguards that are designed to ensure:

- that a prisoner who desires psychological help should be treated no differently from a patient outside prison who seeks similar treatment;
- that the prisoner's consent to such treatment is full, free and informed.

If the prisoner consents and if a physician of the prisoner's choice advises that the treatment is in the interest of the prisoner, the suggested safeguards provide for a panel of assessors chosen in consultation with the prisoner, to determine whether the consent is indeed full, informed and voluntary, whether the subject would benefit from the proposed treatment and whether the proposed treatment respects the prisoner's inalienable right to his or her personality. The safeguards also provide for regular reviews of the treatment and for withdrawal of consent at any time during the treatment.
OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

As in previous years, the United Nations has provided a focus for AI's efforts to strengthen and improve international law and its implementation in relation to the problem of torture. Further progress was made in this field with the unanimous adoption by the UN General Assembly of its resolution 3452 (XXX) of 9 December 1975, the "Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from being subjected to Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment". The full text of the declaration is printed at the end of this chapter.

A detailed account of AI's initiatives with regard to the adoption of the UN declaration on torture, in which the CAT Department took an active part, can be found in the chapter on relations with other organizations. In the same chapter will be found a summary of major developments and, where applicable, activities, including those of the CAT Department, undertaken by AI in relation to the UN Committee on Crime Prevention and Control, the UN Commission on Human Rights and its Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, the Council of Europe, the World Health Organization, the World Medical Association, the International Council of Nurses and other inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations.

CAT AND THE NATIONAL SECTIONS

AI national sections are instrumental in carrying out the major tasks of the CAT program. They have built up networks and established contacts for the speedy execution of urgent action campaigns. They have provided essential support for AI's initiatives on the inter-governmental level by approaching their own governments and, no less important, by informing public opinion in their countries. With a great variety of imaginative and well prepared actions, they made the Uruguay campaign a success in terms of drawing international attention to the practice of torture in that country. Finally, they continue to provide the funds necessary for the existence of the Campaign for the Abolition of Torture.

The fullest possible utilization of the vast potential of the AI movement as a whole against torture remains a matter of priority for the CAT Department. The experience gained in the Uruguay campaign, the special contacts built up with other organizations in urgent action and other campaigns, and the goodwill created for AI's work as a whole through the CAT program give no reason for complacency. Existing methods of action are in constant need of streamlining and improvement, and new methods must be developed. At the same time, new structures must be designed for groups of individuals interested in working with the campaign in countries where AI national sections do not yet exist.

In all this, the CAT Department endeavours to assist the national sections as much as possible. For example, in October 1975 a special document for fundraising purposes was distributed. Also, the newly established South Asia Publications Service in Sri Lanka was given technical and financial support for the production of a general CAT information file and for its distribution throughout the South Asian region. In addition to these and other initiatives from the center, the CAT Department endeavours to act as a channel for the exchange of ideas and methods among national sections.

The establishment of specialist groups has been encouraged and, where possible, ideas and material for action provided. In addition to already existing groups of health professionals in Denmark, Holland and the United States, efforts were under way in Sri Lanka and Japan to establish new medical groups. In some of the larger national sections, individual members or groups have assumed the task of coordinating all matters related to certain professions or sectors of the community, such as lawyers, doctors, trade unions, law enforcement personnel, publicity work and education. More often than not, these groups do not restrict themselves to working against torture, but make use of their expertise and contacts to work on other issues within the AI mandate, and so benefit the work of their national section as a whole.

On 10 and 11 April 1976, CAT coordinators from 14 national sections, including representatives from European sections, Mexico, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and the United States, met in London to discuss with International Secretariat staff and members of the International Executive Committee the progress the campaign had made since 1973 and its future direction. While there was unanimity about the need for AI to continue the CAT program and about its often beneficial effect on the work and development of AI as a whole, those attending the meeting felt at the same time that efforts to ensure that the campaign developed in close integration with the rest of the organization had to continue.

FUTURE PROGRAM

Consolidation of the existing program will be a matter of priority both on the international and on the national level. Strengthening of methods and structures for implementation of this program will, therefore, be continuously sought. This includes, in particular, urgent actions, utilization of other publicity and action material, cooperation nationally and internationally with professional and other non-governmental bodies, and work on the inter-governmental level.

In addition to a possible second major international campaign on a single country, two important documents have been scheduled for publication during the next year. At the end of 1975, the CAT Department began preparations for a report on the first major "torture trial" of military police officers in Greece, who had been charged with committing acts of brutality against detainees during the seven-year military dictatorship. The trial by court martial was held in Athens during August and September 1975. It ended in sentences of up to 23 years for former commanders and agents of the special investigations branch of the Athens military police. The report's planned publication date is the end of 1976.

The second major report to be published during 1976-77 is a country-by-country survey of torture during the previous year. It will be produced annually in the future and is envisaged as an updating of the world survey of torture in the Amnesty International Report on Torture (1973 and 1975). The up-dated survey will provide factual information about reliable allegations of torture received from any country during the preceding year.
Declaration on the Protection of All Persons From Being Subjected to Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment


Article 1

For the purpose of this Declaration, torture means any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted by or at the instigation of a public official on a person for such purposes as obtaining from him or a third person information or confession, punishing him for an act he has committed or is suspected of having committed, or intimidating him or other persons. It does not include pain or suffering arising only from, inherent in or incidental to, lawful sanctions to the extent consistent with the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners.

2 Torture constitutes an aggravated and deliberate form of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 2

Any act or torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment is an offence to human dignity and shall be condemned as a denial of the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and as a violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Article 3

No state may permit or tolerate torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. Exceptional circumstances such as a state of war or a threat of war, internal political instability or any other public emergency may not be invoked as a justification of torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 4

Each State shall, in accordance with the provisions of this Declaration, take effective measures to prevent torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment from being practised within its jurisdiction.

Article 5

The training of law enforcement personnel and of other public officials who may be responsible for persons deprived of their liberty shall ensure that full account is taken of the prohibition against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. This prohibition shall also, where appropriate, be included in such general rules or instructions as are issued in regard to the duties and functions of anyone who may be involved in the custody or treatment of such persons.

Article 6

Each State shall keep under systematic review interrogation methods and practices as well as arrangements for the custody and treatment of persons deprived of their liberty in its territory, with a view to preventing any cases of torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 7

Each State shall ensure that all acts of torture as defined in article 1 are offences under its criminal law. The same shall apply in regard to acts which constitute participation in, complicity in, incitement to or an attempt to commit torture.

Article 8

Any person who alleges that he has been subjected to torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment by or at the instigation of a public official shall have the right to complain to, and to have his case impartially examined by, the competent authorities of the State concerned.

Article 9

Wherever there is reasonable ground to believe that an act of torture as defined in article 1 has been committed, the competent authorities of the State concerned shall promptly proceed to an impartial investigation even if there has been no formal complaint.

Article 10

If an investigation under article 8 or article 9 establishes that an act of torture as defined in article 1 appears to have been committed, criminal proceedings shall be instituted against the alleged offender or offenders in accordance with national law. If an allegation of other forms of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment is considered to be well founded, the alleged offender or offenders shall be subject to criminal, disciplinary or other appropriate proceedings.

Article 11

Where it is proved that an act of torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment has been committed by or at the instigation of a public official, the victim shall be afforded redress and compensation in accordance with national law.

Article 12

Any statement which is established to have been made as a result of torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment may not be invoked as evidence against the person concerned or against any other person in any proceedings.
Capital Punishment

The most notable initiative by Amnesty International in the field of work for the abolition of the death penalty was the submission of an amicus curiae (friend of the court) brief to the Supreme Court of the United States on 25 February 1976. The court was hearing the appeal of Troy Leon Gregg versus The State of Georgia and four other cases. The decision of the court is expected to confront the issue of whether capital punishment constitutes "cruel and unusual punishment". Were it to be so decided, the penalty would be considered unconstitutional and illegal.

The AI brief argued that the penalty was "cruel, inhuman or degrading" within the meaning of article 5 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and that the international standard was relevant for the court in the interpretation of the US constitution. The brief was submitted by the attorney, Arthur M. Michaelson, a member of the board of AI's US section. It was the first example of any such legal initiative by AI. It is to be hoped that this new technique may be developed upon with respect to other countries and even other legal issues.

At the international level, the principal AI action took place in connection with the Fifth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders held in Geneva, Switzerland, 1-12 September 1975. AI circulated to the participants a resolution, signed by 26 international non-governmental organizations concerned with human rights, calling on all governments that retain capital punishment to cease employing it and calling on the UN General Assembly to promulgate a declaration that would urge its total worldwide abolition (for text and list of signatories, see Annual Report 1974-1975, page 26). In addition, the Legal Adviser made an oral intervention at the congress drawing attention to the resolution. These initiatives found only a modest reflection in the report of the relevant section of the congress, which suggested, among "some general guidelines for "all countries", "constant and persistent endeavour to seek sanctions which are less aggressive in their application and less aggression-provoking on the part of offenders, particularly as regards capital and corporal punishment".

Meanwhile, work is commencing within the Research Department on a major report on the use of capital punishment in political cases. The report is to be the basis of a campaign against the death penalty, as authorized by AI's International Council meeting in St Gallen, Switzerland, 12-14 September 1975. All national sections have been asked to prepare for the campaign, particularly to enable them to take action in specific cases.

During the year, AI has continued to intervene to seek the commutation of death sentences imposed on individuals.

Documentation Center

In response to the growing need within the International Secretariat for expert handling of the increasing flow of information coming into and going out of it, and to meet the needs of national sections, members and others for information retrieval, the International Executive Committee decided in April 1975 to establish a Documentation Center within the IS. In October 1975 a Head of Documentation Center was appointed.

The Documentation Center's main function will be to store, process and retrieve all material produced by the IS, to create an information storage and retrieval system for the prisoner data and to perfect the system of disseminating, storing and retrieving incoming press and other printed information. At present the Documentation Center includes a library of reference books and prison writings, a press library encompassing articles from some 300 newspapers and periodicals, and an archive of all reports, newsletters and other campaign material from the national sections.

The Head of Documentation Center undertook a three-week visit to various European sections and selected international documentation centers, including the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the World Council of Churches (WCC), the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and others. It was clear from this mission that the IS and national sections can cooperate more closely on information storage and flow, and that some other international organizations are ready to cooperate on information exchange where possible and appropriate.

With a now-enlarged staff of three full time assistants, the Head of Documentation Center has taken the first steps in establishing a comprehensive information system which will make more information available to members and other interested parties as well as facilitate the work of the Research Department in this area. Since much of the information has to be classified as confidential, the new information system will also include special security measures.
More attention than ever before was given during 1975-76 to the dissemination of Amnesty International information and publications throughout the world and to producing material in more languages.

A South Asia Publications Service was established in Colombo, Sri Lanka, to produce and distribute the monthly *Amnesty International Newsletter* to national sections and members in Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. The service, which began operations in November 1975, also produced leaflets on AI both in English and Sinhala and material on the Campaign for the Abolition of Torture (see section on The Membership).

Last year's annual report was published in Spanish for the first time, and in April 1976 the International Secretariat began issuing a Spanish translation of the Prisoners of the Month Campaign and the CAT appeals for circulation to Spanish-speaking sections and members. This was in addition to the regularly produced bulletin of AI news in Spanish. The possibility of establishing a Latin American Publications Service similar to the one in South Asia is being explored.

Another advance in multi-lingualism - or multi-culturalism, as many people prefer to describe AI's development in this area - was the production of a general information leaflet in Arabic. Similar booklets on AI are planned for 1976-77 in other non-European languages.

A joint effort by the French-speaking national sections has helped facilitate a better system of translating and producing the monthly *AI Newsletter* in French. They also cooperated in preparations for publishing the USSR report and this annual report in French editions. These were major steps toward implementing the International Council's directive that important AI material be published and distributed internationally in at least three languages: English, French and Spanish.

All of these developments were in addition to the regular publication of AI material by all national sections in their own languages.

Another innovation was the publication in January 1976 of the first of a new series of well-presented briefing papers on human rights situations in individual countries. Number one was on Singapore. This was followed by briefing papers on Rhodesia/Zimbabwe and on the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen. Ten such briefing papers will be produced each year and are being sold by subscription as well as individually.

AI published two major new reports during the year: *Report of an Amnesty International Mission to Spain and Priso...
During the year 1975-76, Amnesty International continued to administer a relief program to assist prisoners of conscience and their families throughout the world, and to provide legal assistance for persons who, if convicted, might reasonably be expected to become prisoners of conscience under the terms of AI's statute. Financial aid was also provided to relief organizations in a number of countries working to give humanitarian support to persons imprisoned or persecuted for their political views.

The year saw a considerable expansion in AI's relief program, both in terms of the amount of money expended and the number of countries covered. Upwards of £80,000 (US $144,000) passed through the relief machinery of the International Secretariat in the form of contributions from groups and national sections - an increase of approximately 75% over 1974-75. The secretariat estimates that a similar amount was sent directly to recipients by adoption groups and national sections.

The International Secretariat Relief Committee met 17 times in 1975-76 to screen applications for relief. It allocated close to £30,000 (US $52,500) for use in more than 20 countries. The generosity of AI's national sections, coordination groups, adoption groups and individual donors made available a pool of unearmarked relief money on which the relief committee was able to draw, using the expertise of the Research Department and the devoted work of relief distributing agencies in recipient countries, where the task of aiding those persecuted for their political or religious views is often undertaken at considerable personal risk to those involved.

Equally, the relief committee was indebted to the efforts of the various national section relief officers, who reported the availability of unearmarked relief funds in their sections and made these funds available for allocation to specific projects. The Norwegian, Swedish, Swiss, Luxembourg, Belgian, German and British sections were particularly helpful in this respect.

One particular object of the relief committee during the past 12 months has been to ensure a broader and more equitable distribution of the relief funds available to AI. Thus, although some areas, such as southern Africa, continue to absorb a very large proportion of AI's relief money, a start has also been made on major relief, legal aid and rehabilitation projects in areas where previous relief activity was somewhat limited.

In addition, steps were taken to supervise more closely the functioning of relief mechanisms within the International Secretariat, to encourage the reporting by adoption groups of their own relief activities and to speed the flow of relief funds through the International Secretariat to those in greatest need.

The effectiveness of AI's relief program is daily attested to by the letters of thanks and appreciation received at the International Secretariat and by individual groups from prisoners, families, and aid-distributing agencies in almost every country where AI has adopted prisoners of conscience. Following the restructuring and rationalization of the International Secretariat's relief machinery which took place during 1974-75, and which permitted an expansion of the size and scope of AI's relief work during 1975-76, there is every possibility that a further extension of this aspect of the organization's work will take place during the coming year.

Along with the fundamental adoption work of the AI membership, and the research and publicity functions of the International Secretariat, AI's relief program is assuming its place as an important and concrete contribution to the welfare of prisoners of conscience wherever they exist.
**International Law and Relations with International Organizations**

**UNITED NATIONS (UN)**

Amnesty International has consultative status (Category II) with the Economic and Social Council of the UN. As in previous years, the UN has provided a focus for AI’s efforts to strengthen and improve international law and its implementation in relation to the problem of torture. Further remarkable progress was made in this field with the UN General Assembly’s adoption by acclamation in its resolution 3452 (XXX), of 9 December 1975, of the Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from being subjected to Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The full text of the declaration is printed at the end of the section on the Campaign for the Abolition of Torture.

The declaration had been recommended to the General Assembly by the Fifth United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders. This congress, which meets every five years and was originally scheduled to be held in Toronto, Canada, was held from 1-12 September 1975 in Geneva, Switzerland. It was requested by the General Assembly (resolution 3218 (XXXIX) of 6 November 1974) to elaborate an international code of ethics for law enforcement personnel, and to include in the elaboration of the UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners, rules for the protection of all persons subjected to any form of detention or imprisonment against torture. The General Assembly had, by the same resolution, asked the World Health Organization to draft an outline of international code of police ethics. This seminar took place on 19 and 20 June 1975 in the Peace Palace in The Hague. It was organized in conjunction with the AI Dutch section and with the financial support of the Dutch government and police unions.

The seminar elaborated a series of ethical principles and provisions in the form of a Declaration of The Hague. The declaration provided for the right of law enforcement officers to disobey or disregard any order which is in clear contradiction to fundamental human rights, as well as the duty to disobey or disregard any order to execute, torture or otherwise inflict bodily harm upon a person under their custody. The declaration was, with one amendment, formally proposed to the Geneva congress by the Dutch government.

AI was represented at the congress by Secretary General Martin Ennals, Legal Adviser Nigel S. Rodley, Campaign for the Abolition of Torture (CAT) Organizer Dick Osting and Professor Hubert Thierry, President of AI’s French Section. IEC member Professor Alfred Heijder was also a member of the Dutch delegation to the congress. The discussion centred on a draft declaration on torture proposed by the Dutch and Swedish governments. After a number of amendments had been made by an informal working group, in which AI participated, this draft was approved by the congress. The draft declaration was acclaimed as the major achievement of the congress, comparable in significance to the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners elaborated by the first congress in 1955.

Little progress was made by the congress on the question of an international code of police ethics. On the one hand, dissatisfaction was voiced about the inadequacy of the working document prepared under UN auspices. On the other hand, many of the expert delegates found that AI’s Declaration of The Hague went too far by giving police the right and even the duty to disobey certain orders. The congress agreed on the need for a code and finally recommended that the General Assembly establish a committee of experts to study the matter further and to prepare a fresh document in the next year for consideration by the competent organs of the UN. The question of medical ethics in relation to torture, on which the World Health Organization had presented a thorough appraisal, was referred to the General Assembly without discussion.

Matters of AI concern were raised at two seminars organized by AI during the first week as part of the program of the congress. The first seminar dealt with "professional, ethical and national and international legal aspects of torture", and the second with "strengthening, implementation and dissemination of the Standard Minimum Rules".

Immediately after the congress, all AI national sections were asked to urge their governments to support certain of the congress’ recommendations at the 30th session of the General Assembly, which had just started. A request was also addressed to some 30 non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the UN Economic and Social Council to ask their national affiliates to do the same. Furthermore, messages were addressed personally to some 15 governments leaders and their UN Ambassadors, urging their continued active support for the congress’ relevant recommendations, in particular the draft declaration on torture.

During a two-week visit to New York in October, the Secretary General had an opportunity to discuss these and other matters of AI concern with a large number of governmental representatives and UN officials, including UN Secretary General Kurt Waldheim. During his stay, Mr Ennals was assisted by AI’s representatives to the UN in New York, Andrew Blane and Margo...
Picken, who continued the talks with UN delegates until the declaration and the resolution referred to in the following paragraph were approved.

The report of the Geneva congress already stated that "the draft declaration represented but an initial step ... There clearly remained the need to move towards more effective international procedures to implement this declaration. The ultimate objective would, of course, be the development of an international convention ratified by all nations". The General Assembly also stated its recognition of the need for implementation procedures when, in addition to adopting the declaration on torture on 9 December - by resolution 3452 (XXX) - it passed by consensus an accompanying resolution 3453 (XXX) of 9 December 1975 - which contained specific requests to other UN bodies. The UN Committee on Crime Prevention and Control and the World Health Organization were asked to work further on ethical codes relevant to torture for law enforcement and medical personnel respectively. The UN Commission on Human Rights was instructed to take any necessary steps to ensure effective observance of the declaration and to formulate a body of principles for the protection of all persons under any form of detention or imprisonment. The General Assembly finally decided in this resolution to review the progress achieved in connection with its 1976 session.

AI submitted a statement to the Commission on Human Rights at its 32nd session in February 1976 in Geneva, proposing a number of steps to ensure effective follow-up to the declaration. AI urged the commission inter alia to study the possibility of creating a convention on torture, which should declare torture to be a crime under international law and contain mechanisms for investigation and enforcement. AI further asked that all UN member states be requested to incorporate the principles and provisions of the declaration into their national legislation. It proposed that an appropriate body should elaborate a code of ethics relevant to the problem of torture for members of the legal profession.

The commission decided, by its resolution 10 (XXXII) of 5 March 1976, to refer the task of drawing up a body of principles for the protection of all persons under any form of detention or imprisonment to its Sub-committee on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, and to consider the whole matter with priority at its next session.

In addition to this new task assigned to it by its parent body, the Sub-committee on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities had also undertaken, on the basis of its own resolution 4 (XXVIII) of 10 September 1975, to give immediate attention at its next session in August 1976, to five issues it considered deserved particular concern in connection with its agenda item on the question of the human rights of persons subjected to any form of detention or imprisonment: (a) the “necessity of impartial judicial investigation into alleged illegal practices against arrested and detained persons”, and, “the lack or ineffectiveness of judicial control over arrest and detention practices”; (b) transmitting a substantial amount of reliably attested information to the sub-committee for its consideration under the above mentioned agenda item.

In preparation for the work of the June 1976 session of the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control on an international code of ethics for law enforcement personnel, AI submitted its comments on the new working document prepared by the UN secretariat. It also sent personal messages to individual members of the committee, informing them of AI's concerns in this matter.

In addition to the initiatives concerning the problem of torture, AI also brought other matters to the attention of the UN. In particular, AI distributed to the Fifth UN Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders a resolution subscribed to by some 26 international non-governmental organizations (NGOs) on the question of capital punishment. On this, see the section of this annual report dealing with capital punishment.

As part of its general proposals to the congress, AI had suggested several initiatives to ensure the implementation and wide dissemination of the UN Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners as well as to gain recognition for their applicability to all persons deprived of their freedom. These proposals were reflected in the report of the particular section of the congress that dealt with the matter. The congress came to no firm conclusions on this. The question will be taken up further by the Committee on Crime Prevention and Control.

At the 32nd session of the UN Commission on Human Rights, AI was particularly interested in the procedure of the commission permitting it to investigate consistent patterns of gross and reliably attested violations of human rights. AI had in previous years submitted information relevant to this topic on Brazil and Indonesia. While the government of Indonesia had indicated to AI that the commission had decided in 1975 to regard that case as closed, press reports suggested that the case of Brazil was still on the commission’s agenda (all proceedings under the item in question are conducted in private).

In an attempt to prevent the Brazilian case from meeting the same fate as that of Indonesia, AI Legal Adviser Nigel S. Rodley on 26 February 1976 appealed to the commission, during its general (open) consideration of the item, "not (to) close its eyes to certain known instances of grievous widespread and persistent violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms". With Brazil in mind, he described the information submitted by AI as disclosing "a reliably attested pattern of arbitrary arrests, detention, torture and disappearances at the hands of government officials or extra-legal death squads operating with the apparent connivance of the authorities — a veritable reign of terror". He argued that this situation "could be treated as a measure of the inefficacy of the confidential procedures". Subsequent press reports suggest that a majority of the commission decided to take no action on the case.

Disappointing as this outcome may be, it is necessary to bear in mind that the commission is composed of governments rather than individuals and thus cannot be immune from political pressures. Although progress may be slow, the UN has departed substantially from the doctrine of the first two decades of its existence whereby it refused to examine specific human rights violations for fear of intervening "in matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction" of member states. Accordingly, AI will continue to send pertinent information to the UN, including further information on Brazil and Indonesia.

Meanwhile, during the year AI sent information to the commission's Ad Hoc Working Group of Experts on Southern Africa and its Ad Hoc Working Group on the Present Situation of Human Rights in Chile. In the same speech the Legal Adviser expressed AI's deep appreciation for the work of the commission through these bodies and assured the commission that AI "remains ready to give all the assistance it can to the groups as they continue their crucial work".

The commission also had the question of conscientious objection on its
THE AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL REPORT 1975-1976

44

agenda. On 5 February 1976, AI Geneva representative Henry Jacoby inter-

tended to ask the commission to recognize as a basic human right the right to ob-
ject to military service on grounds of conscience. However, the commission
defered the matter to its 1977 session.

A major landmark in the international legal promotion and protection of
human rights was reached on 23 March 1976 when the UN's International
Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and its Optional Protocol came into
force. Meanwhile, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural
Rights had already entered into force on 3 January 1976. AI has been
working to this end since the UN General Assembly adopted the covenants
and the protocol on 16 December 1966. In a letter of 31 December 1975 to
President Gustav Husak of Czechoslovakia, AI expressed its "great satisfaction"
that, as a result of his country's being the 35th to ratify the covenant on civil
and political rights (35 ratifications were required to bring the treaty into
force), "this major landmark in the protection of human rights" would enter
into force.

AI will continue to work to the end that all states become bound by the
covenants and protocol. In particular, it has made the texts of these available
to its national sections and urged the sections to intensify their efforts, where
necessary, to ensure that their governments become parties as soon as possible
to the treaties. They will be reminding the governments that the effectiveness
with which the treaties are implemented will depend heavily on those countries
that become parties to them in the early stages of their operation.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND
CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (UNESCO)

AI now has "information and consultative relations" (category B) with
UNESCO and has sought to participate actively in matters of AI concern.
Thus, Secretary General Martin Ennals joined AI International Executive
Committee member Marie-José Protais and Dr Jean Guiton, AI's Paris repre-
sentatives, at the UNESCO Interdisciplinary Expert Meeting on the Study of
the Causes of Violence, held in Paris 12-15 November 1975. This is a topic
of general concern to AI, and especially with reference not only to individual
violence but also to governmental violence. AI is expected to cooperate with
the UNESCO-sponsored follow-up to the meeting. Also AI responded to a
UNESCO questionnaire on the right to communicate, which clearly is closely
related to the right of freedom of expression that is a basic AI concern.

The three AI representatives mentioned above also attended the 15th Confer-
ence of International Non-Governmental Organizations in Consultative
Relationship (categories A and B) with UNESCO, held in Paris 18-21 November
1975. AI contributed to various initiatives at the conference, particularly a
resolution calling for clarification of and improvements in UNESCO procedures
dealing with human rights complaints. The conference elected AI to its Stand-
ing Committee with the highest number of votes. At the first meeting of the
committee, AI was represented by Dr Guiton and the Legal Adviser.

Of particular interest here was the agreement by the UNESCO secretariat
finally to inform the committee concerning the procedures referred to in the con-
ference resolution. It is clear that, as its mandate implies, UNESCO could do
much to secure the implementation of international human rights law in the
fields of its competence. It has already made important achievements in the
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development of the law, particularly as regards discrimination in education.

COUNCIL OF EUROPE

AI has consultative status with the Council of Europe.

On 3 October 1975, the council's Parliamentary Assembly adopted recom-

mandation 768 (1975), "stress[ing] most strongly that torture is one of the most
serious violations of human rights". The Assembly approved a report of its
Legal Affairs Committee on "Torture in the World", in the preparation of
which AI had closely cooperated, and which outlined areas in which the
Council of Europe could take possible action.

Recommendation 768 stated that "extradition or expulsion to countries where
torture is practised or tolerated by governmental bodies is contrary to article 3
of the European Convention on Human Rights" (article 3 prohibits torture). It
asked that the Committee of Ministers "examine the possibilities for member
states to revise their conventions on extradition and mutual assistance in legal
matters concluded with countries where torture is practised or tolerated by
governmental bodies". Several speakers in the debate in the Parliamentary
Assembly paid tribute to the assistance given by AI on its continuing work
against torture.

In a separate development on 2 October, the 23rd meeting of non-govern-
mental organizations concerned with human rights which have consultative
status with the Council of Europe approved a draft European code of police
ethics. AI participated in the preparation of this draft, which contained the
most important points from the Declaration of The Hague, and which would
constitute the basic working document of the Legal Affairs Committee. This
represented a unique step in the field of integrating non-governmental organ-
izations into the substantive work of an inter-governmental body.

At the 25th meeting of NGOs, AI proposed that the council should sponsor
a seminar on the prevention of torture and the protection of the human rights
of imprisoned persons. The meeting accepted this proposal, as did the repre-
sentative of the council's directorate of human rights. AI undertook to
organize the seminar in consultation with the directorate. It is hoped that the
council's Committee of Ministers will make a financial contribution to enable the
seminar to take place.

With regard to developments within the Council of Europe on the death
penalty, see the section of this annual report on capital punishment.

AI was represented at different council meetings, including meetings of non-
governmental organizations as appropriate by Secretary General Martin Ennals,
Legal Adviser Nigel S. Rodley, CAT organizer Dick Gosting and AI Strasbourg
representative Roland Fischer.

ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES (OAS)

AI has "cooperative relations" with the Inter-American Commission of
Human Rights of the OAS. Over the past year the commission has taken a
number of important actions concerning cases submitted by AI.

Guatemala: In 1971, 1972, 1973, 1974 and 1975, AI submitted to the com-
mmission information relating to deaths, disappearances and torture in Guatemala
(commission cases 1702 and 1748). Having, in 1974, resolved "to presume the
confirmation of the occurrence of the allegations" and to recommend that the
government of Guatemala carry out an investigation "with the promptness
that the case requires" and "to determine and punish those responsible", the
resolved "to call the attention of the Government of Guatemala to the fact that these acts constitute serious violations of the rights to life, liberty and personal security; to a fair trial; of protection from arbitrary arrest and to due process of law . . .". The Guatemala government had earlier refused the commission's request for an in loco (on the spot) investigation.

Meanwhile, further information submitted by AI on 6 August 1975 has now been taken up by the commission as case 1982. At its 36th session, the commission resolved "to inform the Government of Guatemala and the Commission, taking into account the information that the Government might submit, would consider at its next session the advisability of requesting permission for an in loco examination of the allegations".

Haiti: On 30 May 1975, AI submitted to the commission a list of prisoners about whom little is known (case 1944). The President of the Commission, Dr Andrés Aguilar, wrote to the government of Haiti on 24 October 1975 to "insist that the Government of Haiti send complete information" relevant to the case.

Paraguay: Over the years, AI has submitted several cases (1741, 1758, 1759 and 1767) about which the commission has unsuccessfully sought from the government both clarifications and an on the spot investigation. On 10 March 1976, AI submitted a list of some 55, out of a possible 200, persons detained in November/December 1975, pointing out to the commission that there is evidence "that many of the detainees, including women, the elderly and the infirm, have been subjected to torture". AI requested the commission to investigate these detentions and disappearances.

Uruguay: The commission is presently seeking from the government complementary information relating to the death in custody, presumably as a result of torture, of Alvaro Balbi (case 1967). AI submitted the case on 16 August 1975.

Having described the serious and courageous work of the commission, AI must nevertheless express disquiet about certain developments within the OAS that could jeopardize this work. Following the decision of the OAS to hold its 1976 General Assembly in Santiago de Chile, the capital of a country about which the commission has recently produced a most comprehensive report of human rights violations, three members of the commission resigned in March 1976. A previous meeting of the General Assembly had refused to consider the commission's report. Moreover Dr Luis Reque, Executive Secretary of the commission, has resigned, effective 30 June 1976, charging that certain OAS members wished to impede the commission from effectively protecting human rights. AI hopes that these developments will not herald a retreat in the pioneering work of this human rights body. It reiterates its appeal to all OAS countries to ratify the American Convention on Human Rights.

ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY (OAU)

AI is an observer on the OAU's Bureau for the Placement and Education of African Refugees (BPEAR). During the year 1975-76 AI maintained its membership of the Coordinating Committee of the BPEAR. In May 1975, a further grant was made by AI to the OAU/BPEAR to further its work for refugees imprisoned in their countries of refuge, or faced with involuntary repatriation to their countries of origin. In December 1975, Stephanie Grant, AI's then Head of Research, visited the OAU and discussed human rights questions with the director of the OAU/BPEAR, Mr. Muni-Tshiamanyana, and also with the OAU legal officer. It was agreed at this meeting that AI would set up a system whereby the OAU would be kept informed, through the production of country dossiers, of AI's evaluation of the human rights situation in various African states.

In June 1976, AI made a further grant of US $1,500 to the OAU/BPEAR for legal aid to detained African refugees.

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (NGOs)

There is no doubt that NGOs can play and are playing an invaluable role in promoting international law and guidelines to prevent torture. This can take the form of working directly within the inter-governmental framework, as is the case with AI, or of setting standards which are applicable to certain professional or other groupings. The latter can have an important bearing on the further shaping of international guidelines in the inter-governmental context.

This was demonstrated in the case of the World Medical Association, whose 29th Assembly on 10 October 1975 in Tokyo adopted a Declaration of Tokyo containing stringent guidelines for medical doctors on the problems of torture. The World Health Organization had included the draft of this declaration in its submission to the Fifth UN Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders. The Declaration of Tokyo states unequivocally that "the doctor shall not countenance, condone or participate in the practice of torture", and forbids doctors "to provide any premises, instruments, substances or knowledge to facilitate the practice of torture", as well as forbidding them to be present during any procedure at which torture is used or threatened. It further contains guidelines regarding the problem of hunger strikes and calls upon medical bodies and fellow doctors to support their colleague, and his or her family, in the face of threats or reprisals resulting from a refusal to condone torture.

The International Council of Nurses, in a policy statement in August 1975 on the role of the nurse in the case of detainees and prisoners, had called on nurses "to take proper action when they have knowledge of physical or mental ill-treatment of detainees and prisoners", including reporting the matter to appropriate national and/or international bodies. The statement reconfirmed that "the nurse's first responsibility is towards her patients, notwithstanding considerations of national security and interest".

At its April 1976 meeting the Inter-Parliamentary Council of the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) adopted a resolution which, if it is approved by the IPU's 63rd Inter-Parliamentary Conference in September 1976, will make a milestone in the protection of human rights of parliamentarians. In the resolution, the council, meeting just after AI had published a list of imprisoned parliamentarians which was sent to council participants, provided for the establishment of a special committee to examine and treat communications concerning parliamentarians "who are or have been subjected to arbitrary actions during the exercise of the mandate entrusted to them by their voters, whether the Parliament is sitting, is recess or has been dissolved as the result of unconstitutional or arbitrary measures". It is proposed that such communications may be submitted by NGOs such as AI.

AI national sections often play an important role in this connection by raising matters of AI concern with relevant national bodies. Sometimes they
initiate such developments, as in the case of a draft resolution concerning ethical guidelines for psychologists in relation to the problem of torture which was to be proposed to the 21st International Congress of Psychology in Paris in July 1976. This initiative was taken by professionals and AI members in Belgium and the Netherlands.

This year also heralded a departure in NGO cooperation on a specific situation. A large number of NGOs have participated in the Uruguay campaign (see section on the Campaign for the Abolition of Torture) and have made a major contribution to international awareness of the problem of torture in that country. This cooperation was illustrated by the participation of a representative of the International Commission of Jurists in the news conference held by AI in Geneva on the occasion of the launching of the campaign. Another example of cooperation was the signing by many national and international NGOs of an AI petition calling on the Uruguayan government to allow an independent international investigation into torture in the country.

Meanwhile, AI joined many other NGOs in distributing a statement to the reconvened Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts in Geneva. Also, a working group of NGOs that are members of the Special NGO Committee on Human Rights (Geneva) has been set up to work towards a strong convention on the law relating to territorial asylum. AI will participate actively in the work of this group.

During the 12 months covered by this report the Research Department initiated action for the release of prisoners, the abolition of torture and capital punishment, and the reform of legal procedures and prison conditions in 113 countries. 1,880 cases were written up for adoption or investigation by AI groups, while 1,599 for whom groups were already working were released. Missions were sent to 32 countries to observe trials, discuss human rights violations with government officials, do research, investigate torture allegations and appeal against the death penalty. These initiatives represent a continuation of the Research Department's traditional work to collect, verify and publish factual and legal information about those human rights violations encompassed by Amnesty International's statute.

However, in 1975 and the first months of 1976, the pattern of research was influenced by a number of major developments in the field of the international protection of human rights. For many years machinery has existed within the United Nations and such other inter-governmental organizations as the International Labour Organization and UNESCO to consider certain clearly defined human rights violations. But recently this limited international capacity has been extended and transformed by political, economic and religious initiatives in different parts of the world.

Within the United Nations, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights has only just come into operation. However, recent debates within the General Assembly on torture and, less significantly on political imprisonment, allied to the UN Human Rights Commission's major initiative on Chile, have helped to create within the UN itself an increasing and critical audience for AI material. In Europe, general human rights awareness has been focused by the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (Helsinki Final Act) of August 1975.

A similar concern for human rights protection is apparent in the area of international trade and aid, where it is increasingly argued that bilateral and multilateral agreements should depend on the degree to which recipient governments observe human rights norms domestically. In the United States of America, recent congressional legislative amendments have gone so far as to relate all foreign assistance, whether military, fiscal or economic, to the level of human rights observance by the recipient government: where torture, untried detention or other gross violations can be shown to be systematic practice, aid may be restricted or threatened. AI takes no position on the issue, except to ask donor governments to use their influence to ensure that economic change is accompanied by human rights guarantees. However, as the main international
organization publishing factual research data on specific human rights problems, AI is increasingly asked to provide information for use in discussions on aid.

During 1975 both the Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches (WCC) made important human rights appeals to their members. In his Holy Year message, Pope Paul VI asked statesmen to grant amnesties to prisoners, while the WCC Assembly in Nairobi, Kenya, in November 1975, directed local churches to act on torture, political imprisonment, and legal defence. In April 1976, prominent leaders from the world's Islamic communities met in London and publicly recognized the need for an Islamic commission to protect human rights.

All these initiatives, in themselves of major significance, have created a situation in which AI's Research Department, which was once designed solely to meet the needs of narrowly-focused AI adoption groups, is increasingly seen as a resource center by parliamentary, governmental, professional and pressure groupings wishing to further any or all of these developments.

In response, the IS has widened the scope of published research information. A new series of briefing papers has been introduced, each intended to summarize information in AI's files on political imprisonment, torture and capital punishment in a single country. Singapore, Rhodesia/Zimbabwe and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen (PDRY) were the first three papers. At the individual level, comprehensive occupational lists have been published: in July 1975 on historians, in August 1975 on lawyers, in March 1976 on parliamentarians, and in May 1976 on journalists. For the first time AI published a major report on prisoners of conscience in the USSR. In Prisoner of Conscience Week, the problem of long term imprisonment was highlighted by cases of prisoners from countries as diverse as Turkey, Taiwan, Cuba, Rhodesia and the Soviet Union.

As another consequence of this heightened international interest, the International Secretariat is increasingly expected to speak with accuracy on situations where civil disturbance, absence of public information or official invulnerability make the prospect for effective AI action slim. This trend has been marked in Angola and in East and South East Asia since the end of the Vietnam war. The detailed sections on Cambodia, Vietnam and China in the pages which follow illustrate problems of information in these countries.

Understandably, partisans are quick to use public inactivity by AI on one problem to cast doubt on its objectivity when speaking on quite different areas. But for the Research Department the ensuing demand for universality reduces its traditional practice of focusing on those areas where AI action can hope to assist prisoners in the short term.

Expansion has also taken place inside the organization. As a result of the introduction of new structures and techniques, largely through the work of the Campaign for the Abolition of Torture, the campaign capacity of AI groups and national sections has been radically strengthened, and so the Research Department's classic function of briefing the organization to take initiatives on cases of legitimate procedures, torture and capital punishment has grown.

Within these rapidly expanding perimeters the department has continued to focus on certain priority countries and issues. In Latin America work continues at a high level on Chile, Cuba and Brazil. Research and action has intensified on Uruguay, while the worsening political situation in Argentina makes this country of new priority. The arrest and murder or literal "disappearance" of suspected dissenters at the hands of either para-official or opposition groups is one which is by its nature difficult to handle within normal AI operational techniques. Protective action has nonetheless been taken on cases in Chile, Argentina, Brazil and Guatemala. This is a growing problem not only for Latin America but also in other regions - PDRY and Uganda - where legal protection is weak and the level of violence high. As a form of extra-legal execution it will be the object of detailed research in the planned report on capital punishment, for which preparations are now being made.

Within Europe work on the Soviet Union reached a peak with the publication of the report on Prisoners of Conscience in the USSR: Their Treatment and Conditions. This compared prison conditions with the judicial and penal norms laid down by Soviet legislation and demonstrated the denial of legal protection to dissidents confined in psychiatric institutions. Simultaneously a new program of initiatives on Eastern Europe has been designed with the aim not only of expanding AI's research into imprisonment within each country, but also of increasing awareness within Eastern European institutions of those international initiatives which they could support. Despite the changing political and consequent imprisonment patterns, Spain was the focus of a major inquiry into torture in the Basque regions in July 1975. New information on Albania, and the proliferation of trials of dissenters in Yugoslavia make both countries priority areas.

Work on southern Africa, set within the complex chain of reactions to the liberation of Angola and Mozambique, focused particularly in Rhodesia/Zimbabwe with the publication of the briefing paper, while in West Africa, Deputy Secretary General Hans Ehrenstrale's mission to six French-speaking states provided an important opportunity to assess the impact of AI's 1975 campaign for amnesties on the governments of those countries. Ethiopia remains a priority.

In Asia AI continue to be faced by untried imprisonment on a scale unknown in other regions. The Indian emergency created a prison population of well over 40,000 while in Indonesia 100,000 untried detainees are now in their 11th year of detention. In East Asia, AI is in the midst of a substantial research program into structures of imprisonment in China. Two missions were sent to Taiwan and delegations visited the Philippines and Pakistan.

Action has again been taken to further AI's statutory opposition to all capital punishment. Public appeals have been made against death sentences in a large number of countries which include Sierra Leone, Nigeria, Rhodesia, Spain, the Soviet Union, Cambodia, India, Iraq and Egypt, while in the Supreme Court of the United States, AI has filed an amicus curiae brief arguing the unconstitutionality of capital punishment. Strong protests have been made about deaths under torture in Brazil and against the murder of prisoners in Bangladesh.

In conjunction with the Campaign for the Abolition of Torture, the Research Department has initiated international appeals and action into many cases of torture throughout Latin America, and particularly in Uruguay where an intensive diplomatic and publicity campaign has taken place. Missions of investigation have been sent to Spain and the Philippines in response to allegations of the systematic torture of prisoners. In contrast, it is this year possible to report that three countries, Greece, Egypt and Venezuela have taken legal proceedings to prosecute officials responsible for torture.

In the period covered by this report AI has welcomed the amnesty of all adopted prisoners in Nepal and Gabon, and the limited release of AI cases in...
Africa

During 1975-76, Africa became the focus of world attention as national and ideological rivalries disrupted the political patterns of the continent more massively than at any time during the past decade. The civil war in Angola, the occupation of the Western Sahara by Morocco and Mauritania and guerrilla warfare in Ethiopia, Rhodesia and Namibia underlined the fragility of peace within and between the more than 50 nations of the continent, and the vulnerability of Africa to outside intervention.

The politics of some of Africa's most powerful states were shaken by attempted or successful coups and assassinations — in Sudan, Mozambique and Ghana, as well as in Niger, Benin, Zaire and the Central African Republic, actual or alleged violent efforts to overthrow the governments in office led to arrests, imprisonment and in some cases executions. Nigeria, after five years of relative calm, suffered two coups during the year, the last one unsuccessful but resulting in the death of the head of state. While the level of political violence in some independent states seemed to be increasing, the struggle for majority rule in the white-minority ruled countries of southern Africa moved rapidly towards a climax.

Throughout this particularly tense and difficult period AI has continued to work within the strict terms of its mandate for the protection of individuals from arbitrary arrest, detention, torture and execution. Applying solely humanitarian standards in its endeavour to see the rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights put into practice, the organization has found itself called on to assist a wide spectrum of persecuted individuals. Detention without trial, major political trials weighted heavily against the accused, torture and the death sentence have all continued to feature as aspects of government in many African states: very few are without at least one of these evils.

In Rhodesia, South Africa and Namibia, AI's first priority continues to be aid to men and women imprisoned because of their opposition to minority rule and, in South Africa and Namibia, to the practice of apartheid. In other states — Mozambique and Malawi, for example — persons persecuted for their religious views have formed the largest group of those whose human rights are violated. Students and teachers have found themselves imprisoned in Zambia, Ethiopia, Malawi, Tunisia and several other states because of their alleged opposition to government policies. In Benin, Congo and the Central African Republic, trade unionists suffered imprisonment during the year 1975-76.

For many African prisoners, 1975-76 marked one more year spent without hope of trial, under legislation permitting indefinite detention. In Rhodesia, the number of persons so detained doubled during the year, to reach more than 700. Malawi continued its sad record of arbitrary imprisonment, holding more
than 1,000 detainees by the end of 1975. Tanzania continued to detain an unknown number under the provisions of its Preventive Detention Act.

In South Africa, the detention clause of the Terrorism Act was used during the year against opponents of the regime, both black and white. Ethiopia retained in prison without trial persons arrested two years earlier—a considerable number of them women. In Sudan, new laws broadened the detaining power of the authorities.

The political turbulence of the past 12 months produced more than the usual number of political trials—often summary trials conducted before courts martial or special tribunals. The summer of 1975 was marked in Tunisia by a series of major political trials, mainly directed against young left-wing activists. In Sudan special military tribunals were set up to try those allegedly involved in a coup attempt in September 1975.

In varying degrees, and at various times throughout the year, the weapon of political trial was employed against alleged subversives in Benin, Ethiopia, Algeria, Zaïre, Senegal, Niger and the Central African Republic. In South Africa and Namibia, the trial of opponents under the Terrorism Act attracted international attention and condemnation.

In a number of instances, defendants took the opportunity of their appearance before a court to report the torture they suffered at the hands of their interrogators. In Namibia and South Africa, Terrorism Act trials claimed that statements had been extracted from them under duress.

A French citizen held for almost five years in Guinea reported that torture was commonly practised, and allegations of mistreatment of detainees reached AI during the year from Ghana, Zambie, Benin, Mozambique and Tunisia. Large scale atrocities were reported from Uganda and Equatorial Guinea. In Chad, AI undertook an inquiry into the deaths in detention of more than 70 prisoners under the regime of President N'garta Tombalbaye, overthrown in April 1975. Deaths of prisoners under mysterious circumstances were also reported from South Africa, Malawi and Ethiopia. In Morocco, several long term political prisoners are reported to have "disappeared" and are thought by their colleagues to be dead.

A further alarming development has been the increasing use by African states of the death penalty for political crimes. Rhodesia continued to hang African nationalists sentenced in secret trials. Nigeria publicly executed over 30 persons summarily convicted of involvement in the attempted coup of February 1976. By the end of the same month, Sudan had executed a total of 16 individuals tried for taking part in a coup attempt the previous September.

Death sentences for political crimes were also passed in Zaïre (seven persons), Algeria (three), Benin (11), the Central African Republic (eight), Tunisia (one) and Niger (nine). World opinion was shocked in July 1975 when eight persons, including several prominent politicians, were executed for treason in Sierra Leone. Executions of individuals who had allegedly taken up arms against the state continued in Ethiopia, and Kenya began, in November 1975, to execute convicts under a new law introducing the death penalty for robbery with violence.

AI has responded to the human rights violations generated by the turbulent political situation in Africa during the past year by striving to expand its adoption program and its other activities on behalf of prisoners falling within its mandate. The number of active adoption and investigation cases handled by AI groups during the year was in the region of 900. The figure is expected to rise above the 1,000 mark by the close of 1976.

AI groups, coordination groups and national sections were mobilized in major campaigns for general amnesties in Morocco, Tanzania and Tunisia in July 1973, December 1975/January 1976 and June 1976 respectively. Likewise, AI undertook a large scale action calling for the release of political prisoners in Rhodesia on the anniversary in November 1975 of that country's unilateral declaration of independence from Britain. In April 1976, one year after the Rhodesian government announced that future hangings would be in secret, AI pressed for an end to hangings of African nationalists there.

AI observers attended trials in Senegal, Namibia and South Africa, and in July 1975 and January 1976, high-level missions from the International Secretariat visited Mali, Ivory Coast, Congo, Cameroon, Senegal and Chad, receiving audiences with the heads of state of the first three countries listed.

On an international level, AI sought to promote interest in human rights questions at an international conference on Namibia held in Dakar, Senegal, in January 1976, and through contacts with the Organization of African Unity (OAU) following AI attendance at a meeting of the World Council of Churches in Nairobi during November 1975. The Africa Section of the Research Department produced a major publication, the AI Briefing on Rhodesia/Zimbabwe which was released during April 1976. In the field of concrete financial assistance to prisoners of conscience and their families, AI continued to administer a program of over $40,000 ($70,000) in Southern Africa, and extended its assistance to victims in areas where previous AI relief program had operated.

Although AI, as a matter of policy, does not claim credit for general amnesties or the release of individual prisoners, it was gratifying that more than 430 AI adoption or investigation case prisoners in Africa were released during the period May 1975-May 1976. In addition, a number of African states granted virtually full amnesties to persons imprisoned for political reasons. These included Gabon (December 1975), the Ivory Coast (October 1975), Somalia (October 1975) and the Malagasy Republic (December 1975). The first two countries had been the object of special AI campaigns during the 12 months prior to the announcement of the amnesties. Partial amnesties were also granted in a number of other states—among them Ethiopia, Mali and Morocco—where AI had long been engaged in adoption programs or in direct representations to the International Secretariat to the authorities on human rights questions.

ALGERIA

Amnesty International continued to work throughout the year on the case of the freed former Algerian President Ahmed Ben Bella, who has been under detention and restriction since his overthrow in April 1965. In spite of special appeals for clemency for Mr Ben Bella in June 1975, the 10th anniversary of his arrest, the Algerian government made no move to lift the restrictions on him.

In March 1976 a state security court sentenced to death three persons described as part of an "international anti-Algerian subversive network". Two other defendants received life sentences, one was sentenced to 20 years imprisonment and a fourth received a six-months suspended sentence. The men were arrested after a bomb attack on the offices of the semi-official newspaper El Moujahid in January 1976. At the time of writing, the executions had not been carried out. During May 1976 a further trial took place of six persons accused of "economic espionage", and resulted in one death sentence (passed on the prime-
pal accused in absentia, two proven terms ranging up to 10 years, and three acquittals. During January and February 1976, detailed data on political prisoners in Angola reached the Research Department, for the first time in recent years.

ANGOLA

Amnesty International's activities in Angola were necessarily limited in 1975-76 by the outbreak of a bitter civil war between three rival nationalist movements in the months immediately preceding the country's assumption of independence on 11 November 1975. The International Secretariat collected data concerning imprisonment and torture and intervened in those instances where sufficient documentation was available.

In November 1975, Amnesty International (AI) appealed to MPLA Minister of Justice Diogenes Boavida to free two foreign journalists who had been detained. Both men were subsequently released.

Following sporadic fighting between supporters of the rival groups, the Popular Movement for the Independence of Angola (MPLA), the National Front for the Liberation of Angola (FNLA), and the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA), the leaders of the three movements met at Nakuru, Kenya, on 21 June 1975. They agreed to work together for national unity and closer understanding, to free all prisoners taken in the fighting and to guarantee to each other the right to political activity anywhere in the country. However, they were unable to implement the agreement and the transitional government formed from representatives of the three movements finally disintegrated in August 1975.

Further clashes between the rival movements led to the outbreak of a full scale civil war in the last months of 1975 and to the intervention of South African and Cuban armed forces. In the north, the military defeat of the FNLA was accomplished by MPLA forces before the end of January 1976, and in the south, UNITA's resistance to the MPLA advance ended the following month.

During the war, the MPLA forces captured 13 foreign mercenaries employed by the FNLA and seven South African soldiers. At the time of writing, preparations were being made for both groups of prisoners to be tried by a People's Revolutionary Tribunal in Luanda. According to reports, the mercenaries could face a possible death sentence.

In April 1976, divisions within the MPLA led to the arrest of more than 100 supporters of the Active Revolt, an opposition faction within the MPLA, and the Angola Communist Organization, reportedly a pro-Maoist group. The detainees included Father Joaquim Pinto de Andrade and Gentil Viana, both founding members of the MPLA and longtime political associates of Angolan President Agostinho Neto. Both men were imprisoned in Portugal with Dr. Neto in the early 1960s.

Benin (formerly Dahomey)

In June 1975 the government of President Mathieu Kerekou announced that the Minister of the Interior, Captain Michel Aikpé, had been shot dead after having been found in adultery with the President's wife. Captain Aikpé's death was followed by angry demonstrations against the government and by widespread arrests, especially among teachers and trade unionists. About 60 people were detained without trial in prisons and military camps in Cotonou and other towns. Although they were reportedly subjected to ill-treatment, many were ultimately released in January 1976.

In October 1975 the government announced once more that it had uncovered a "gigantic plot" allegedly organized by former President Emile Zinsou, who was one of seven alleged plotters against President Kerekou's regime sentenced to death in absentia in March 1975. A wave of arrests took place during October and November, mainly in Cotonou and Porto Novo. According to data reaching the Research Department, some of the prisoners were seriously mistreated and even tortured during their detention.

A further political trial took place in Cotonou in January and early February 1976, at which time the ruling Revolutionary Council of Benin, transformed into a revolutionary tribunal, considered the cases of the persons allegedly involved in the October 1975 plot. As a result, 11 persons were sentenced to death (eight in absentia), three to life imprisonment (one in absentia) and one to 20 years' imprisonment. Four persons were acquitted. On February 9, the Council gave President Kerekou calling for a commutation of the death sentences.

AI groups are currently handling five adoption and two investigation cases in Benin, mostly persons arrested in October and November 1975.

According to reports reaching AI, three former presidents of Benin (then Dahomey) who were arrested after the coup in October 1972 which brought President Kerekou to power, were still being held under house arrest at Avrankou, a small village northeast of Porto Novo. They are Hubert Maga, Justin Ahomadégbé and Sourou-Migan Apithy.

Botswana

Amnesty International's principal concern in Botswana in 1975-76, as in previous years, was the situation of political refugees from surrounding countries who have sought asylum there. The number of such refugees continued to grow throughout the year. This was the result of continuing repression in Rhodesia and government action against supporters of the South West Africa People's Organization in Namibia and of the "black consciousness" movement in South Africa.

The International Secretariat has been in contact with both the Botswana government and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees concerning the status and security afforded to all political refugees, particularly those who were formerly imprisoned or detained in their home country.

Cameroon

During July 1975 Amnesty International Deputy Secretary General Hans Ehrenstrøle visited Cameroon to further AI's campaign in December 1974 for a general amnesty for political prisoners in that country. An amnesty in May 1975 had in fact released 50 political detainees, including Monsignor Albert Ndongo, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Nkongsamba, who had been sentenced to life imprisonment in 1971.

During his mission Mr. Ehrenstrøle was able to discuss human rights problems with Minister of Justice Charles Doumba. AI was able to confirm the release of three adopted prisoners during 1975. AI groups continue to handle fifty cases of persons believed still to be in detention.
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

On 3 February 1976 President Jean-Bedel Bokassa escaped an assassination attempt at Bangui airport. Later in the month eight persons were sentenced to death for their alleged part in the attempt. Two other defendants were given 20-year prison terms, three 10 years and one 3 years. One defendant was acquitted and it was announced that another 15 persons would be tried at a later date. Amnesty International is at present assembling information on these cases.

AI groups continued to handle as adoption cases the secretary general of the Union Générale des Travailleurs Centrafricains, Jean-Richard Sandos, and his deputy, J. B. Malikanga, both initially arrested in January 1974. Mr Sandos was released in August 1974 but re-arrested in January 1975.

The total number of political prisoners held in the Central African Republic is unknown, but believed high. Difficulty in obtaining information on individual prisoners has precluded a more extensive program of adoption work.

EQUATORIAL GUINEA

Reports reaching Amnesty International concerning Equatorial Guinea continue to indicate that the former Spanish colony, now ruled as a dictatorship by President Macias Nguema, is one of the most repressive and totalitarian states in Africa. Amongst those reported arrested between April and July 1975 were the Vice-President and Minister of the Interior, Miguel Eyegue, one of the President's top military advisers, Captain Salvador Ela, and between 15 and 20 Roman Catholic priests and nuns, largely in the country's mainland province of Río Muni.

In November 1975 Nigerian migrant workers, who formed the main labour force on the island's cocoa plantations, began to withdraw because of harassment and brutality. By mid-February 1976 about 50,000 of the estimated 60,000 Nigerian workers had left the country, bringing reports of torture and indiscriminate imprisonment. A mass repatriation of Nigerians was ordered by the Nigerian government in January 1976 after 11 Nigerian workers were killed by soldiers in the Equatorial Guinean capital, Malabo.

Reports from exile sources in February 1976 indicated that citizens of Equatorial Guinea were being rounded up and forced to labour on the cocoa plantations in the place of the departed Nigerians.

ETHIOPIA

During August 1975, Amnesty International pressed the Ethiopian Provisional Military Government to mark the first anniversary of its advent to power on 12 September 1974 by declaring an amnesty for political prisoners. Rumours circulated in the international news media in August that the military government allegedly intended to execute certain of the prisoners on the anniversary. These stories became particularly prevalent following the death in prison of former Emperor Haile Selassie I on 27 August.

However, the executions did not take place, and on 12 September General Teferi Bante, Chairman of the ruling Dergue, announced the release of 55 political detainees, including four former cabinet ministers under the Selassie government. AI's International Council meeting, which was taking place at the time in St Gallen, Switzerland, cabled the Ethiopian government on 14 September welcoming the amnesty and requesting further releases.
In October 1975 there were further widespread arrests, mostly in student and trade union circles, and a state of emergency was declared in the Addis Ababa area. This was ultimately lifted in December 1975, and although somereleased took place, an unknown number of the persons arrested in October remained in detention without trial.

In December Stephanie Grant, AI’s Head of Research, visited Addis Ababa in order to express the organization’s concern at the continued detention of political prisoners without charge or trial — especially the prolonged imprisonment of women and aged people — and to prepare the ground for a future AI mission to Ethiopia as a follow up to the mission which took place in February 1975.

There were more widespread arrests in February 1976, after a radical restructuring had taken place within the Dergue itself. A particular feature of this series of arrests was that it affected a large number of women, some of them widows of former Selassie government officials who were executed summarily in November 1974. Estimates of the numbers arrested vary from several hundred to 2,000; no exact figures are known.

On 1 March, shortly after the arrests, a Norwegian member of AI, Dr Arnt Meyer-Lie, was able to visit some of the detained women in Akaki Prison, Addis Ababa, in his private capacity as a medical doctor. Among those he visited were female members of the former royal family who have been held without charge or trial since September 1974. Reports in May 1976 indicated that many of the women arrested in February had been released.

On 9 March 1976 a partial amnesty for political detainees was announced by the Ethiopian authorities. This freed 97 prisoners, among them a number of military personnel and leaders of the Confederation of Ethiopian Labour Unions. In response to this measure AI cabled the Dergue on 9 March welcoming the amnesty and reiterating the organization’s desire to send another mission to Ethiopia. No reply has been received at the time of writing, and the matter is being pursued through the Ethiopian embassy in London.

Meanwhile, AI continues to be disturbed at the human rights situation in Ethiopia, which, in spite of the amnesties mentioned above, has been marked during the past year by arbitrary and massive arrests, prolonged detention without trial of numerous prisoners including women, continuing use of courts martial for the trial of civilians and application of the death sentence against persons alleged to have opposed the regime in arms. Meanwhile the guerrilla war in the northern province of Eritrea continues to dominate the internal political scene in Ethiopia, in spite of an offer of amnesty to the secessionist forces by the Ethiopian government in May 1976.

Gabon

In late June 1975, 16 persons who had been held without charge since 1972 were tried in the Gabonese capital, Libreville. Of the 16, nine were acquitted and freed into "provisional liberty". Three received 3-year prison terms and four were sentenced to 8 years in prison. Five Amnesty International investigation cases were amongst those receiving terms of imprisonment. All of the sentences passed at the trial were reduced by one year in a presidential clemency declared during August 1975.

An attempt by AI Deputy Secretary General Hans Ehrenstrål to visit Gabon during July 1975 as a follow up to an AI campaign for a general amnesty in that country during the previous February was abortive. Mr Ehrenstrål was admitted to Gabon, but expelled the next day without having been able to contact any of the authorities.

On 31 December 1975 President Omar Bongo announced an amnesty which freed all of the prisoners sentenced in July 1975 with the exception of one, whose release was expected to follow shortly.

Ghana

A former Amnesty International adoptee, Joseph Henry Mensah, who served as minister of finance in Ghana’s last civilian government (overthrown by a coup in January 1972) was re-arrested in early September 1975 and subsequently brought to trial with two other persons on a charge of sedition. The charge related to the production and circulation of a pamphlet critical of the economic policies of the ruling National Redemption Council.

On 24 November 1975, Mr Mensah was sentenced in the Accra Circuit Court to 8 years’ imprisonment with hard labour, while his co-defendants were given 6 and 5-year prison sentences for abetment of sedition. Mr Mensah is reportedly carrying his case to the Court of Appeal. Pending the results of this appeal, AI has taken up all three defendants as investigation cases.

In a separate development, army personnel and civilians were arrested in November and December 1975, following an extensive restructuring of the government in October. On 23 December 1975 the Ghanaian authorities announced that they had uncovered a plot aimed at the overthrow of the government. No details were given, but they stated that those responsible had been arrested and would be brought to trial when investigations were complete. Some 50 persons appear to have been arrested during this period, including Dr Kofi Awoonor, one of Ghana’s most prominent poets and authors, who was detained on 31 December 1975. By April 1976 there was no indication that the release on trial of the arrested persons was pending. In consequence AI’s Research Department began producing case sheets on those individuals about whom sufficient data was available.

Under Ghana’s Preventive Custody Decree, which has been in effect since 1972, individuals may be held indefinitely without trial. A further cause for concern were reports reaching AI that some of the detained persons had been mistreated during interrogation. Allegations smuggled out of the prison where those arrested were being held reported beatings, stripings and sexual abuse. The reports were similar to allegations made by individuals on trial for subversion in September 1972, who stated that they had been physically mistreated by military personnel during interrogation.

In May the trial by military tribunal of eight persons accused of plotting to overthrow the government began in the capital, Accra. The accused had been arrested in the closing months of 1975. AI made representations to the Ghanaian High Commission in London with a view to arranging for an AI observer to attend the trial. By the end of May 1976 AI groups were working on six investigation cases.

In two positive moves during the year, the Ghanaian government in August 1975 offered an amnesty to all persons involved in the secessionist National Liberation Movement of West Togoland; and in January 1976, to mark the fourth anniversary of the assumption of power by the military, the government commuted to life imprisonment the death sentences on all prisoners awaiting execution.
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GUINEA

In July 1975, as a result of the "normalization" of relations between Guinea and France – which had been strained since 1960 – 18 French citizens who had been imprisoned in Guinea since the end of 1970 were released and allowed to return home. One of the released prisoners, Pierre Xueruf, was an Amnesty International investigation case.

According to information reaching the Research Department in late 1975, the total number of political prisoners held in Guinea may be in the region of 2,000. Detailed data has been obtained on a total of 108 prisoners, 96 of whom are Guineans, the remainder being citizens of other African or Middle Eastern states. These prisoners, many of whom have not been charged or tried, are reportedly held at Camp Boiro in Conakry, the Guinean capital, or in the civil prison at Kindia. Prison conditions are reported to be extremely bad.

During early 1976, the Research Department was preparing for new initiatives on Guinea in the light of the data received.

IVORY COAST

In July 1975 Amnesty International Deputy Secretary General Hans Ehrensträle visited the Ivory Coast as a further stage in the AI campaign, launched in March 1975, for a general amnesty for political prisoners. He was granted a two-hour audience with President Félix Houphouët-Boigny and also met Lucien Yaboby, Vice-President of the High Court. During the discussions the principal topic was the situation of the 85 prisoners sentenced to prison terms ranging from 5 years to life in August 1974 for their part in an uprising in the Gagnoa district of the country's southwestern region in October 1970.

On 13 October 1975 President Houphouët-Boigny, as a prelude to the sixth congress of the ruling Parti Démocratique de la Côte d'Ivoire (PDCI), announced a general amnesty covering 5,000 prisoners. These were mostly criminals, but included the 85 persons sentenced in August 1974. All AI adoptees in the Ivory Coast were released as a result of the amnesty, which also commuted the death sentences passed on 13 officers involved in an abortive plot in July 1973. Twelve of the officers were released and pardoned, but a 13th, the alleged ringleader, had his sentence commuted to imprisonment. On 15 October 1975 AI wrote a letter to the President congratulating him on the amnesty.

KENYA

During the middle and later part of 1975, Kenya experienced a political crisis which began with a lethal bomb explosion in a Nairobi park on 1 March. This was followed several days later by the discovery of the murdered body of J. M. Karuki, a prominent politician renowned for his outspoken opposition to the ruling group surrounding President Jomo Kenyatta. A parliamentary committee of inquiry into the murder produced in June 1975 a report which appeared to implicate senior security officers in the killing of Mr Karuki. Critics of President Kenyatta's rule became more vocal during the middle of 1975. Student riots occurred in Nairobi, the capital, and a parliamentary select committee was appointed to look into the question of corruption in government.

By September 1975, however, President Kenyatta began once more to take the initiative against his detractors. Following a speech in parliament in which he had accused the government by implication of "killing KANU" (the Kenya African National Union, Kenya's only lawful political party), Martin Shikuku, a member of parliament, was arrested and detained, along with the deputy speaker of the Kenyan parliament, John Marie Seroney, who had refused to overrule Mr Shikuku's statement. Both were detained under the Preservation of Public Security Regulations, which permit indefinite detention without trial.

Other members of parliament who had been critical of President Kenyatta also found themselves brought before the courts. One such case was that of Philomena Chelagat Mutai, a young parliamentarian who was arrested on 23 January 1976 and charged with incitement to violence on the basis of a speech she allegedly made at a meeting on 12 September 1975. Miss Mutai denied having incited violence, and Mr Seroney, with whom she had been closely associated in Kenyan politics, was brought from detention temporarily to appear as a defence witness on her behalf. She was, however, found guilty and sentenced to 21 years' imprisonment. She is appealing against this sentence and has meanwhile been taken up by Amnesty International as an investigation case. Both Mr Shikuku and Mr Seroney have been adopted.

One long term AI adoptee, Ramogi Achieng Ooko, a former member of the banned Kenya People's Union (KPU) who had been in detention without trial since 1969, was released in October 1975. Another former KPU supporter, Wasioma Sijeyo, remains in prison and is adopted by AI.

In a further amnesty measure, on 11 December 1975, President Kenyatta released 10,000 prisoners – apparently mostly common criminals – to mark the 12th anniversary of Kenya's independence. By the beginning of February 1976, however, 285 of them had been reconvicted of petty crimes.

During 1975 the death sentence was reintroduced in Kenya for armed robbery, and in November 1975 the first execution of a convicted robber took place – believed to be the first time the death penalty had been actually carried out on convicted robbers since Kenya's independence.

AI groups handled three adoption cases and one investigation case from Kenya in the year 1975/76.

LESOTHO

Nineteen supporters of the opposition Basutoland Congress Party (BCP) received prison sentences ranging from 3 to 5 years on 13 July 1975 at the conclusion of Lesotho's second major treason trial within a year. Their convictions followed the conviction of 20 other BCP supporters at a trial in February 1975. The trial of the 19 arose from their involvement in an abortive attempt to overthrow the ruling National Party government of Chief Leabua Jonathan in January 1974.

Eleven other defendants were acquitted during the course of the trial. An Amnesty International observer, Professor Barend van Niekerk of the University of Natal in South Africa, attended in the early stages of the trial.

Subsequently, on 20 May 1976, the Lesotho Appeal Court quashed convictions on three of the defendants and reduced the sentences imposed on three others. AI groups provided substantial relief assistance to the families of those imprisoned and to more than 100 other BCP supporters who had been detained without charge for the greater part of 1974. Thirty-seven prisoners are currently taken up as investigation cases.

Following the arrest of former BCP general secretary G. M. Kolisiang on 21 November 1975, he was adopted by an AI group. Mr Kolisiang was released uncharged on 21 January, after having been held for the maximum 60-day period.
permitted under Lesotho's Internal Security Act. But he was re-detained the following day and again held without charge until 5 February. Al protested to Minister of Justice Gerard Ramorebi over the re-detention of Mr Kolisang.

MALAGASY REPUBLIC

In March 1975 more than 300 persons, including former President Philibert Tsiranana, were brought to trial on charges of complicity in the assassination of Colonel Richard Raisimandravo, the Malagasy head of state who was shot dead in the capital, Tamanarive, on 11 February 1975. In May 1975, however, the government announced an amnesty for 270 of the 300 persons charged, in the interests of "strengthening national unity".

On 15 June Lieutenant Commander Didier Ratsiraka, was named the new head of state, and 10 days later the martial law imposed on the island six months earlier was lifted. Also in June, the special military court which had been hearing the cases of those allegedly involved in the assassination of Colonel Raisimandravo acquitted all but three of the accused, including former President Tsiranana. The three convicted were sentenced to 5 years' hard labour and to fines.

An Amnesty International mission planned for the Malagasy Republic during 1975 was postponed indefinitely in January 1976, after the Research Department received information that President Ratsiraka had proclaimed a general amnesty on 31 December 1975 covering all political infractions committed prior to 1 January 1975.

MALAWI

Reports received by the Research Department in August 1975 indicated that approximately 170 prisoners had been released as a result of amnesties declared on 14 May 1975 (Kamuzu Day - a national holiday) and 6 July, the anniversary of Malawi's independence. Amnesties on these dates are traditional, but it is not known how many of the released persons were being held for political reasons, and how many were common criminals.

In September 1975 about 400 prisoners were being held without charge or trial at Mikuyu Detention Center near Zomba - since 1973 the main prison for political detainees. Zomba Prison was reported to hold 155 male and female detainees along with criminal prisoners, and a further 150 detainees were imprisoned at Lilongwe, Malawi's capital. Estimates in June 1975 put the total of political detainees in Malawi at approximately 1,000. New detentions are continually taking place, whereas releases are seldom reported.

In November 1975 Dr Hastings K. Banda, the Life President of Malawi, stated publicly that he had been considering granting an amnesty to detainees but had changed his mind because of alleged subversion among "teachers, businessmen and civil servants". In February 1976 a new wave of detentions among civil servants and staff and students of the University of Malawi was reported.

Most detainees in Malawi are not informed of the reason for their detention, which in its initial stages is theoretically limited to 28 days, but which may in fact be extended indefinitely. Very few are ever charged or tried. Conditions at Zomba Prison are not favourable, but the situation of prisoners in Mikuyu Detention Center is reported to be particularly bad, with overcrowding, poor diet and extremely limited exercise facilities. During the past year Amnesty International has received several reports of detainees being permanently in-
MAURITANIA
During June 1975 Amnesty International learned of the release on "provisional liberty" of 30 AI adoptees who had been held without trial since the previous year. In September 1975 this group benefited from a general amnesty which removed the restrictions that had been imposed upon them. As a result, case work on these former prisoners ceased, and AI has now no adoption or investigation cases in Mauritania.

MOROCCO
In spite of the calls for a general amnesty by the major Moroccan opposition parties at the end of 1974 and during the first months of 1975, the number of political prisoners exceeded 600 throughout 1975. In a campaign designed to coincide with the initiative by the opposition parties, Amnesty International national sections, Morocco coordination groups and adoption groups made a concerted effort to publicize the fate of Moroccan political prisoners in the weeks leading up to 9 July 1975, the birthday of King Hassan II. In a letter to the king on his birthday, AI asked for an amnesty "in furtherance of the spirit of national unity" which the royal government had been fostering during the weeks leading up to 9 July 1975, the birthday of King Hassan II. In a letter to the king on his birthday, AI asked for an amnesty "in furtherance of the spirit of national unity" which the royal government had been fostering during the previous months in the wake of Morocco's territorial dispute with Spain over Spanish Sahara.

In the latter group were a number of AI adoptees, including Ahmed Benjellou, a leading militant of the opposition Union Socialiste des Forces Populaires (USFP) who was sentenced to 10 years' imprisonment at the Marrakesh trial. His release was marred by the murder, on 18 December 1975 of his brother, Omar Benjellou, who was stabbed and beaten to death outside his home in Casablanca. Omar Benjellou had a long record of opposition to the government of King Hassan and had been imprisoned on several occasions, and adopted by AI. Those thought to be responsible for his death were arrested shortly after the killing.

In 1976, AI, along with other international human rights bodies, prepared to undertake a series of high-level missions to Morocco in an attempt to obtain a general amnesty for political prisoners. In May AI sent Jean Hous, a Luxembourg lawyer, there as its representative.

MOZAMBIQUE
Following a mission to Mozambique in early June 1975, Amnesty International appealed to President Samora Machel to declare a general amnesty on 25 June 1975, Mozambique independence day.

The new FRELIMO (Front for the Liberation of Mozambique) government did not grant the amnesty, however, and the International Secretariat received reports of further detentions throughout the year. People detained include former members of FRELIMO, a number of Portuguese and South African citizens resident in Mozambique and many Jehovah's Witnesses and religious dissidents. The Research Department is presently considering taking up some of these cases.

Further arrests are believed to have been made following an unsuccessful mutiny of FRELIMO soldiers in December.

A number of Portuguese nationals who were freed from detention and deported following the visit of a Portuguese government delegation to the capital Maputo (formerly Lourenço Marques) in January, alleged that they had been subjected to torture and maltreatment while in detention.

A group of Rhodesian railway workers detained when Mozambique closed its border with Rhodesia on 3 March 1976 were freed in April 1976.

In October 1975, the Mozambique government created its own secret police force, the National Service for Popular Security, under the direct control of the President. Designed to counter all forms of internal subversion, the new security organization was given powers of indefinite detention without trial.

NAMIBIA
The political situation in Namibia became increasingly tense in the last months of 1975. This was due to South African military action in Angola, Namibia's northern neighbour, and to the intensification of nationalist guerrilla activity. On 16 August 1975, Chief Filiemon Elifas, the Chief Minister of the Ovamboland tribal area or "bantustan", was assassinated near his home at Ondangwa. Sporadic guerrilla attacks were subsequently reported at Grootfontein and Okahandja and in Ovamboland.

Following the death of Chief Elifas, who was perhaps the foremost supporter of the South African administration in Namibia, security police detained many members of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) and the Namibia National Convention (NNC), the two political organizations most critical of continued South African rule. More than 50 SWAPO and NNC supporters were detained in Ovamboland alone, while others were reported arrested in Windhoek. The National Chairman of SWAPO, David Meroro, who had been detained for six months in 1974 under the Terrorism Act, narrowly escaped arrest and sought asylum in Botswana.

In late November 1975, after three months in detention, six SWAPO supporters were charged under the Terrorism Act. None of the defendants - three men and three women - was charged with direct participation in the murder of Chief Elifas although the three men were all accused of providing indirect assistance to the assassins.

The trial began at Swakopmund in February 1976 and was concluded on 12 May. Two of the defendants were acquitted, two others were convicted and
sentenced to terms of 5 and 7 years' imprisonment, and two men, Hendrik Shikongo and Aaron Mushimba, were sentenced to death.

Following the imposition of death sentences on Mr Shikongo and Mr Mushimba, AI cabled an immediate protest to South African Prime Minister John Vorster. AI also appealed to United Nations Secretary General Kurt Waldheim and UN Commissioner for Namibia Seán MacBride to intervene personally to prevent the executions being carried out.

Reports at the end of May said that confidential documents relating to the defence of the SWAPO supporters had been leaked to the security police by certain individuals employed by the defence attorneys. An official complaint was subsequently made to the Supreme Court by lawyers representing the SWAPO defendants. It is expected that the Chief Justice of South Africa may now order a re-trial.

They said they had made statements to the security police only under extreme duress. After detailing their treatment both men refused to testify for the state. They were then each sentenced to one year's imprisonment for contempt of court.

Further information concerning the use of torture by the South African security police in Namibia was revealed by David Meroro after his escape to Botswana, and by Reuben Hauwanga, a SWAPO official who left the country in January 1976 after more than 3 months in detention. According to these reports, methods of torture included severe beatings and hanging by the ankles for prolonged periods.

Dr Otto Triffterer, Professor of International Criminal Law at Giessen University in the Federal Republic of Germany, visited Namibia in March 1976 in order to observe the Swakopmund trial proceedings on behalf of AI. Professor Triffterer also discussed the situation of other uncharged detainees with political leaders in Namibia.

Further arrests of SWAPO supporters took place in May 1976 when 20 people were reported detained in the Windhoek area. Ten of them appeared in court on 18 May on charges under the Terrorism Act. They were all remanded in custody until 25 June 1976.

The South African authorities also announced new security measures in May 1976. Under emergency regulations issued by proclamation on 19 May, the authorities were given powers of arbitrary detention without charge in the Ovamboland, Kavango and Eastern Capviti region. They were also empowered to prohibit or disperse meetings and to create a depopulated zone along the entire Namibia-Angola border, a distance of more than 1,600 kilometres.

In January 1976, Deputy Secretary General Hans Ehrenstrale attended the Dakar international conference on Namibia and Human Rights, organized by the Strasbourg based International Institute of Human Rights. AI's International Secretariat prepared an annotated list of Namibian political prisoners for the conference participants.

### NIGER

Former President Hamani Diori, overthrown in a coup in April 1974, remains in detention without trial. He is reportedly held under relatively good conditions at the military camp at Zinder, on the edge of the Sahara Desert. Several other supporters of the Diori government remain in detention or restriction throughout Niger, although five former ministers were released on 3 August 1975 to mark the 15th anniversary of the country's independence.

On 2 August 1975 President Seyni Kountché announced the arrest of his deputy, Major Sani Souma Sido, and two other persons, for alleged involvement in an abortive plot. The others arrested were Maïtouaré Badjo, former secretary to the cabinet under the Diori government, and Dibo Bakary, leader of the Sawaha party, a leftist organization which had been banned under the Diori regime.

Mr Bakary had returned from exile to Niger in September 1974, on condition that he not involve himself in political affairs. Although at the time of his arrest the Niger authorities announced that Sawaha supporters would not be persecuted, further arrests were made in October 1975 after Sawaha members allegedly held a private meeting to discuss how best to express to the government their concern at the detention of Mr Bakary. The prisoners, who have not yet been tried, are reportedly held at Bilma, Agades, N'Goungou, and Tillabery. Eighteen Sawaha prisoners, including Mr Bakary, have been taken up by Amnesty International as investigation cases.

An attempt on 14 March 1976 to overthrow President Kountché's government by force failed, and the authorities announced that the coup's alleged leaders - Major Moussa Bouryé, Captain Sidi Mohamed and Ahmed Moudour, the secretary general of the Niger National Union of Workers - had been arrested. In subsequent trials nine persons were sentenced to death for their alleged involvement in the coup.

On 13 April 1976 AI expressed concern at these sentences to President Kountché and called for their commutation. On 21 April, however, seven persons, including the three leaders, were executed.

### NIGERIA

Reports of the detention without trial of suspected critics of the government of General Yakubu Gowon continued to reach Amnesty International until 29 July 1975, when the government was overthrown in a bloodless coup while General Gowon was attending an Organization of African Unity summit meeting in Kampala, Uganda.

Two weeks later, the new government, headed by Brigadier Murtala Mohammed, announced the release of 50 political prisoners. These included a number of civilian critics of the Gowon government who had been detained without trial under the provisions of the 1967 Emergency Regulations — among them several AI adoptees. Also freed were five military officers who had been detained for their alleged part in the coup of January 1966 which overthrew Nigeria's last civilian government. This represented the final and apparently complete implementation of a promise General Gowon made on 1 October 1974 to free all military personnel in detention. The amnesty of August 1975 was accompanied by a warning from Brigadier Murtala's military government that it would not tolerate any subversive activities.

The new government proceeded with a thorough purge of the Nigerian civil service, judiciary and military, replacing many individuals who had occupied
Rhodesia

Amnesty International’s concern over the deepening political crisis in Rhodesia, and its consequent effect upon human rights, was reflected by the two campaigns in which Al groups participated during the year and by the publication, in March 1976, of a 16-page Amnesty International Briefing on Rhodesia/Zimbabwe.

On 11 November 1975, Prime Minister Ian Smith’s Rhodesian Front regime celebrated the 10th anniversary of its unilateral declaration of independence from Great Britain (UDI). Al groups appealed to Mr. Smith to mark the anniversary by granting a general amnesty for all political prisoners as an indication of his administration’s desire to achieve a just and equitable settlement of the constitutional issue. Regrettably, no such amnesty was granted and the numbers of people detained or imprisoned on political grounds have continued to rise since November.

Al groups made new approaches to the illegal Smith regime in April 1976, this time concerning the use of the death penalty in Rhodesia. Reminding the regime that all executions had been carried out in secret since April 1975, Al groups appealed for an immediate end to the use of the death penalty in Rhodesia and a complete revision of the legislation under which it is imposed.

In a letter to the British government, which theoretically retains legal responsibility for Rhodesia, Al asked that Queen Elizabeth II should be advised to grant reprieves to all prisoners under sentence of death in Rhodesia.

The use of the death penalty, which may be applied to a wide range of poll...
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Deputy Secretary General Hans Ehrenstrale was able to raise human rights questions in informal conversations with the Senegalese authorities during his attendance at a conference on Namibia in Dakar (see Namibia). On 3 April 1976 Mr Savané and the other persons sentenced in connection with the Xar-Bi affair were freed under a general amnesty announced by President Leopold Sedar Senghor.

Al now has no adoption or investigation prisoners in Senegal.

SIERRA LEONE

On 19 July 1975 eight people were executed at Pademba Road Prison in the Sierra Leone capital, Freetown, after being found guilty of involvement in plotting the unlawful overthrow of the government. The charges stemmed from an incident on 30 July 1974, when a bomb exploded at the residence of Minister of Finance C. A. Kamara Taylor.

The executions were the sequel to a major treason trial which took place during the latter part of 1974 and a court martial in January and February of 1975. Fifteen persons were sentenced to death before the civilian court and seven before the court martial. One civilian subsequently won his appeal against the death sentence and was freed. Of the remaining 21, 13 reportedly had their sentences commuted to life imprisonment by President Siaka P. Stevens.

Among those executed were former Minister of Finance Mohamed Forna, who resigned from Mr Stevens' government in 1970, and former Sierra Leone armed forces commander Brigadier David Lamana, who had previously been sentenced to death in a 1970 treason trial but was subsequently pardoned and released.

Following the executions, which were not announced in advance, Amnesty International cabled President Stevens on 23 July 1975 to express the organization's "profound shock and dismay" at the deaths of the eight. The cable reaffirmed Al's categorical opposition to capital punishment. It expressed deep regret that the commutation of sentences granted to the 13 other prisoners under death sentence had not been also extended to the eight who were executed.

An unknown number of people remained in detention without trial in Sierra Leone during 1975 under the provisions of the Public Emergency Regulations, which were first introduced in October 1970, and which provided for indefinite preventive detention. Although a small number were taken up by Al as investigation cases, lack of data on individual prisoners precluded a large-scale adoption campaign.

In late 1975 the Research Department received indications that the Public Emergency Regulations had been lifted making detention without trial no longer possible under the Sierra Leone legal system. This was confirmed by a reply from the Sierra Leone government in April 1976, which indicated that the emergency regulations had been lifted with effect from 8 October 1975.

SOMALIA

On 17 June 1975 Amnesty International wrote to Major General Mohammed Siad Barre, President of the ruling Supreme Revolutionary Council of the Somali Democratic Republic, urging that a general amnesty be granted to mark the 15th anniversary of Somali independence on 1 July. No reply was received, and preparations were made by the Research Department for a mission to Somalia to discuss the human rights situation with the authorities.
However, in October 1975 a series of amnesties to mark the sixth anniversary of the Supreme Revolutionary Council's accession to power resulted in the confirmed liberation of all but three of AL's Somali adoption cases. On 6 October, President Siyad Barre announced the release of a group of Somali teachers who had been sentenced in April 1974 to prison terms ranging from 7 to 10 years for organizing and taking part in an illegal strike. This group comprised the majority of AL adoption cases.

On 18 October, a special amnesty freed 112 convicts, and two days later, President Siyad Barre issued a seven-point amnesty decree which, according to some reports, freed all political prisoners in Somalia. It also commuted death sentences to life imprisonment, life sentences to 30 years and sentences of up to 30 years to 7 years.

Among those released in the 20 October amnesty were former Somali prime minister and AL-investigation case Mohammed Ibrahimi Egal, who was sentenced to 30 years imprisonment in October 1974, and three of his former cabinet colleagues, who were sentenced at the same time to prison terms ranging up to 20 years.

Following the amnesty, AL continued to plan the projected mission. However, in May 1976 AL received a reply from the Somali authorities indicating that it would not be possible for an AL mission to be received in Somalia "for the moment" due to the preoccupation of the government with the resettling of persons affected by the 1975 drought.

SOUTH AFRICA

Renewed waves of detentions and a series of major political trials punctuated the course of events in South Africa during 1975-76. At the same time, the South African government introduced new legislative enactments designed to reinforce the machinery of repression and further limit freedom of political expression in the country.

The trial of nine members of the South African Students' Organization (SASO) and the Black Peoples' Convention (BPC) continued throughout the year. This followed the dismissal of charges against three of the original 13 defendants and a decision that one other defendant should be tried separately.

The defendants, whose cases have been taken up by Amnesty International, were all charged in January 1975 under the Terrorism Act, which carries a mandatory minimum sentence of five years' imprisonment upon conviction and a maximum sentence of death. They were detained together with more than 30 other supporters of SASO and the BPC following an attempt to hold a pre-FRELIMO (the liberation movement in Mozambique) rally in Durban on 22 September 1974, the 18th anniversary of the FRELIMO-led war for the liberation of Mozambique. The rally was banned in advance by the government and did not actually take place.

Nevertheles, the security police began a series of raids against members of organizations like SASO and the BPC which promote the "black consciousness" movement in South Africa. Such raids continued throughout 1975 and into 1976 and resulted in more than 250 people being detained without charge for various periods of time. Nine detainees arrested in late 1974 were held until October 1975 before being released uncharged.

An AL observer, Dean Charles Duncan of Howard University Law School in Washington DC, attended the SASO/BPC trial in February 1976. In November 1975, a Natal University law lecturer, Raymond Suttner, went on trial in Durban on charges under the Terrorism Act and Suppression of Communism Act. After two other detainees testified against him, he was convicted of furthering the aims of the banned African National Congress (ANC) and sentenced to 71 years' imprisonment.

Two other critics of apartheid were also jailed in November. Eric Molobi, a member of the BPC, was convicted on two charges under the Suppression of Communism Act on 24 November and sentenced to 5 years' imprisonment. Two days later, the distinguished Afrikaans poet and painter Breyten Breytenbach was jailed for 9 years after admitting that he had travelled to South Africa incognito in an attempt to establish an underground wing of the banned ANC. The 9-year sentence was imposed despite the prosecution's request that Mr Breytenbach be given the minimum five year sentence required by the Terrorism Act.

Two major trials resulted in acquittals. Molefi Pheto, director of a black drama group called "Mehloti", was acquitted of charges under the Suppression of Communism Act at his trial in Johannesburg in December 1975. In February 1976, the Rand Supreme Court found Bernard Bloem not guilty of various charges under the Suppression of Communism and Terrorism Acts. However, during the course of his trial two of Bloem's friends, Raymond Burgers and Patrick McGhie, were each jailed for one year for contempt of court when they refused to give evidence for the state. Both men are AL adoptees.

Five members of the National Youth Organization (NAYO), another of the groups prominent in the "black consciousness" movement, were also acquitted of charges under the Terrorism and Suppression of Communism Acts in the Pretoria Supreme Court during May. However, two other defendants were sentenced to terms of 5 years' imprisonment after being convicted of inciting people to undergo unlawful military training outside the country. This trial, commonly known as the NAYO trial, commenced in Johannesburg in March 1976, but it was transferred to Pretoria following clashes outside the Rand Supreme Court between police and crowds demonstrating in support of the defendants.

One of the acquitted defendants, Phumza Dyantyi, was immediately re-detained as she left the court and was charged with possessing illegal literature. She was later refused bail, although she had been in detention since August 1975. Miss Dyantyi is adopted by AL.

One other important trial was in progress at the time of writing. In Johannesburg, five white student leaders, former members of the executive of the National Union of South African Students (NUSAS), went on trial in April 1976 on charges under the Suppression of Communism Act. They are alleged to have promoted the policies of the ANC and South African Communist Party — both banned organizations — by organizing amongst other things the 1974 NUSAS campaign for the release of all South African political prisoners. AL has taken up their cases.

Substantial allegations concerning the ill-treatment of detainees by security police were made by witnesses and defendants at several political trials. Vincent Selanto, a state witness in the Molobi trial, alleged that he had been forced to make a false statement under extreme security police pressure. Jarius Kgokong, who gave evidence at the NAYO trial, similarly asserted that he had been forced to sign a false statement for use against the accused while detained incommunicado by the security police. Both Mr Selanto and Mr Kgokong were immediately re-detained and charged with perjury after giving evidence. At
become "independent". However, after considering Chief Matanzima's request, the African government to grant a general amnesty to all political prisoners from 1976 against members of "black consciousness" organizations and against white and against Peter Magubane, expired but were not renewed. Their trial is expected to commence in July 1976.

In May 1976, 5-year banning orders were also imposed on two other detainees, Johnny Ramrock and Weizmann Hamil-ton, at the time of their release. They are adopted by Al.

However, the banning of four supporters of SASO and the BPC during the same month indicated that the government has no intention of phasing out its use of banning orders to restrict political opponents. Each of the banned SASO and BPC members had previously been detained without charge for several months under the Terrorism Act. In May 1976, 5-year banning orders were also imposed on two other detainees, Johnny Ramrock and Weizmann Hamilton, at the time of their release. They are adopted by Al.

In April 1976, considerable speculation was aroused following reports that Chief Kaiser Matanzima, Chief Minister of the Transkei, had asked the South African government to grant a general amnesty to all political prisoners from the Transkei on 26 October 1976 – the date on which the Transkei is due to become "independent". However, after considering Chief Matanzima's request, Minister of Justice James Kruger stated that the authorities would continue to imprison Nelson Mandela and other Transkei-born political prisoners currently serving sentences on Robben Island.

In view of the South African government's continued use of its existing powers of banning, detention without trial and imprisonment in order to contain internal criticism, perhaps the most disturbing feature of the year was the introduction, in early 1976, of two new security measures. In January, the government introduced the Parliamentary Internal Security Commission Bill which passed through Parliament to become law in May 1976. This provides for the creation of a 10-member parliamentary commission to investigate matters which, in the opinion of the state president, affect matters of internal security.

The commission has been given the powers of the Supreme Court to summon witnesses on oath and will report periodically to the prime minister, who may then withhold from parliament all or parts of the commission's report. Witnesses who refuse to testify before the commission are liable to successive six-month terms of imprisonment.

Parliamentary opposition to the bill was unusually strong. The main opposition United Party – which cooperated with the ruling National Party when previous legislative measures involving internal security were enacted – and the smaller Progressive-Reform Party, both saw the bill as heralding the creation of a permanent commission similar in form to the Schlebusch-Le Grange Commission. The latter's investigations in 1974-75 led to NUSAS and the anti-apartheid Christian Institute being declared "affected organizations", thus cutting them off from overseas financial assistance.

In April 1976, the government introduced the Promotion of State Security Bill. This bill, which has not yet become law, proposes that the minister of justice be empowered, without reference to the courts, to order the detention of any person for an indefinite period on security grounds. Such a detainee would not be informed of the specific grounds for his arrest. His case would be reviewed annually by a committee which would meet in camera and make recommendations to the minister. However, the minister will be under no obligation to disclose to the review committee the evidence upon which he has acted or to implement the committee's recommendations.

This bill has also provoked much criticism of the government and is opposed in parliament and by the various Bar Councils present in South Africa. The overall parliamentary majority of the National Party makes it inevitable that the bill will become law.

AI groups continued throughout the year to work on the cases of more than 170 prisoners and former prisoners in South Africa. In addition, AI provided substantial relief and rehabilitation assistance to prisoners and their families.

SUDAN

On 30 July eight Sudanese soldiers were executed by a firing squad in southern Sudan after being found guilty of mutiny in connection with a violent incident at the garrison of Akobo, on the Ethiopian border, the previous March. At the same trial, 48 soldiers were sentenced to prison terms ranging from one to 15 years.

An unsuccessful attempt to overthrow the government of President Jaafar el-Nimeiry on 5 September 1975 resulted in widespread arrests, both of civilians and military personnel. During the early hours of the revolt, which the Sudanese authorities attributed to elements of dissolved political parties, the rebel forces managed to free 51 detainees from Kober Prison in the northern part of the capital, Khartoum – the main prison used to house detainees held under the
provisions of the National Security Law promulgated in June 1973. Most of these released prisoners were recaptured within a few days. In addition, 185 persons, mostly military personnel, were arrested by 13 September for their alleged involvement in the coup attempt.

Immediately after the suppression of the coup, special state security courts were established to try those believed responsible. On 16 September 1975 the Sudanese People’s Assembly approved retroactive constitutional amendments conferring wider legislative and executive powers on the president, and giving the legislature increased power to determine the circumstances under which persons might be placed under preventive detention or house arrest. This development was seen as a means of strengthening the government’s emergency powers in the light of the 5 September coup attempt.

On 25 November 1975 military tribunals began hearing the cases of officers and men accused of having participated in the attempted coup. By the end of February 1976, 20 alleged participants had been sentenced to prison terms ranging from 6 months to 12 years. Sixteen persons had been executed and 18 persons had been acquitted. At the end of April 1975, the number of untried detainees was still estimated at several hundred.

In November 1975 Amnesty International’s International Executive Committee approved a high-level mission to Sudan in conjunction with a similar mission to Ethiopia and Somalia. Preparations for the mission were underway at the time of writing.

**SWAZILAND**

Dr Ambrose Zwane, leader of the Ngwane National Liberatory Congress (NNLC), Swaziland’s main opposition party, was detained on 29 October 1975 after the publication of an article he had written for a South African newspaper concerning Swaziland’s foreign policy. As on previous occasions – he was similarly detained in 1973 and 1974 – no charges were brought against Dr Zwane and he was released after 60 days, the maximum period for which a person can be detained without charge under Swazi law.

Amnesty International cabled a protest to the Swaziland government over Dr Zwane’s detention.

AI has also been concerned throughout the year with the situation of Phenias Nene, a supporter of the NNLC, who is detained as a prohibited immigrant. Mr Nene is a political refugee from South Africa, but it is his association with the NNLC rather than his nationality which seems to have led to his detention.

The vulnerability of political refugees in Swaziland was vividly demonstrated in March 1976 when Cleophas Ndlovu and Joseph Nduli were reportedly abducted from the country by South African security agents. Both men subsequently appeared in court in South Africa charged with political offences (see section on South Africa).

**TANZANIA**

During the period 1975-76 Amnesty International groups continued to handle approximately 50 adoption and investigation cases in Tanzania – 18 of them persons imprisoned in mainland Tanzania, and the remainder held on the island of Zanzibar. The majority of those held on Zanzibar was arrested in April 1972 after the assassination of the Zanzibari president, Sheikh Abeid Karume. They were tried between May 1973 and May 1974, when the trial culminated in a series of death sentences and long prison terms. Following the sentencing, the convicted men carried their appeals to the Zanzibar High Court. On 11 November 1975, the High Court upheld the death sentences imposed on 24 of the prisoners (10 of whom were originally sentenced in absentia, since they were held on the mainland of Tanzania). Nineteen others had their sentences reduced to terms of imprisonment. Of those who were sentenced to prison terms at the end of the original trial in May 1974, two had their sentences reduced and five were acquitted – although their actual release has not been confirmed. One man who had originally received the death sentence was also acquitted by the High Court.

On hearing of the results of the appeals, the International Secretariat asked AI groups with prisoners on Zanzibar to appeal to the Zanzibari authorities not to carry out the death sentences. In addition, a major campaign for a commutation of the sentences and a general amnesty for political prisoners on Zanzibar was timed to coincide with the 11th anniversary on 12 January 1976 of the advent to power of the Afro-Shirazi Party (ASP) in Zanzibar. At the time of writing it appears that none of the death sentences have yet been carried out, and that the prisoners are continuing their appeal procedure by having their cases considered by the ruling council of the ASP. Final decision on the cases will lie in the hands of President Aboud Jumbe of Zanzibar.

On mainland Tanzania, parliamentary and presidential elections took place towards the end of October 1975. President Julius Nyerere, who has been Tanzania’s head of state since independence, received 91.3% of the votes cast. Following his successful re-election, President Nyerere announced an amnesty on 1 November 1975 which freed 7,308 common criminals and reduced the sentences of a further 3,685. According to news reports, political prisoners were excluded from this act of clemency.

In early November 1975 AI launched a major campaign involving adoption and coordination groups to press for a general amnesty for political prisoners on the Tanzanian mainland on 9 December 1975, the anniversary of the country’s independence. Although several long term AI adoptees were released from mainland prisons during 1975 – including Gray Mattaka, a journalist whose conviction on a treason charge had been quashed by the East African Court of Appeals in 1971, but who had been detained by presidential order even since – an unknown number of persons are still reported to be held under the provisions of Tanzania’s Preventive Detention Act, which provides for indefinite detention without trial.

They include refugees from other African states, relatives and associates of former cabinet minister Oscar Kambona, and former Tanzanian minister for economic affairs Abdul Rahman Babu, who was one of those sentenced to death in absentia by the Zanzibar court in May 1974. Mr Babu’s health gave cause for concern in late 1975, after he had smuggled out of prison an appeal for assistance.

According to eyewitness accounts reaching the Research Department, conditions at Tanzanian prisons such as Butimba Prison, Mwanza, and Ukonga Prison, Dar es Salaam, are not good, and some prison staff reportedly behave brutally towards convict prisoners.
TOGO
Amnesty International groups continue to handle the cases of two Togolese prisoners, one of whom, Frank Tsogbe, has been detained without charge or trial since 1973. Both are held in the civil prison in the capital, Lomé. Although about 20 persons are believed held without trial in Togo for political reasons, insufficient data on individual prisoners has precluded a major adoption program.

TUNISIA
The situation in Tunisia during the period 1975-76 has been marked by new student unrest and an increasingly repressive attitude by the authorities towards young leftwing dissenters. In response to this, Amnesty International has increased its adoption program: groups are now handling more than 60 cases, in contrast with the 40 adoption and investigation cases which had been taken up by May 1975.

Most of the new adoption cases are students and teachers arrested in a wave of detentions between February and April 1975, which was followed by a series of political trials extending from July 1975 through January 1976. These resulted in leftwing activists being sentenced to prison terms ranging from 6 months to 7 years on such charges as plotting against the security of the state, forming an illegal organization, insulting the head of state and spreading false information. The two largest trials, in July and September/October 1975, involved 42 and 101 defendants respectively. International legal observers sent by human rights organizations to observe these trials were in both cases expelled from Tunisia. Further clashes between the government and students took place in May 1975. In the same month a court in Tunis sentenced to death a Libyan, Mohamed Ali Nayel, who was accused of planning to kidnap members of the Tunisian cabinet.

During early 1976, AI widened its efforts to assist prisoners of conscience. In January the Research Department produced a background paper on Tunisia. In February, Nejib El-Euch, a Tunisian student who had been sentenced to 5 years imprisonment in August 1974, was featured as an appeal case in The Amnesty International Report 1974-1975, publication of Al's Annual Report 1974-75, in which Uagna was one of the countries criticized for violations of human rights.

In response to President Amin's speech, AI Secretary General Martin Ennals requested an audience with the Ugandan ambassador to the United Nations during a visit to New York later in the month. The ambassador was informed of AI's concern about the situation in Uganda and also reminded that AI representatives had visited Uganda twice since President Amin seized power in 1971. The ambassador confirmed that the invitation made by the President for Al to send a team to Uganda still stood, but that the timing of any such AI mission would have to be decided subsequently. At the time of writing, no definite date had been set for such a mission.

On 1 October 1975, in a speech to the United Nations General Assembly, President Amin attacked AI as being "fed on rumours and concoctions from discredited criminals and exiles" and for having "taken no trouble to investigate or send a team to Uganda to see for themselves". The speech followed the publication of AI's Annual Report 1974-75, which contained a report on the "disappearance" of people in Uganda since 1971, reported back to the Ugandan ambassador to the United Nations in which Uganda was one of the countries criticized for violations of human rights.

In spite of this, however, reports of political arrests and "disappearances" continued to be received by AI in Uganda and also reminded that AI representatives had visited Uganda twice since President Amin seized power in 1971. The ambassador confirmed that the invitation made by the President for AI to send a team to Uganda still stood, but that the timing of any such AI mission would have to be decided subsequently. At the time of writing, no definite date had been set for such a mission.

On 25 June a commission of inquiry appointed by President Amin to investigate the "disappearance" of people in Uganda since 1971, reported back to him. The chairman of the commission, Justice Mohamed Said, stated that 308 persons had disappeared since 1971, but added, according to the Ugandan news media, that "there was no even the remotest indication that President Amin directed the disappearance of any person...".
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ZAMBIA

Faced with mounting economic and political difficulties, aggravated by the situation in Angola and in Rhodesia, President Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia invoked full emergency powers on 25 January 1976. It was widely regarded as an attempt to stifle internal criticism of his government's policies towards Angola and the white-rulled states of southern Africa.

In February, the emergency powers were used to detain six lecturers and 17 Zambia University students, all of whom were suspected of supporting the MPLA (Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola), one of the three rival nationalist groups in Angola. Five of the detained lecturers, all expatriates, were subsequently released and deported in late March. But at least 16 students and one lecturer were still reported detained at the time of writing. The detainees, who have not been charged, are all believed to be Zambian citizens.

Amnesty International has appealed against their detention to President Kaunda and has adopted their cases.

The Research Department has also been concerned with the continued detention without trial of more than 50 members of the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU), the Rhodesian liberation movement. They were detained following the assassination of the ZANU national chairman Herbert Chipepo in Lusaka on 18 March 1975. Several of the detainees were tortured during the first two months of their imprisonment. But the use of torture was reportedly discontinued after AI asked President Kaunda to intervene personally to ensure that the detainees were accorded fair and humane treatment.

With one exception, all the detainees were held without charge while a Special International Commission appointed by President Kaunda investigated the circumstances of Mr Chipepo's death. The exception, Tyypo Shumba Chigwe, went on trial in January 1976, charged with the murder of another ZANU official, Edgar Madekurozwa. He was convicted and sentenced to death in April 1976. The case is now on appeal.

Following the publication of a report of the Special International Commission's findings in March 1976, three other detainees were charged with the murder of Mr Chipepo. They included Josiah Tongogara, the former head of ZANU's guerrilla operations. Their trial was expected to begin in June 1976.

In April 1976, the Zambian authorities detained more than 50 members of another nationalist movement, the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), when it became evident that divisions within the leadership might lead to open violence. At the end of May, a commission of inquiry was established to investigate the causes of the SWAPO dispute.

In December 1975, President Kaunda granted an amnesty to 96 political detainees who had been held without charge since 1973 in connection with an alleged plot to overthrow the government. This followed the trial of William Chipungu, the former mayor of Livingstone, and three other men. They were accused of planning the conspiracy and organizing the recruitment of Zambians for military training in Namibia in preparation for the alleged attempt to overthrow the Kaunda government. Although the trial was completed at the end of 1975, the verdict was still awaited in May 1976.

Two South Africans arrested on suspicion of espionage in early 1974 were also freed in December 1975. Like several other detainees in Zambia, they had been detained by presidential order after having been acquitted in court of all charges brought against them.

The Americas

Throughout 1975-76 there has been a slight but unmistakable deterioration in the overall human rights situation in the Americas, particularly in the cono sur (southern cone) countries of Latin America. This introduction concentrates on this region. The specialized problems of such countries as Cuba, the United States of America and those in the English-speaking Caribbean are discussed in their individual sections in the following pages.

The cono sur countries — Chile, Argentina, Brazil and Uruguay — present the department's greatest workload, because they contain the heaviest concentration of political prisoners in Latin America. Approximately 30,000 political prisoners are believed held in these four countries alone. This figure represents nearly 90% of the total political prisoners population of the whole continent (excluding Cuba). It is true that more than half the population of Latin America lives in the cono sur. But it is equally true that the proportion of the population detained for political reasons is also the highest there.

In Uruguay, with a population of only 21 million, one out of every 250 persons is a political prisoner - the highest ratio in the Americas. This was one consideration in the selection of Uruguay as the target of a worldwide Amnesty International campaign during February and April 1976 to draw international attention to the use of torture and deaths under torture there over the past two years.

One factor common to all the countries of the cono sur has been a reaction by the military to what they conceived to be a threat to the established center of power from either violent guerrilla movements or even the democratically-elected leftwing (as was the case in Chile). Significantly, Latin American countries which have fewer political prisoners have not experienced such an alleged threat to their stability.

Furthermore, all four countries have the highest socio-economic and cultural standards in Latin America. Whereas less developed countries such as Paraguay, Nicaragua and Haiti, with stable autocratic régimes, had the highest number of political prisoners more than 10 years ago, today the reverse is true. It is notable that in the richer countries, repression is characterized by a systematic and well organized apparatus which has at its disposal advanced technology and highly sophisticated equipment. The poorer countries do not have such "resources"; torture tends in these places to consist of beatings and more basic forms of maltreatment. The greatest number of allegations of torture emanate from the cono sur.

Figures for the number of political prisoners are misleading if they fail to take into consideration political assassinations. This particularly Latin American pattern of political repression is especially prevalent in Guatemala and
Argentina. It is also impossible to calculate accurately the numbers of those
who are killed or who simply disappear as a consequence of extra-legal activi-
ties of terrorist death squads. In Argentina, victims of such squads for 1975
numbered 1,000. In Guatemala 15,000 people are estimated as having been
killed in this way between 1970 and 1975.

There is strong evidence to suggest that in some countries these activities
are condoned if not encouraged by the authorities. Few people are brought to
trial or convicted for participation in death squads despite the fact that such
groups often operate in broad daylight. The function of the death squads is to
eliminate actual or potential opposition to the regime. Those most vulnerable
to attack, therefore, are trade unionists, lawyers who defend political prisoners,
students and political leaders. In Brazil at least, the death squads extend their
work to executing petty criminals and tramps: statistics for those killed in this
category are understandably incomplete.

An important secondary motive for political assassinations is the creation
of a climate of fear and uncertainty to discourage any form of opposition to
the ruling elite. Therefore, the methods of assassination are deliberately shock-
ning: often the victim has been tortured first. The Research Department intends
to devote much of the forthcoming year to analyzing this phenomenon.

In countries where there was an active and armed opposition, guerrillas form
the largest proportion of political prisoners. The next largest groups of
detainees are members of the communist party, members of other leftist
organizations and members of the radical wing of the Roman Catholic Church.
Only in very exceptional circumstances are right-wing groups detained. Generally
most political prisoners are young, and those most likely to arrest are students,
followed by trade unionists, journalists, lawyers and peasants.

In Latin America, human rights' problems do not in most cases arise out of
a need for constitutional or legislative reform, but out of an abuse of or
disregard for the law.

In Chile and Bolivia, AI has been most concerned about the use of forced
exile as a punishment for alleged political opponents of the regime. In many
cases those exiled have had no hearing before a court of law and are punished
by exile for unspecified crimes or offences.

There has been an increasing awareness in the department of the need to
approach the problems of human rights from a regional perspective. At present,
the department is working for a total of 967 prisoners. Collaboration
with the Campaign for the Abolition of Torture (CAT) department on urgent
actions for individual torture victims has been an important aspect of our work.
Indeed more than 80% of all CAT urgent actions have dealt with Latin
America. This reflects both the relatively high incidence of torture and extra-
legal detentions in this region and the development of increasingly fast and
reliable sources of information.

Efforts have been made to expand the work of the department into areas
which have not been the focus of AI research until recently, or about which
little reliable information has been obtainable. Consequently in June 1975
a mission went to Mexico, and in April 1976 AI delegates visited four central
American countries: Nicaragua, Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras.

Submissions to the United Nations Human Rights Commission concerning
Chile and Brazil were made in 1975 and 1976. Information on individuals
detained in Paraguay and Haiti was also forwarded to the Inter-American
Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States. In

November 1975 members of the department attended the Second Interparlia-
mentary Conference of the European Community in Luxembourg where they
were able to discuss several matters relating to AI concerns with parliamen-
tarians from both Europe and Latin America.

Campaigns on Chile and Brazil were conducted in September 1975 and
April 1976 respectively. The CAT Campaign on Torture in Uruguay was, how-
ever, the major project of the department for the year.

ARGENTINA

This report is broadly divided into two parts. The first concentrates on the
human rights' situation prevailing in Argentina prior to the coup d'etat of
24 March 1976, the second with events since the military take-over. Nevertheless,
as can be seen from the latter section, most of the problems which concerned
Amnesty International during the presidency of Isabel Peron remain and the
situation in certain respects has worsened.

Widespread corruption, soaring inflation, labour unrest, and the escalation
of political assassinations by both left-wing and right-wing extremist groups,
had characterized Isabel Peron's term of office. The state of siege, introduced
in November 1974, led to the detention without trial (for unlimited periods)
of more than 4,000 people. But in January 1976 the Supreme Court declared
the state of siege unconstitutional on two grounds: it had not been ratified by
Congress and its duration had never been specified. This effectively meant
that the 4,000 prisoners were being held illegally, but the coup forestalled any
intervention the judiciary might have initiated.

Throughout 1975, the number of abductions and assassinations attributable
to groups like the AAA (Alianza Anti-Comunista Argentina – Argentinian
Anti-Communist Alliance) dramatically increased, and in August 1975 Amnesty
International prepared a survey of 461 murders that occurred in the period
between July 1974 and June 1975. In all cases some political motive could be
identified. The survey was sent to President Peron with a commentary drawing
attention to the fact that almost two-thirds of the victims appeared to have been
executed by right-wing death squads. AI urged the Argentinian government
to take steps to bring to trial those guilty of such activities.

On 24 September, while Sehora Peron was convalescing from illness, AI
wrote to the provisional President of the Republic, Italo Luder, to express
concern at the apparent impunity with which the para-military groups were
operating in Argentina. A new and disturbing feature of the retaliatory
activities of the AAA had been the extermination of whole families. In one
case, on 14 August 1975, the parents, brother and sister of Mariano Pujadas
(a guerrilla killed in 1972) were kidnapped from their home and shot. Their
bodies were removed by dynamite.

It was notable that the Argentinian government, which has tried to quell
left-wing guerrilla activities and has mounted a huge anti-guerrilla operation in
the northern province of Tucuman, detaining several key guerrilla leaders,
has made remarkably few arrests in connection with the AAA, an organization
which has carried out more than 2,000 political assassinations since 1973. There
is strong evidence to suggest that highly placed officials have condoned or
actively supported right-wing acts of terrorism. AI has made urgent appeals
in over 133 cases of abductions in the last year.

Another cause for concern in this period was the increase in the number of
allegations of torture received by AI. Olga Talamante, an American
citizen released shortly after the March 1976 coup, stated that when she was
released in Azul, in November 1974 she was tortured in the local police
station. Centers of torture most frequently referred to are: Escuela Número II de
Familia in Tucuman, Brigada de Investigaciones de Banfield and the
military barracks of Campo de Mayo in the Province of Buenos Aires, and the
Superintendencia de Seguridad Federal in Buenos Aires (formerly known as
la Coordinación Federal). However, torture is allegedly a routine practice in
many local police and military headquarters throughout the country.

Many of the prisoners adopted by AI during the year were members of trade
unions, for the exceptional measures taken by the government to combat
armed insurrection inevitably led to the repression of lawful trade union
activity. The case of Raimundo Ongaro, leader of the Printers' Union in
Buenos Aires, is typical of this aspect of repression. After leading a strike
which was declared illegal by the minister of labor, Señor Ongaro was removed
from the leadership of the union, and arrested in October 1974 on a charge of
illegal possession of firearms. In December 1974, a judge acquitted Señor
Ongaro and ordered his release. Señor Ongaro was immediately placed in
preventive detention at the disposal of the executive power.

In May 1975, while Señor Ongaro was still detained, the AAA kidnapped
and shot his 21-year-old son Alfredo. One week later there was an attempt on
the life of another son, Raimundo. After spending one year in prison, Señor
Ongaro decided to exercise his legal right and opt for exile.

Other sectors of the legal opposition, such as the Partido Socialista de los
Trabajadores (PST - Workers' Socialist Party), have also been affected by the
state of siege provisions. About 20 PST members were placed in preventive
detention after they had given their support to the two-month long strike at
Villa Constitución which paralyzed the steelworks complex on the River
Parana in April/May 1975. AI groups are working on behalf of the five who
remain in detention. The PST has also been a target of rightwing violence:
eight of its members were murdered in 1975, and many of their local offices
have been attacked and blown up.

The freedom of lawyers to practise their profession was progressively under-
mined throughout 1975. Lawyers formed one of the largest categories of
prisoners held under the state of siege provision, usually because they had
defended political prisoners. In addition, members of the legal profession
were one of the main targets of intimidation and often assassination at the
hands of organizations such as the AAA. Even judges who were regarded as
"too lenient" with subversives received death threats. The cumulative effect
was that in some areas lawyers refused to defend political prisoners.

AI worked on behalf of 32 lawyers held in preventive detention during
1975-76, two of whom obtained their release and three others exercised their
constitutional right to opt for exile. (This right has been withdrawn by the
new government.)

There has been a steady deterioration in prison conditions, partly as a result
of overcrowding. Most Argentinian prisons now house political prisoners. In
November 1975, many of the prisons came under military jurisdiction and a
new regimen was applied which caused considerable suffering. In almost all
prisons there is now heavy censorship of mail, severe restriction on exercise
and a ban on any activities (prisoners are not permitted to read or study and
even singing can be a punishable offence).

Hortensia Rodriguez de Portez, a former provincial deputy of the Justicialista
party in Salta, stated in a letter to the President of the Liga Argentina por los
Derechos Humanos (Argentinian League for Human Rights) in December
1975:

Since November 1975 we are not allowed any parcels or food. Nor will
they sell us anything at the prison shop. Many of the female prisoners
are ill from eating prison food.... I hope to God that this situation
will not last long so that the babies will not have to suffer with their mothers
any more.

One prisoner, Jorge Nicaner Fernandez, committed suicide on 28 December
1975, allegedly as a result of the bad conditions.

It is difficult at the moment to assess the effects of the 1976 military coup
on the human rights situation in Argentina. The new President, General Jorge
Rafael Videla, in his inaugural speech promised that there would be proper
respect for human dignity and that the use of force would be the exclusive
reserve of the state. But the initial moves by the new government are far
from reassuring. Congress has been dissolved, all political parties have been
suspended, the central trade union organisation, Confederación Nacional del
Trabajo, has been placed under military control, the state of siege is to
continue in force, a form of martial law has been established, the entire
judiciary has been suspended. The death penalty has been introduced and
there are severe penalties for crimes such as "disturbing the public order".

On 25 March 1976, AI wrote to the new Argentinean head of state urging
the speedy release of all those held in preventive detention. AI also asked for
an effective curb on rightwing atrocities and a guarantee that refugees from
other Latin American countries would not be deported.

Several thousand people were arrested immediately after the coup, including
officials of the previous government and many others such as trade unionists
and suspected leftwing sympathizers. The new government has indicated that
some of the 4,000 already in preventive detention at the time of the coup
will be released in the near future. Those who are considered to be "subversive"
will face court martial.

Furthermore, the situation of the hundreds of thousands of recognized or
de facto refugees has been made extremely precarious. A government com-
municate issued on 26 March 1976 said that any refugee who carries out
activities which "affect social peace, national security or public order" will be
expelled. The government has said that it will not necessarily deport refugees
back to their countries of origin. Nevertheless, there is close collaboration
between the police forces of neighbouring countries such as Chile, Paraguay,
and Uruguay, who seem to operate freely inside Argentina (arresting and even
torturing their own nationals). This provides cause for grave disquiet.

On 19 December 1975, Senator Hipolito Solari Yrigoyen of the Unión
Cívica Radical denounced in Congress the activities of DINA (Chilean
security police) in Argentina.

There are unconfirmed reports that a leader of the Chilean MIR (Movi-
mento de Izquierda Revolucionaria), Edgardo Enriquez, who disappeared
in Buenos Aires on 10 April with Brazilian Regina Marcondes, was handed over
to DINA on 29 April. Reports from other sources suggest that Señor
Enriquez may have been assassinated in Argentina. Both the Chilean and
Argentinean governments have denied any responsibility for his disappearance.

On 20 May, AI issued a news release concerning the abductions of two
prominent exiled Uruguayan parliamentarians, Zelmar Michelini and Hector
affected until a meeting of representatives to the labour federation Central Obrera Boliviana (COB) was broken up in the mining town of Oruro on 12 July 1975.

AI cabled President Banzer on 18 July protesting against the arrests on the grounds that they directly contradicted international norms regarding trade union rights and freedom of assembly. Twenty-four of the principal leaders of Bolivian organized labour were detained, and Minister of the Interior Colonel Juan Pereda Asbun alleged that they had conspired "to provoke social chaos and a general strike". Colonel Pereda added that Bolivian authorities "consider no price too high to guarantee the tranquility needed for the progress of the nation"; and that those who attempt to disturb that tranquility "run the risk of being drastically repressed". All of the detained trade unionists were adopted by AI.

All but five of the prisoners detained at Oruro have now been released or sent into exile. Mirna del Rio, head of the La Paz Teachers’ Union, and a representative of her union to the COB, was one of AI’s prisoners of the month in December. She was released at the end of December but shortly afterward re-arrested and summarily exiled to Chile.

A significant improvement was observed during the first half of the period covered by this report in the reported treatment received by political prisoners. Nearly all of 1975 was characterized by a notable absence of the allegations of torture which had been all too frequent in previous years.

But in December 1975, the detention of nine people for alleged links with guerrilla movements was reported. Among them Antonio Peredo, journalist brother of Inti and Coco Peredo, companions of the Cuban revolutionary Ché Guevara in 1967. Four were Chilean exiles. The gravity of government allegations – despite the fact that no guerrilla activity has been reported in Bolivia for some years – as well as unofficial reports that the prisoners were manacled and subjected to torture, led to actions on their behalf by the Campaign for the Abolition of Torture (CAT) department on 23 December and 9 January.

On 16 February, AI cabled President Banzer requesting information on the detention on 29 January of other alleged guerrilla conspirators. One of them, Serfin Gil Cubresul, is reported to have died under torture.

In March 1976, Minister of the Interior Pereda Asbun told the newspaper Prensa in that Antonio Peredo was not in government custody. This contrasted sharply with an earlier statement by him on 11 December that Antonio Peredo had been detained.

In the face of fears that Antonio Peredo, and other prisoners accused of guerrilla activities may be tortured, or may have died under torture, a CAT appeal was made in April for Antonio Peredo and others detained at the same time.

BRAZIL

Since early 1975, about 2,000 suspected communist sympathizers have been detained throughout Brazil. The actual figure of those still in detention is around 700-800, 240 of whom have been adopted by Amnesty International. The majority of detainees have either been charged or convicted under the Law of National Security. This relates to the organization of political parties banned by the state and carries a penalty of 2 to 5 years' imprisonment.

The arrests started in the major centers such as Sao Paulo and Rio de
congress by parliamentarians. Celio Borja, president of the House of Representatives and member of the ARENA party (pro-government) personally delivered a letter about the torture of the communist Marco Antonio Tavares Coelho. But later arrests included progressive members of the Movimento Democrático Brasileiro, the only legal opposition party, journalists, lawyers, trade unionists and others whose connection to the PCB ranged from the tenuous (many admitted past membership) but stated that they had long ceased to be members - to the non-existent.

There has been a growing tendency by the linha dura (hard-liners) to link members of the MDB with the illegal communist party. In the November 1974 elections to the Senate and House of Representatives, the MDB had fought a successful campaign on human and civil rights issues. It had called for the restoration of habeas corpus for political crimes and for an inquiry into cases of "disappeared" persons. However, its success was officially attributed to communist support, and so any initiative by the MDB party on torture or disappearances was dismissed by the government as subversion.

Moves in 1976 to silence criticism from the MDB party have culminated in five deputies being cassados (ie losing their parliamentary mandate and having their political rights suspended for 10 years). One of the deputies was Lysaneas Maciel, who worked on human rights.

About 150 members of the MDB party are estimated to have been detained during the wave of arrests. Some are key party officials such as Manuel Teodosio, the regional organizer for the state of Pernambuco, who was arrested in March 1976 when he had gone to protest about the detention of his two sons, and Sergio Santana, an MDB town councillor in Salvador da Bahia who testified in court that he had been tortured. Nevertheless, he was sentenced to 21 years' imprisonment by a military court in March 1976. One of the most interesting developments in 1975-76 has been the number of documents issued by political prisoners themselves. The most detailed is the "São Paulo" document, which was sent to the President of the Brazilian Bar Association in November 1975. In it, 35 prisoners recount the physical and psychological coercion used to force them to sign incriminating "confessions" prepared by the security agents. They describe their appalling prison conditions - inadequate diet and sanitary facilities, the incidence of torture. Finally they cite some 55 eye-witness accounts of death or mutilation of prisoners under torture.

The motive behind the documents is possibly to give support to the campaign for a general amnesty, which has the backing of members of the church, the legal opposition party and the Brazilian Bar Association. However, the prospects for such an amnesty now look slight. In a speech on 1 August 1975, President Ernesto Geisel said that there could be no "decompress" until the threat of subversion had been overcome. He categorically rejected the possibility of a general amnesty and the abolition of the laws of exception and refused to allow an investigation into disappearances and the activities of the security forces.

Over the past 18 months, AI has received numerous allegations of torture, in many instances substantiated by affidavits or denounced in the Brazilian congress by parliamentarians. Celio Borja, president of the House of Representatives and member of the ARENA party (pro-government) personally delivered a letter about the torture of the communist Marco Antonio Tavares Coelho to the minister coordinator to the Presidency in February 1975. Lysaneas Maciel in his last speech as a deputy on 2 April 1976 accused the government of torturing and killing political prisoners.

Reports received from victims in Recife, Salvador da Bahia, Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Curitiba in Parana, Florianopolis in Santa Catarina indicate that systematic torture continues to be practised throughout Brazil. During the last year AI intervened urgently on behalf of about 200 potential victims of torture. One of the worst centers for torture is in São Paulo at the headquarters of the Second Army, Comando de Operações da Defesa Interna (CODI/DOI - Command for Internal Defence Operation/Department of International Operations), about which the Brazilian Justice and Peace Commission wrote in October 1975:

There is in São Paulo a huge torture complex which has at its disposal the most modern and sophisticated equipment, and which requires an increasing number of staff - jailers, drivers, executioners, typists, public relations officers, doctors and others - to run.

Between August 1975 and January 1976, four deaths of prisoners occurred in CODI/DOI, São Paulo. After the first death, that of an officer of the Policia Militar (state militia), Lieutenant José Ferreira de Almeida, AI wrote to President Geisel expressing concern about reports that the lieutenant's body bore clear signs of torture and that according to his lawyer, the cell was too low for the prisoner to have hanged himself as stated by an army spokesman. On 25 October 1975, Vladimir Herzog, a journalist, died in custody hours after he had voluntarily presented himself at CODI/DOI for questioning. The official cause of death was suicide. More than 400 journalists contested the facts about his death, and 30,000 people, in protest, attended a memorial mass celebrated by Cardinal Arns in São Paulo cathedral. Three months later, a metal worker, Manoel Fiel Filho, was found dead in similar circumstances. As a result, President Geisel summarily dismissed General D'Avila Melo from his post as commander of the Second Army and the operations of CODI/DOI were temporarily suspended.

In April/May 1976, AI conducted a campaign on behalf of prisoners in northeast Brazil - the majority of them peasants - who had been given particularly harsh sentences for political crimes during a period of severe repression in 1970. (One man had a double life sentence and 66 years, others had sentences of 72 and 66 years.) Although many of them are not prisoners of conscience, nevertheless, since many of their trials were conducted without a proper legal defence or with other irregularities, AI decided to press the Brazilian government to review their cases and where appropriate grant the right to appeal for a diminution of their sentence or parole.

In February 1976, AI submitted supplementary evidence regarding violations of human rights in Brazil to the 32nd session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights. This included a detailed study of the 22 "disappeared" persons who featured on the list that Cardinal Arns, the Archbishop of São Paulo, handed to the government in 1974. AI also provided additional information on the disappearance of trade unionists, student leaders, journalist and lawyers.

One such case is Jaime Miranda, who was arrested by security police in Rio de Janeiro in February 1976; he was not seen again. The president of the Brazilian Bar Association stated: "I am sure Mr Miranda is imprisoned and being tortured." Later unconfirmed reports allege that Jaime Miranda died as
a consequence of torture.

In October 1975, AI sent a report to the International Press Institute's conference in São Paulo on the torture of journalists and censorship.

In November 1975, AI made an urgent intervention on behalf of Cesar Queiroz Benjamin who had been arrested when he was a minor and held intermittently in adult penal establishments and psychiatric clinics for the past four years. AI acted after a civilian judge who ordered Cesar Benjamin's release informed his family that he could not guarantee Cesar's security, as the death squad had threatened to murder the youth as soon as he left prison. At the last minute, the Supreme Court overruled the judge's decision and Cesar remains in prison.

AI was pleased to learn of the release of Manoel da Conceicao dos Santos, a peasant leader from northeast Brazil, who was badly tortured during different periods of detention between 1968 and December 1975. He has gone into exile.

In the months prior to President Geisel's visit to France and Britain in April and May 1976, AI made various approaches to the Brazilian authorities in an attempt to obtain agreement for a mission which would discuss with ministers and persons in authority the present human rights situation in Brazil. One such approach elicited the following reply from the Brazilian Ambassador to Britain, Roberto de Oliveira Campos:

For a government to accept an investigation by a self-appointed foreign body — the impartiality of which has not been the object of independent evaluation of judgement — with respect to the observance of constitutional rights of its own citizens, would be tantamount to admitting that its legal institutions, Parliament and Tribunals, are incapable of preserving the Constitution and/or are guilty of violating it. We have confidence in our institutions and are thus unable to defer their responsibilities to any international organization.

Despite this rebuff, AI will continue its attempt to enter into a dialogue with the Brazilian government.

CHILE

During 1975, the number of political prisoners remained relatively constant at 5,000-6,000. By the end of April 1976, this total dropped below 5,000, a decrease which was largely due to the release of prisoners into exile under the provisions of decree law number 504.

However, this downward trend does not reflect a general improvement in the human rights situation over the past year. Earlier patterns of arrest, torture and imprisonment, either without trial under the State Security Law or with nominal hearings before a military tribunal without adequate defence, and forced exile, have become institutionalized.

Amnesty International has been especially concerned at the problem of disappearances. Since the coup in September 1973, it is estimated that well over 1,500 people have been arrested but never subsequently been located by their family and friends. It is impossible to know whether these people are dead or are being held incommunicado in prisons or camps. In every case, writs of habeas corpus presented by the family have been rejected.

Immediately following the refusal by the Chilean government in June 1975 to admit delegates from the United Nations Ad Hoc Working Group on
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Human Rights in Chile, the Chilean press published a list of a total of 119 Chileans who had allegedly been killed abroad by their own comrades or had died in confrontations with the Argentinian police. Of these 119, seven were AI investigation cases and in a further 45 cases, the arrests had been notified to AI.

Several of those appearing on the list had been the subjects of the AI Campaign for the Abolition of Torture appeals during 1974 and 1975. AI adoption groups responded by addressing inquiries to the Chilean authorities. In August, in response to almost unprecedented pressure both from outside and inside Chile, President Augusto Pinocet Ugarte ordered an inquiry into the matter.

In support of its belief that many of the 119 had in fact been arrested inside Chile by the Chilean authorities, AI obtained a sworn statement from a former adopted prisoner, Dr Katia Reszynski Padilla, to the effect that six of the 119 had been detained in Santiago. In a letter on 8 September 1975 to the President of the Supreme Court, Jose Maria Eyzaguirre, AI presented Dr Reszynski's testimony as evidence germane to the inquiries. No reply has been received.

In a special campaign to mark Chilean Armed Forces Day and the second anniversary of the 1973 coup, AI groups and sections pressed the junta to release or identify the whereabouts of the hundreds of "disappeared" Chilean citizens. In December 1975, AI included in a submission to the UN Ad Hoc Working Group on Human Rights in Chile an analysis of statements received directly from a large number of ex-prisoners and prisoners' families. These said that 34 of the 119 mentioned above had been seen in detention centers inside Chile at different times during 1974 and early 1975.

In November, the Cardinal Archbishop of Santiago, Monsignor Raul Silva Henriquez, announced the closure of the Committee of Cooperation for Peace in Chile (Comite pro Paz). This was an ecumenical committee established shortly after the coup of September 1973 to assist political prisoners and their families legally, financially and socially. Cardinal Silva Henriquez's announcement gave rise to an intensification of existing harassment of churchmen and others connected with the Comite pro Paz, and at least 13 people, laymen and women and priests were arrested in that same month.

AI responded immediately by publicly appealing for the release of these people. Those arrested included three executive members of the Comite pro Paz in Santiago, among them the lawyer Jos Zalaquett who, although released on 30 January 1976, was expelled from Chile on 12 April 1976. British doctor Sheila Cassidy was among those arrested during this period. AI sent a cable to Cardinal Silva Henriquez expressing concern at the arrests and offering him support in his humanitarian work.

The Comite pro Paz was finally closed in December. It was replaced by a similar organization — the Vicerio de la Solidaridad. By the end of April 1976 more than 160 priests and nuns had been expelled from Chile and about 40 others had been arrested and three had died as a result of repression.

September 1975 marked a period of harassment against certain sectors in the universities in Santiago. Forty-four people were arrested in one of the largest purges to take place in the universities since 1973. AI sections and Campaign for the Abolition of Torture (CAI) groups appealed for the immediate release of these students and teachers. Many were later released in
an amnesty of 163 people announced by General Pinochet in December 1975. AI did not receive allegations that these particular detainees were tortured, but at least 275 others lost their jobs or their places in the university.

Some of the most intensive work carried out by AI adoption groups has been for prisoners in two major armed services trials: the trials of the Chilean Air Force (FACH) and navy personnel. The latter were arrested shortly before the coup by navy elements who were partially responsible for the overthrow of the previous government of President Salvador Allende Gossens. The majority of the FACH prisoners have now been released into exile under the provisions of decree law 504, and many have been welcomed and helped in Europe by AI groups on arrival. But by the end of last year, there still remained 27 people in prison, including Captain Raúl Vergara Meneses and Captain Carlos Carabuco Astorga.

In the majority of these 27 cases, the prisoners were still awaiting the final decision of President Pinochet on their “pardon”, despite the fact that the decision had been made about their colleagues some time previously. AI sent a cable to President Pinochet on 15 December requesting that 18 of those prisoners, who had applied for exile under decree law 504, be released and permitted to take advantage of the visas that had been offered them in other countries. But by the end of April 1976, 11 of these prisoners, including the two mentioned above, were still being held. Moreover, in January, Captain Raúl Vergara was transferred to an isolation cell and later to another part of the public prison of Santiago. At the end of March 1976 he was being held there with common law offenders, contrary to Chilean law. AI undertook a series of initiatives on behalf of this adopted prisoner early in 1976.

In the other armed services trials, the sentences passed on the 57 naval marines and civilians — all now AI cases — were finally announced in May 1976. At the moment of writing this report, the defendants are awaiting final ratification of their sentence by the naval court. As soon as the sentences are confirmed, these prisoners will be entitled to apply for exile in the normal way under the provisions of decree law number 504. This group of prisoners is being held in three different prisons in Valparaíso, Concepción and Talcahuano.

AI protested vigorously following an incident in Valparaíso prison on 31 October 1975, when all prisoners were removed from their cells and beaten, robbed and humiliated. In April 1976, reports were received of an epidemic of tuberculosis in this prison. At least three of those who had already contracted the disease were defendants in the naval trial. As a result of this further indication of the sub-standard prison conditions in Valparaíso prison and the consequent danger of the health of the inmates, AI asked the Chilean authorities for the release of the prisoners whose cases had taken up.

The use of torture is still known to be widespread in Chile. This was documented in the UN Ad Hoc Working Group’s report in February 1976 and by information AI continues to receive from ex-prisoners and contacts in Chile. The Campaign for the Abolition of Torture has undertaken urgent action on behalf of at least 48 people since June 1975. The Chilean government’s response to the UN report did not attempt to deny that torture is used but put arguments forward in justification.

However, the junta has recently introduced a decree which strengthens existing legal protection for detainees against torture. Decree law 187 of 28 January 1976 specifies that all prisoners should be examined medically both on arrest and prior to release. The law was officially described as a measure to protect the detainees against illegal physical punishment. It gives the minister of justice and the president of the Supreme Court the authority, for the first time since the coup, to visit certain recognized detention centers for political prisoners. These include 4 Alamos, one of the prisons in Santiago where prisoners are held strictly incommunicado.

Decree law 187 also alters and emphasizes the existing regulation that a prisoner’s family must be notified of arrest. Initial hopes that this law represented a serious attempt to protect the rights of prisoners have been disappointed by information on at least five cases up to the time of writing. This suggests that the decree is being observed no more than previous decrees which appeared to be providing some protection to the prisoner.

By the end of April 1976, AI had 252 adoption and investigation cases. During the past year AI had also had CAT actions for 61 people and further appeals on mass arrests in Chile.

**COLOMBIA**

A rural peasantry largely unprotected by the rule of law has been a principal concern of Amnesty International in Colombia. On 22 July 1975, AI issued an appeal following the disappearances of six leaders of the Asociación Nacional de Usuarios Campesinos (ANUC — National Peasant Union) who had been detained with 319 peasants in Sincelejo, Sucre Department.

Most of the prisoners were held in the town’s bull ring without food or sanitary facilities, but the six leaders were taken from the town in a police car. As a number of peasant trade union leaders have been tortured or assassinated in similar circumstances, there was considerable fear for the safety of the six men. They were later located in Sucre’s national prison. This mass arrest of peasants followed police action against an unauthorized meeting under the auspices of the ANUC. The prisoners, including women and children, were detained on the accusation of rioting (saqueo asomado). The release of the detainees, including the six leaders, was later ordered by a judge in neighbouring Cordoba Department who ruled that no law had been broken. Local judicial authorities had disqualifed themselves from ruling on this case, allegedly because of threats from large landholders.

Large scale guerrilla activities in much of the country, coupled with labour and student unrest over economic measures taken under the government of President Alfonso López Michelsen, led in June 1975 to the imposition of a state of siege, severely curtailing civil liberties and granting the military extraordinary powers of arrest, as well as the right to prosecute civilians within the military court system. A decree law published in August 1975 granted police officers, mayors and state governors the judicial power — under the state of siege — to impose jail sentences for as long as 4 months for a broad range of minor offences.

AI wrote on 29 July 1975 to Colombian officials dealing with internal security problems, to express disquiet over the potential for abuse of human rights presented by the suspension of fundamental rights under the newly imposed state of siege. AI also requested information on three cases of detention under the state of siege in which severe torture was alleged: Juan Gregorio Díaz Duque, detained in Pereira, and peasants Jacobo Araujo and Manuel Ordóñez, of the municipality of Mercaderes. A reply was received from General Fernando Landazábal Reyes, head of the Brigada de Instituciones Militares (BIM), who declared his inability under Colombian law to...
release information of this nature to an international organization.

Four men, later taken up for investigation, were convicted in January 1976 of the assassination of the inspector general of the Colombian army, General Ramón Arturo Rincón Quinones in September 1975. The trial, before a military tribunal in Bogotá, was marred by numerous irregularities which led to serious doubts as to the impartiality of the court and the veracity of the witnesses for the prosecution. It was shown conclusively that German Villamil Garcia, convicted of taking part in the attack on General Rincón, was confined, at the time of the attack, to a psychiatric hospital where he was receiving electric shock therapy. A witness for the prosecution claimed he had met with fellow conspirators on the Sunday prior to the attack in a certain Bogotá cafe which the defence proved always remains closed on Sundays. Other prosecution witnesses were shown by the defence to be petty criminals. One was shown to have lied. None of the fingerprints found in the assassin's car belonged to any of the accused.

Major Genaro Nungo Mendez, the military prosecutor, was sharply criticized for statements to the court, in which he said that "to the military, everyone is guilty until proven otherwise . . . (It is) better to condemn an innocent man than to acquit a guilty one, as among the innocent one might be guilty". He also stated that in military courts suspicion should be adequate for conviction and that there should be no appeals.

German Villamil Garcia, Hugo Henry Casasdiegos and Heriberto Ramirez were sentenced to 24 years' imprisonment. Ricardo Quiroga was sentenced to 28 years' imprisonment. All were immediately transferred to the maximum security island penal colony La Gorgona. The four are the only cases currently under adoption or investigation by AI in Colombia, although there are estimated to be some hundreds of political prisoners.

CUBA

Amnesty International has concentrated, during 1975-76, on encouraging group actions for individual adopted prisoners of conscience, some of whom have been in prison since 1959. It has pursued, in addition, a program of research in order to overcome the difficulties presented by the lack of detailed information on political prisoners in Cuba and the continuing refusal, in nearly all cases, of the government to reply even to specific inquiries about individual prisoners.

An exception to this practice was made in the case of the cable, sent in July 1975 by Ivan Morris, chairman of AI's United States Section, to Cuban Prime Minister Fidel Castro, and to Carlos Rafael Rodriguez, Vice Prime Minister and Minister for International Relations, expressing concern over the health of a prisoner jailed in 1965. Assurances were received that every member of society "including criminals" received adequate medical attention.

Typical of the difficulties encountered by groups is the case of Dr Miguel Angel Lorodo García, a Franciscan priest sentenced in April 1966 to 15 years' imprisonment for concealment of a political refugee. He was adopted by two groups, one in Sweden and one in Germany, who made continuous appeals for information to no avail. In November 1975 he was included in the worldwide campaign run by AI for Prisoner of Conscience Week. He was released conditionally in February 1976, after serving two-thirds of his sentence. However, the Cuban authorities failed to reply to any of the inquiries.

Similar difficulties have been encountered in attempts to arrange discussions

on subjects of mutual interest. For example, no reply was received to AI's request to the Cuban Embassy in London for a meeting prior to the 5th United Nations Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Prisoners which was held in Geneva in September 1975. Even where Cuban delegates have given recommendations to AI on the procedure to be followed, no replies have been received.

A letter was sent to the minister of justice with details of the cases of 18 adopted prisoners who were reportedly still detained after the expiry of their sentences, in accordance with the request of the delegates at the 1975 Conference of the International Association of Democratic Lawyers in Algiers. Over a year later no reply has been received.

However, in 1975-76 delegates from AI have held occasional and informal discussions with Cuban delegates using the forum provided by the UN and its specialized agencies in New York and Geneva. The aim has been to present the work of AI and to seek the views of the Cuban government on specific human rights issues.

The new constitution of Cuba was ratified at the 1st Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba held in Havana in December 1975. It guarantees inter alia the inviolability of the personal integrity of the citizen and denounces the use of violence or pressure of any kind against people to force them to testify. It furthermore assures the right to freedom of speech, religion and assembly but only within the framework of the objectives of socialist society.

Cuba has never denied the existence of political prisoners. However the government has traditionally been vague about both numbers and their identity. The best estimate of numbers is of approximately 4,000-5,000 based on recent Cuban government statements to visitors and public speeches by officials.

It is more difficult to identify the groups which make up the total due to the problems of definition presented by the continually evolving system of law under which individuals can be classified as political prisoners for offences as diverse as currency speculation, absenteeism, sabotage, guerrilla warfare, treason and possession of counter-revolutionary literature. It is likely that only a minority of the total number of political prisoners could be classified as prisoners of conscience.

By category, one could cite: (a) religious and conscientious objectors; (b) former revolutionaries and trade unionists who disapproved of the acceptance by the revolutionary leaders of communist theories and in consequence tried to dissociate themselves from the movement; (c) political groupings such as Movimiento de Recuperación Revolucionaria, Movimiento Revolucionario del Pueblo, Ashotemismo, etc, who briefly exercised a legitimate role in opposition but became increasingly penetrated by foreign based and controlled movements.

AI has adopted prisoners in all three categories. The persistence of the fear, real or imagined, of counter-revolutionary conspiracies was primarily responsible for the early excesses in the treatment of political prisoners. By the same token, the removal of that fear has been largely responsible for the improvement in conditions.
By status, prisoners are now divided into two major categories: those who have accepted the rehabilitation plan and those who have rejected it. The first category has the great majority of political prisoners. In return for committing themselves to political indoctrination courses and work programs, prisoners become eligible for greater privileges which lead eventually to a spell in relatively comfortable open prisons (usually farms) with monthly visits and finally release after two-thirds of their sentence have been served. The second category are held in maximum security jails about which there is little recent or reliable information as to the conditions inside.

The earliest reports were of uniformly bad, in some cases appalling, conditions with deficient diet, brutal forced labour, solitary confinement in specially darkened cells, beatings and frequent torture. However the worst of these institutions have now been closed and such indications as there are, suggest much improved conditions with the possible exception of Boniato Prison where reports indicate that some prisoners died in late 1975 as a result of brutal treatment by prison guards.

DOMINICA

Amnesty International continued to follow the case of Desmond Trotter, sentenced to death in 1974 after having been found guilty of the murder of an American tourist. On 22 March 1976 Al wrote to Sir Louis Cools-Lartigue, Governor of Dominica, to reiterate its appeal for a commutation of the death sentence.

Mr Trotter was reprieved on 3 April 1976 and his sentence was commuted to life imprisonment, following a retraction of her testimony by the chief prosecution witness. Mr Trotter has always maintained that he is innocent and that his political activities were the reason for his arrest and conviction.

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

The human rights situation in the Dominican Republic in 1975-76 remained as bad as in previous years. Allegations of torture, harrassment of political opponents, mainly trade unionists, illegal arrests and detentions are regrettably common.

In December 1974 the United States Section of Amnesty International proposed to send a mission to the republic to press for the release of five Al-adopted prisoners, including Julio de Peña Valdes of the Movimiento Popular Dominicano (MPD). The objectives of the mission were later enlarged to include other human rights problems. As a result of a change of the Dominican Republic's envoy in Washington was rescheduled to begin on 2 May 1976.

The delegates named were Thomas Jones, an American lawyer from Washington DC and Judge Carro, Judge at the Criminal Court of the City of New York.

Extensive communications had taken place between the AI delegates and the Dominican Republic authorities through its envoy in Washington. However a few days before the mission was due to arrive in Santo Domingo, the Dominican Republic government refused its permission on the grounds that a mission would not be appropriate at that time.

Al wrote to the Ambassador of the Dominican Republic in Washington Dr Horacio Vicioso Soto, on 3 May expressing its disappointment at his government's last minute decision not to allow AI delegates into the country.
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In the letter, AI requested the ambassador to ask his government to advise which date would be considered appropriate for the delegates to visit the country.

A most disturbing and continuing feature of the situation in the Dominican Republic is the re-arrests and mass round-ups of prominent trade unionists and politicians. In June 1975 hundreds of arrests took place following a supposed landing of a nucleus of a guerrilla force lead by Claudio Cano, a well-known politician who had been living in exile. Among those arrested were many former Al-adopted prisoners who were immediately re-adopted. However, the majority of them were soon freed without trial. AI cabled President Joaquin Balaguer on 25 June expressing its concern and urging that the detainees receive the full protection of the law. A news release was issued reporting the situation.

In addition to the Dominican Republic detainees, three Puerto Rican citizens were arrested and charged with having transported the guerrilla force. They were found guilty and sentenced to 30 years' forced labour on the basis of confessions in a trial strongly condemned by observers from the American Civil Liberties Union for its legal irregularities. This was reduced on appeal to 5 years, and subsequently the three prisoners, Angel Gandia, Raul Garcia and Jonny Sampson were pardoned by the President and released on 22 December 1975.

ECUADOR

In the past year, only one new case was taken up by Amnesty International in Ecuador. Dr Julio Cesar Trujillo Vasquez was detained in Quito on 1 May 1975 and accused of slandering the military government. Dr Trujillo Vasquez is the head of the Ecuadorian Conservative Party, as well as a member of the Latin American Parliament. He was not formally charged but was detained in Montalvo military garrison in Ecuador's Amazon region.

AI sent a cable to President Guillermo Rodriguez Lara on 19 June 1975 requesting information on the legal status of the prisoner and asking that procedural guarantees be respected. Dr Trujillo Vasquez was unconditionally released shortly afterwards.

Seven of the nine prisoners taken up by Al prior to the period covered by this report were released during the past year, while groups continue to work for the two remaining political prisoners known to be detained in Ecuador. No allegations of torture or maltreatment have been received.

GRENADA

On 11 June 1975 Amnesty International wrote to Prime Minister Eric Gairy of Grenada expressing the hope that all charges against members of the opposition New Jewel Movement would be dropped. This was in the light of the report of the Duffus Commission of Inquiry into the breakdown of law and order and police brutality in Grenada. As AI stated in the letter:

It is made quite clear by the report that these men were subjected to deliberate harrassment and persecution by the police and that any police evidence against them must be regarded with suspicion . . . the commission completely demolishes the police case against members of the New Jewel Movement, and I urge you to use all your influence to have any proceedings against these men dismissed.

AI has no adopted prisoners in Grenada.
GUATEMALA

Deaths and disappearance resulting from the extra-legal action of paramilitary groups and official security forces continued to dominate Amnesty International work on Guatemala during the period covered by this report.

A dossier detailing 134 cases of political murder in which security forces appeared to be implicated was submitted to the Organization of American States (OAS) Inter-American Commission on Human Rights in June 1975; after prior submission to President Kjell Laugerud failed to elicit response. The dossier dealt with murders which occurred in the first seven months of President Laugerud's regime.

Characteristics differentiating these and other cases of "disappearance" and extra-judicial execution from acts of common criminality include the practice of abducting victims before murder, without requests for ransom, and the high percentage of bodies that are found with marks of torture or mutilation.

Most victims disappeared after abduction by heavily armed bands of men. Peasant smallholders, tenant farmers, members of agricultural cooperatives and landless peasants make up the vast majority of the victims, even if only the criminal antecedents of certain victims, in apparent justification of the percentage of bodies that are found with marks of torture or mutilation.

A total of over 30 campesinos (peasants) "disappeared" from the Xalbal area between 10 June and 7 July last year. Others included Gabriel Carcel Torres, Juan Perez Ramirez and Baltazar Tomas.

The most grave single case of mass detention - by security forces - and disappearance reported this year occurred in the isolated northern Department of Quiche on the cooperative farm Xalbal near the municipality of Chajul. AI has received notarized statements from community representatives of Xalbal reporting the arrests by uniformed army troops of cooperative members Miguel Sales Ordenez, Jose Felipe Sales, Alonso Ortiz and Sebastian Felipe Jimenez. The arrests took place on 7 July 1975 in the Xalbal village market-place. All have since disappeared.

A mission to Guatemala was carried out in April 1976 by two AI delegates. Dr. Kurt Macler of the Max Planck Institute of the Federal Republic of Germany and Michael McClintock of the International Secretariat spoke to members of government and of the legal profession, as well as private indi-
demned in the past, but even where the Haitian authorities have replied to the complaints, the information they have produced has not necessarily corresponded to the allegations and inquiries submitted by, or via, the commission.

On 30 May 1975, AI submitted to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights a list of 74 adoption/investigation cases with the request that the commission use its good offices to persuade the Haitian government to bring these prisoners to trial or order their immediate release. The government responded to the commission’s inquiry on 28 August 1975, but the limited information it provided referred to only one of the list of 74. Maitre Hubert Legros. It claimed that he had been released, but omitted to mention that he had been re-arrested shortly afterwards.

AI urged the commission to seek further information from the Haitian government, whereupon the commission, at its 36th session, 6-24 October 1975, decided to renew its request for an adequate response to AI’s submission. A number of adoption groups have also made use of this commission’s complaints machinery in the case of individual Haitian prisoners.

AI has also been able to provide information for the defence of Haitians in the United States who are threatened with repatriation, identifying the risks that would be involved.

On 22 December 1975, President-for-life Jean Claude Duvalier announced an amnesty for 31 prisoners, sentence reductions for criminal offences and the abolition of capital punishment in favour of life imprisonment with hard labour. AI understands that one prisoner included in the amnesty (an AI adoptee) has been freed, but past experiences of such “amnesties” has shown that prisoners listed are not always released and that some may have been released, or in exile, for some time previously.

In such a difficult situation, AI actions on Haiti have not been able to reach the same level of intensity and efficiency as on more accessible countries.

HONDURAS

Prisoners arrested during a continuing agrarian crisis have been the focus of Amnesty International’s action on Honduras in the past year. Although no individual prisoner cases were taken up, a number of interventions were made over the short term detention of peasants and peasant leaders. The major intervention made by AI was in response to the torture and assassination of nine peasant leaders and sympathizers in Olancho province in June 1975.

The Honduran peasantry - 70% of the population of 2.9 million - owns only a tiny percentage of the cultivable land and has become increasingly desperate since a hurricane in September 1974 devastated much of the productive land, including the great banana plantations that have traditionally dominated the national economy. Subsistence crops were lost, and cropland spoiled by flooding, while peasants reliant on full or part time labour in the banana plantations were left with no source of income. The hurricane was followed by a severe and continuing drought.

Although an agrarian reform law published in January 1975 provided the basis for the redistribution of lands, government reluctance to implement the law, coupled with conditions of near starvation in the countryside, led to increasingly militant demands by peasant federations for an effective agrarian reform. Peasant direct action - squatting on unused but cultivable land - led to massive arrests, as well as violent vigilante counter-action by landlords of the large estates and their armed guards.

On 25 June 1975 the crisis reached its peak when soldiers and armed estate owners attacked the headquarters of the (National Union of Peasants – Unión Nacional de Campesinos – UNC), in Juticalpa, the capital of the cattle ranching province Olancho. Five peasant leaders were killed and a number of leaders and bystanders were detained in the local jail. Among the detained was Father Jerome Cypher, a middle-aged priest from the United States. He was detained in the street in Juticalpa, stripped to his undershorts, beaten, and then taken to the Juticalpa jail.

The following day, Major José Enrique Chinchilla, commander of the Olancho military zone, told the press that most of the prisoners arrested on 25 June had escaped from jail during the night, and some of them had been seen in the nearby hills in the company of the radical Colombian priest Ivan Betancourt, who allegedly was at the head of a band of armed peasant guerrillas. Church authorities and trade unions denounced the killings of 25 June and asked that the missing prisoners be located.

On 8 July AI wrote to President Juan Alberto Melgar Castro to express concern over the reported murder of peasant leaders in Honduras, apparently at the hands of local authorities and armed bands employed by estate owners, and the apparent failure of the authorities to investigate these killings. AI also requested information about the arrest of peasants and peasant leaders in May and June 1975 and presented a list of 85 prisoners for consideration.

The letter referred specifically to disturbing reports that many of the arrests were carried out on the direct instruction of local landowners with a personal interest in agrarian cases.

On 18 July, the bodies of nine persons who disappeared from Juticalpa on 25 June were discovered by a military commission on the estate of Manuel Zalaya, one of Olancho’s wealthiest landowners. All the bodies bore marks of torture. The bodies had been buried in a 20 meter deep well that had been dynamited and bulldozed over. The bodies of Father Jerome Cypher and five UNC leaders who allegedly “escaped” from jail were found with those of Father Ivan Betancourt and two young women who accompanied him at the time of his detention. All had been savagely tortured before being executed with bullets to the head.

The subsequent report of the military commission charged Major José Enrique Chinchilla, subordinate army officers and two local landowners with responsibility for the crime. They were detained prior to trial before a civil court.

On 26 July, AI wrote to all members of the Honduran cabinet to express continuing concern over the grave human rights violations in rural areas. In August 1975, it was learned that most of the peasants and peasant leaders detained over the past months were released following negotiations by representatives of the UNC and other peasant trade union organizations with members of the Supreme Military Council, which is presided over by the Head of State, Colonel Juan Alberto Melgar Castro.

On 4 December AI Secretary General Martin Ennals wrote to President Juan Alberto Melgar Castro to express his recognition of the government’s efforts to resolve the agrarian crisis, including the freeing of the peasant leaders, and the prosecution of those responsible for the Olancho affair. AI also requested information on the current stage of the trial of the 12 men indicted for the murders committed in Olancho.

AI sent a mission to Honduras in May 1976. The delegates were Dr Kurt
police bodies which act in a law-enforcing capacity and which exceed the legal
limits of detention by transferring detainees from one authority to the next.
(This also creates difficulties in tracing missing persons.) Therefore the mission
felt that the Mexican authorities should reduce the number of police forces
and carefully define areas of competence for those remaining.

Given the present situation, reports are often heard about the use of exces-
sive force by the police and army when making arrests, which result in
injury and sometimes death. The failure of the law-enforcing bodies to comply
with the statutory obligation which requires them to have warrants for arrests,
and to present the detainees before a judge within 72 hours of his arrest, has
led to numerous allegations of maltreatment, torture and even disappearances.

The mission considered that torture is virtually encouraged by the prevailing
legal doctrine in Mexico which places undue importance on confessions while
giving little weight to retractions. It was of the opinion that abuses would be
less likely to occur if any statement by a defendant not made before his lawyer
and judge was rendered inadmissible.

It was generally felt that where unconstitutional trial delays occur, the
accused be released automatically.

The mission was convinced that the Political Constitution of the
United States of Mexico provides the basis for the genuine protection
of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all and has assured that
there are many highly placed Mexican officials who are concerned to
make that objective a reality.

On 26 March 1976 a general amnesty was declared for all those implicated
in the student disturbances of 1968 which had culminated in the Tlatelolco
massacre. The amnesty affected about 230 people who were still awaiting trial
five years after the event. This gives an indication of the slow machinery of
Mexican justice.

On 28 April 1976, AI sent urgent cables to the Mexican authorities on
behalf of four students who had been arrested and allegedly beaten in
Querétaro.

AI has adopted one prisoner in Mexico and is investigating five other cases
at present.

NICARAGUA

Torture, arbitrary detention and "disappearance" appear increasingly
characteristic of the human rights situation in Nicaragua. Amnesty Inter-
national is currently studying the cases of more than 100 prisoners detained
in the custody of military courts under the state of siege that has been in force
since December 1974. The state of siege suspends personal guarantees
— including the right to habeas corpus — and permits indefinite administrative
detention incommunicado. Many of these prisoners have alleged periods of
up to four months in complete isolation. Most have allegedly suffered severe
torture.

The state of siege was decreed following a guerrilla assault on a private
house on 27 December 1974 in which high government officials and wealthy
businessmen were present. There were four deaths in the attack, and guerrillas
held the party-goes present hostage until a ransom of reportedly more than
US $1,000,000 was paid. The guerrillas and 18 political prisoners were per-
mitted to fly to Cuba. The guerrillas were members of the Frente Sandinista
de Liberación Nacional (FSLN), a leftwing armed opposition group.

René Núñez Tellez, a 28-year-old engineering student, was one of hundreds
of suspected FSLN sympathizers detained immediately after the 27 December 1974 action. AI appealed on his behalf in August 1975. Detained on 28 December 1974, he had "disappeared" for 123 days, during which time he suffered severe torture. Reliable reports received in August 1975 said that he had received severe head injuries as well as severe fractures.

In October 1975, further AI action on his behalf was taken, following a report by his own doctor that Senor Nunez was in urgent need of intensive medical treatment for tuberculosis: he underwent a lung operation for tuberculosis in 1968.

AI recently received a copy of a doctor's report stating that on 5 January 1975 - one week after the arrest of Rene Nunez - he was brought to Leon hospital by the National Guard and was treated for head wounds and other "diverse injuries".

Senor Nunez had been indicted by the Permanent Military Court of Investigation on the basis of alleged joint responsibility for violent crimes of the FSLN.

Another student who "disappeared" after arrest was Luis Armando Guzman Luna who was detained on 8 August 1975. AI's Campaign for the Abolition of Torture department appealed on 12 September for his safety, but the authorities denied his detention. However, on 28 October 1975, Senor Guzman was suddenly produced as a witness before the Military Court of Investigation. As a witness, he had no right to a defence lawyer. He confessed to having been a collaborator of the FSLN, although not in the 27 December 1974 assault. He was indicted shortly afterwards on charges based on FSLN actions. When he testified a second time, after indictment, he told the court that he could only in part endorse his prior testimony, as he had been in total isolation for over two months. During this time he had been badly tortured. In addition, some of his testimony on that occasion had apparently been wrongly recorded or altered.

The broad range of human rights violations under the state of siege can be largely attributed to the unchecked action of the combined army-police force, the Guardia Nacional. Its commander is President Anastasio Somoza Debayle, who is the third member of his family to occupy the presidency and the command of the Guardia Nacional - a family rule that has lasted over 40 years.

The Guardia Nacional carries out extensive police functions, as well as a major judicial function under the state of siege.

Police action by the Guardia Nacional can broadly be seen as countering the armed opposition movement of the FSLN. But their actions affect a vastly larger population than the small group actively composing and assisting this movement. The unprotected rural population bears the brunt of abuses of human rights incurred as a result of counter-insurgency measures. AI has lists of more than 200 campesinos (peasants) who "disappeared" or were killed, reportedly at the hands of Guardia Nacional troops.

Reports from members of the clergy in remote rural areas - especially in Matagalpa and Nueva Segovia Departments and along the Atlantic coast - describe massive detentions of peasants. Local leaders reportedly are tortured and murdered as a routine method to uncover FSLN guerrillas and to discourage local support. While many allegations have been received of "concentration camps" in these remote areas, AI information indicates that such camps are generally cattle corrals used for the relatively short-term detention of large groups of people.

Prisoners believed to be members or important collaborators of the FSLN
in detention have been adopted by AI. These are Professor Miguel Chase-Sardi, Professor Mauricio Schwartzman, Victorio Suarez and Gloria Estrago. Also arrested were members of the legal opposition Liberal Radical Party who had been outspoken in the press and congress about violations of human rights.

Early in 1976, AI had 63 cases under adoption or investigation. While it could be maintained that the use of torture is general, this does not mean that it is applied systematically. It appears to vary with the place and length of detention or the personality of the jailors. Reports state that prisoners are subject to forms of torture during the first stages of interrogation, which usually take place in the Departamento de Delitos y Vigilancia of the Ministry of Internal Affairs. Following the receipt of torture allegations, two Campaigns for the Abolition of Torture (CAT) actions were issued (December 1975 and January 1976) for members of the Marandu Project and others detained at the same time. In April 1976, following allegations of the discovery of a guerrilla network, the régime denounced the involvement of priests in subversive activities and arrested hundreds of its political opponents. Although the 1967 constitution contains basic human rights' guarantees, this protection has been countered by legislation enabling the executive power to restrict any opposition activity considered to be of a "subversive" character. Furthermore, individual rights may be curtailed under successive states of emergency which have been renewed every three months since the mid-1950's and are lifted only on election days.

On 10 March 1976, AI submitted a complaint to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States, requesting investigation of 55 named cases of arrests or disappearances. This was followed by a news release on 17 March 1976.

Political detainees are only rarely charged or sentenced. An important exception has been the trial of 13 prisoners implicated in the alleged attempted coup of November 1974, all of whom were sentenced in March 1976 to imprisonment and heavy fines. (Most of these are under adoption or investigation.) On 3 March 1976, AI's request for permission to observe the trial was turned down.

Article 149 of the constitution provides Congress with the right to declare an amnesty for any type of prisoner, and article 180 allows the President to commute sentences, but these options have never been used. Releases tend to be as arbitrary as arrests. In some cases a released prisoner may be deported to a neighbouring country. As releases do not follow any formal judicial procedure, the uncertainty adds to the torment in which prisoners live.

A further important aspect of AI group work is relief to families of prisoners of conscience. This material humanitarian aid is most valuable, as poverty is widespread in Paraguay and, if the breadwinner is detained, the family may have no alternative source of support.

PERU

Amnesty International groups continued working for 11 peasants accused of guerrilla activity in Cajamarca Province. Detained between July 1972 and December 1974 under the military Law of Justice, all alleged severe torture and the murder of members of their communities during counter-insurgency campaigns by the Guardia Nacional in mid-1972. All were detained when troops assualted the isolated community of Huarango, and they were forced to confess to actions they had no part in. Following the trial and conviction of 11 by a military court in Lambayeque in March 1975, when sentences ranging from 2 to 9 years were passed, the cases were reviewed by the Research Department and it was decided to adopt them, despite the original charge of violent activities.

President Velasco Alvarado was replaced by General Francisco Morales Bermudez in a coup in August 1975. AI wrote to the new President on 17 September 1975 in order to introduce the work of AI and to express recognition of his decision to decree an unrestricted amnesty for the numerous journalists, trade unionists and political activists exiled during the previous government. AI also suggested that a general amnesty for all political prisoners should be announced on the anniversary of the Peruvian Revolution on 3 October.

On 12 December, AI learned of the incommunicado detention on 4 December of Dr Genaro Ledesma, lawyer and legal advisor to the Peruvian Federation of Mine and Metallurgical Workers. A cable was immediately sent to Minister of the Interior General Cesar Campos Quesada expressing concern at the detention. It was later learned that three other labour lawyers had also been detained and held completely incommunicado. Their whereabouts were unknown even to their families until early January.

On 21 January, AI again cabled President Morales Bermudez expressing concern over the continued detentions of the four. The same day, AI national sections were asked to take immediate action on the case, and a news release was issued. A visit was also made by AI Deputy Secretary General Hans Ehrenströml to the Peruvian Ambassador in London, Adhemar Montagne, who agreed to transmit AI's representations to his government.

The four lawyers were detained in their offices on 4 December by agents of the Peruvian Investigative Police (PIP), whereupon they effectively disappeared, since authorities denied they had been detained. A letter smuggled from the Amazon jungle penal colony of El Sepa to the families of the four in early January was the first indication the four were truly in detention. The letter told how they had been transferred from jail to jail in Lima during their first week in detention—a state of affairs resulting in the rejection of habeas corpus proceedings by civil courts, as it could not be proven the four were in custody. They were finally taken to El Sepa by a military aircraft.

AI also took action on the related cases of Victor Cuadros and Hernan Cuentas, leaders of the National Federation of Mine and Metallurgical Workers. Although information on their cases was received much later, they were detained at about the same time as the labour lawyers and received similar treatment. They were transferred to three different Lima police stations. On 25 February, after three months' incommunicado detention, the wives of the prisoners learned that their husbands had been on hunger strike since 21 February. They eventually located the two in the Lima Police Hospital, but their insistence on seeing their husband resulted in the removal of the two very sick men from hospital and their immediate transfer to El Sepa.

On 11 March, AI cabled President Morales Bermudez requesting immediate presidential intervention to guarantee the hunger strikers' proper medical attention. AI also requested the immediate release of Señor Cuadros and Señor Cuentas, as well as other trade unionists and labour lawyers detained without charge.

On 25 March, AI issued a news release reporting the receipt of a letter from...
the four detained labour lawyers announcing they were joining the hunger strike begun by Hernan Cuestas and Víctor Cuadros. Shortly afterwards, the six hunger strikers were returned to Lima where they received medical attention. All adopted the six detained trade unionists and the five trade union legal advisers. During April and May all nine adopted trade unionists and legal advisers were released in an amnesty. A total of 14 Peruvian prisoners are currently under adoption or investigation by groups.

EL SALVADOR

No prisoners of conscience were taken up by Amnesty International in El Salvador during the period covered by this report. Allegations of human rights violations were infrequent, but severe.

A list of four cases of men allegedly in detention whose arrest was denied by security forces. As beatings and severe maltreatment had been reported by former prisoners prior to 1975 – and by a Roman Catholic priest who was briefly detained in early 1975 – there was considerable concern for their well-being. None of the men has been located, and AI is continuing to seek a clarification of their situation.

One of the four, Carlos Mauricio Carballo, was the elected community leader of the “22nd of April” Colony, a shanty-town housing some 1,000 families on the outskirts of San Salvador. Señor Carballo was carrying out negotiations with the city administration on behalf of the community members to buy land. Señor Carballo reportedly left the community on 13 August 1975 for the mayor’s office in downtown San Salvador to discuss the land question and never returned. Five days before, his home had been visited by five men some of whom were said to have been members of the parapolitical organization Orden (Spanish for “order”) – an organization headed by President Arturo Armando Molina that parallels the official government party Partido de Conciliación Nacional. Orden has members throughout El Salvador and a daily radio program. Members of the opposition in El Salvador credit Orden with a para-police or para-military role in which armed civilian members use minor violence against political opposition members and work in support of official security forces. Since August 1975, there have been rumours that Señor Carballo is in the custody of the National Guard. A writ of habeas corpus was unsuccessful in locating him in any place of detention.

By far the most serious human rights violation occurred on 30 July 1975. A student demonstration protesting alleged police brutality the week before on the branch campus of the National University at Santa Ana was trampled on an elevated highway bridge by security forces and fired upon. One student was officially acknowledged to have died there. But a dossier presented by AI to Salvadorean authorities in May 1976 listed 21 students seen dead or dying on the scene who “disappeared” after being removed in ambulances by security forces. Although writs of habeas corpus were presented in almost all of the cases, none of the 21 have been located.

A Mission composed of Dr Kurt Madlener of the Max Planck Institute of the Federal Republic of Germany and Michael McClintock of the International
of AI court hearings concerning Dennis Banks, a well-known native American activist and a leader of the American Indian Movement (AIM). Mr Banks faced charges of possessing firearms and explosives, but he denied the charges and attributed his arrest to police harassment because of his work for AIM. All charges against Mr Banks in Oregon were dismissed by the court prior to trial. But in July 1975 he was convicted on a charge of "assault with a deadly weapon without intent to kill" in South Dakota. He is now in California awaiting a hearing for extradition to South Dakota.

On 7 May 1976 AI Secretary General Martin Ennals appealed to US Attorney General Edward Levi on behalf of Joanna Le Deaux, an American Indian woman imprisoned because of her refusal to testify to a grand jury. In the letter the Secretary General wrote:

"I urge you to consider that Joanna Le Deaux should be at least temporarily released from prison on humanitarian grounds, until the birth of her child, bearing in mind that she has not been imprisoned for a criminal offence but as a result of her conscientious refusal to testify to a Grand Jury."

On 25 May 1976 a reply to this letter was received from Norman A. Carlson, Director of the US Bureau of Prisons. Mr Carlson said that Joanna Le Deaux had been released for the birth of her child and would not be returned to prison.

AI groups are working on eight cases of American prisoners. Other cases are being investigated by the Research Department. It is impossible to estimate the number of political prisoners in the US. People are not officially imprisoned because of their political views or actions, or because of their ethnic origin. But in some cases it is difficult to avoid the suspicion that an individual's imprisonment may be due to his political actions, rather than to the crime which he or she is alleged to have committed.

URUGUAY

Despite persistent and extensive violations of human rights in Uruguay, the country attracted little international attention until the end of 1975. The fact that the military takeover was gradual (a civilian president has been maintained) obscured the progressive erosion of civil liberties.

Since the dissolution of Congress on 27 June 1973, there has been a severe restriction on any form of organized opposition to the regime. All left-of-center parties were banned and all political activity and press freedom were severely curtailed. All public servants, including teachers, had to take the "oath of democratic faith", to demonstrate that they have never belonged to any of the organizations now banned by the government, or to any organization which has attacked the existing system of government.

In such a situation, the numbers of detained peaceful dissenters have increased dramatically. Up to 1973, the majority of political prisoners were members of (or were accused of being connected with) the Movimiento de Liberacion Nacional (MILN - National Liberation Movement) Tupamaros urban guerrilla organization. However, since then, their proportional number in the total of political prisoners has sharply decreased, and the majority nowadays belong to non-violent political factions, including the right-of-center, traditional Nacional-Blanco (White) and Colorado (Red) parties, the Christian Democrats, Socialists, populists and various leftwing organizations, notably the Communist Party.

The Communist Party (banned December 1973) has recently become the principal target of repression. After initially arresting only the leaders, the security forces intensified persecution to include the cadres, which were particularly hit by the wave of arrests that took place at the end of October and during November 1975. Between 400 and 500 people were arrested, mainly in Montevideo. Following government allegations of communist preparations for armed insurrection, some 300 further arrests took place in late January and February 1976, throughout the country. Re-arrested in January 1976 was General Liber Seregni, the populist presidential candidate of the Frente Amplio in the last elections (1971).

The total number of political prisoners has been estimated at between 3,000 (Newsweek, 2 June 1975) and 6,000 (exile sources: Punto, Caracas, November 1975). Amnesty International assesses the present number at approximately 5,000. In December 1975, it could be said that one in every 500 citizens was in political detention, and an average of one in every 50 citizens has suffered interrogation or short-term detention in recent years. Uruguay therefore has the highest per capita ratio of political prisoners in Latin America.

The number of cases under adoption or investigation by AI has almost tripled since April 1975 and now stands at 174. Relief sent to prisoners' families has also increased. However, the alarming increase in human rights violation in Uruguay required a major organization effort over and above normal adoption work, and a worldwide campaign against torture in Uruguay was launched on 20 February 1976 (for details see Campaign for the Abolition of Torture section). Extensive documentation and background material were prepared for this campaign, which involved the participation not only of all levels of AI's membership, but also of numerous other international non-governmental organizations and interested individuals. News releases were issued in the course of the campaign and these received extensive coverage throughout the world.

On 19 February, Uruguayan Foreign Minister Juan Carlos Blanco, denounced the campaign at a major news conference. This was followed by a series of editorials and leading articles in the government-controlled Uruguayan media accusing AI of being an "instrument" of international communism. The articles presented a distorted picture of AI.

Rapidly escalating repression, plus the postponement of national elections, stimulated a wider dissent, not only among the small civilian sector of the ruling elite, but also among the military. Reports in April 1976 said that approximately 100 officers had been arrested.

Information received by AI indicates that the use of torture has become routine in nearly all cases of political imprisonment. Furthermore, this quantitative intensification has been accompanied by increasingly brutal methods, leading to a high number of deaths as a consequence of torture. AI printed a list of 22 people who had died under torture between May 1972 and November 1975, and this was distributed widely in the course of the campaign. However, by June 1976, nine additional cases were reported.

Number 20 on this list was Alvaro Balbi, a 32-year-old student of medicine and amateur musician who was married with four children and whose wife was again pregnant. He was arrested with others at a meeting to discuss a housing cooperative on 29 July 1975 and died a few hours later. The official explanation that his death was the result of an attack of asthma (the first he had ever suffered) was unconvincing in view of the clear evidence of
torture: fractures, ruptured liver, burns and multiple bruises. There were indications that he died under the “submarine” method of torture (semi-asphyxiation by immersion in a tank of water). A formal denunciation presented by his father, Selmar Balbi (a prominent teacher and trade union leader) was ignored by the judiciary. However, the father’s open letter to President Juan Maria Bordaberry, seeking justice, was translated into several languages and widely circulated by AI.

As the use of torture has become so generalized, CAT appeals have been issued at an average rate of one every month between April 1975 and the beginning of the campaign in February 1976, and many have been for large categories of detainees, sometimes grouped by profession (dock-workers, doctors, etc). Included in these urgent actions (and subsequently adopted) was the eminent Uruguayan mathematician, former parliamentarian and Communist Party leader José Luis Massera, arrested on 22 October 1975 and tortured.

Prior to the campaign, in a letter to President Bordaberry dated 8 December 1975, AI suggested that an independent investigative commission be allowed into Uruguay to discuss allegations of torture. No response has yet been received, although this initiative has been supported by a petition signed by 350,000 people, from countries all over the world calling upon the Uruguayan government to allow an independent investigation.

The impact of the campaign has undoubtedly been considerable, and its effects are now reaching governmental circles in several countries. Members of European, South and North American legislatures have noted the situation of human rights in Uruguay with growing concern.

To date, few of the cases taken up by AI have been released, and release is often followed by re-arrest. More alarmingly, in recent months, those accused of membership of an illegal organization – in some cases, even prior to prescription – are being charged with “subversive association” and given maximum sentences (6-18 years).

Lately, Uruguayan political refugees in Argentina have been brutally harassed. Four Uruguayans, including two prominent parliamentarians, Senator Zelmar Michelini and the former speaker of the Chamber of Deputies, Hector Gutiérrez Ruiz, were abducted in Buenos Aires in May 1976 and found assassinated two days later. Furthermore, more than 11 bodies have been found badly mutilated in the River Plate. It is feared that certain “hard line” sectors of the Uruguayan regime have been connected with these murders (see section on Argentina).

VENEZUELA

Venezuela took measures towards improving human rights both domestically and on the international level during the past year. The Venezuelan delegation played an outstanding role in supporting United Nations resolution 3452 (XXX) concerning the protection of all persons against torture and other forms of ill-treatment, which was adopted by the General Assembly on 9 December 1975.

In recent years Amnesty International has received many allegations of severe torture in Venezuela. These allegations referred specifically to interrogation methods of the DISIP (División de Inteligencia Policial – Police Intelligence Division), the PTI (Policía Técnica Judicial – Technical Judicial Police) and the DIM (División de Inteligencia Militar – Division of Military Intellige-
Asia

The most significant event in Asia last year was the imposition of a national state of emergency in India in June 1975, which the government claimed was necessary because of "internal disturbances". There were mass arrests, and at least 40,000 people are estimated to be detained without trial for political reasons under the emergency regulations.

The government introduced wide ranging legislation, including constitutional amendments, which barred the courts from questioning the President's reasons for declaring a state of emergency. It also changed the law relating to preventive detention, removing the right of prisoners to be informed of the grounds for their arrest, and the right to make appeals against detention to the courts. It further made it an offence for anyone to disclose the grounds for detention, even to the courts. This was a regrettable development because India has had a tradition of supporting international initiatives to protect human rights.

The massive scale of arrests in India presents problems for the work of Amnesty International similar to those of a country like Indonesia, where large numbers of people are detained without trial. In its work for prisoners in such countries, the Research Department has developed its initiatives on several levels. The central feature is case adoption of known prisoners of conscience. Combined with this, there are programs of broad-based international initiatives designed to influence governments to release large groups of prisoners. This work is supported by missions to Asian countries to explain the work of AI and to seek general amnesties.

A different set of problems is encountered in AI's work for prisoners of conscience in the communist countries of Asia. In the countries of Indochina, the end of war in 1975 has been followed by internal social adjustments described as "national reconstruction". There are reportedly cases of violations of human rights: the allegations regarding Cambodia are the most prominent. Regarding China, more is being learned about the legal system and treatment of political dissenters, although examples of individual cases are not available for AI's adoption work.

It may be said that, in general, information regarding individual cases of deprivation of human rights is not freely available in some of these countries, and this presents real difficulties for AI's work for prisoners of conscience. The most extreme example is the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, where there is almost total suppression of information relating to human rights. It is a high priority of the Research Department to develop its level of work in these areas. Diplomatic initiatives and research projects are planned to determine the institutional structure of imprisonment in a number of communist countries. A number of general features about political imprisonment in Asia may be
mentioned. In numbers, there are more political prisoners in Asia than in the rest of the world. Apart from the widespread social effect in countries which deprive their national communities of so much of the talent and abilities of people kept in prison, the maintenance of prison systems to cope with vast numbers of prisoners imposes severe strains on the administration of Asian countries. One effect is that people become literally "lost" in prisons.

It is not uncommon to find patterns of governmental and administrative laxity which lead to arrests of tens of thousands of people following some political incident. Many of those arrested are merely victims of circumstance who happened to be at the wrong place at the wrong time. They are often without any political motivation which could have been regarded by the arresting authorities as justifying detention.

The beating up of such "suspects" during interrogation is commonplace in most Asian countries. Increasingly, there is employment of "sophisticated" torture techniques, including application of electric shock and beating designed to leave no visible scars. Commonly, after pointless interrogation, the "suspect" is thrown into prison and his case file becomes lost in a maze of administrative inefficiency and incompetence. Such prisoners find themselves kept for very many years in captivity without justifiable cause. The most unhappy example is Indonesia, where more than 55,000 prisoners, and perhaps as many as 100,000, are now in their 11th year of imprisonment. Denial of justice of this kind affecting thousands is common throughout Asia.

In most countries of Asia constitutional provisions for human rights are defined in ways which are not specific enough for effective application. But even these constitutional safeguards are eroded almost everywhere by extraordinary enactments and by decrees which permit wide ranging human rights violations by the authorities. In virtually every country, human rights provisions are overridden by decrees issued under martial law administration, by special enactments under states of emergency or by "normal" legislative enactments supposedly intended to preserve "internal security".

Thus, presidential decrees in the Republic of Korea and in the Philippines actually removed constitutional safeguards. Emergency regulations, preventive detention laws, special ordinances relating to internal security, constitute serious violations of human rights in India, Pakistan, Malaysia and Singapore. In all the Asian countries which had once been subject to British rule, there are legislative enactments based on those of the colonial period which allow for preventive detention without trial.

Moreover, even constitutional and legal provisions are irrelevant, for example in Indonesia, where long term detention of prisoners without trial is covered by presidential decree in the form of instructions to the military forces supervising by a national security agency, therefore rendering detention completely outside the legal-constitutional process, and making it simply one of military administration.

In many countries, prisoners are prosecuted in political show trials on trumped-up charges, and sentenced to further long periods of imprisonment in addition to the many years already served in prison without trial. It should be remembered that even this is irrelevant in the case of the vast majority of prisoners, where it is normal practice for them to be detained without trial according to rules which are formally "legal", and which in many instances contravene legal provisions of the country.
of its functions acts with integrity and faith in ordinary principles of justice. Nor is it common for the legal profession of most Asian countries to take a strong public position against persistent erosion of civil liberties. In some countries, prisoners can only secure their release through the payment of large bribes. In Indonesia, for example, the amount of the "normal" bribe is widely known and subject to bargaining. Following release, prisoners are often kept under house arrest. Many prisoners are only released conditionally, under constant threat of being returned to prison if they incur the authorities' displeasure. Examples are "temporary release" in the Philippines and the "suspension" of heavy sentences in the Republic of Korea.

Although administrative breakdown is a widespread feature of political imprisonment in Asia, it has become so only because of government actions in ordering large scale arrests and continuing to keep in prison people who should be free.

**BANGLADESH**

Martial law was imposed in Bangladesh on 15 August 1975 following the assassination of President Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. The new government was itself ousted by a military coup on 3 November 1975, and this second new regime in turn was overthrown by a military counter-coup four days later. Through these events, a number of leading Bangladeshi figures were killed.

Many political prisoners were reportedly released, although others were arrested and trials began before martial law tribunals. Immediately after the overthrow of President Mujibur Rahman, the new government under President Khondkar Mushitaq Ahmed retained the constitution but made its provisions subject to the martial law proclamation and regulations. The government also announced that human rights would be recognized at every level. It started a modest process of liberalization, which included the lifting of bans on certain papers and the release of approximately 1,000 political prisoners on 4 October. These included a number of persons still held on charges of collaboration with the Pakistan army in 1971.

The government also commuted the death sentences on certain prisoners and promised the release of all those who were seriously ill, or were below 16 and above 55 years. But at least 29 officials of the Mujibur Rahman government were also arrested, including five members of parliament and seven former ministers.

On 27 August, Amnesty International sent a cable to the government expressing concern about these arrests and at the introduction of the death penalty, also under martial law regulations, for crimes including corruption and possession of arms. AI expressed regret at the decision to try civilians before martial law tribunals and requested an assurance that trials be open and that the defendants have full rights of defence and appeal.

On 3 November, a second military coup took place, which removed the group of young army officers who appeared to be in power since the killing of the late President. On the night of 2/3 November preceding the coup, four of Sheikh Mujibur Rahman's former closest associates were killed in Dacca Central Jail, an incident unprecedented in the history of Bangladesh. They included two former Prime Ministers: Tajuddin Ahmed and Mansur Ali. AI called President Mohammad Sajem, who had assumed office after the killings, and requested that the new government take immediate steps to guarantee the full safety and protection of all persons under detention for political reasons. This appeal was released to the news media. AI also expressed its support for the commission of inquiry announced by the new government "to investigate the jail incident and to inquire into the circumstances under which some of the criminals were given safe passage out of the country". But AI has not received any information that the committee announced to have been set up, consisting of Supreme Court judges, did actually start functioning.

Le Monde of 13 November 1975 reported that it had been formally disbanded.

A counter-coup by the armed forces took place four days later, on 7 November 1975. Justice A. M. Sajem remained in power as Head of State and became Chief Martial Law Administrator. Martial law remained in force and a series of Martial Law Amendment Regulations were promulgated by the new régime. The Martial Law Fourth Amendment Regulation of 1975, taking effect from 2 November, provides punishment for any activity prejudicial to the defence, security or inter-service code, or any other anti-state activity. Persons found guilty of such offences may be sentenced to imprisonment up to life and may even be sentenced to death.

The Martial Law Seventh Amendment Regulation of 1976, promulgated on 8 January 1976, makes it a punishable offence to criticize the imposition, operation or the continuation of martial law, and to create disaffection towards any of the martial law administrators. Offenders can be punished with imprisonment up to 10 years. Martial law tribunals were set up to try offences punishable under martial law. These are summary tribunals, consisting of one military judge, and special martial law courts, headed by a sessions judge or a military officer not below the rank of lieutenant colonel. Of the other two members, only one has to be a magistrate.

So far, AI has received reports that only three officials serving under the Mujibur Rahman administration have been sentenced by martial law courts. They received terms ranging from 5 years to life imprisonment on charges of corruption and misappropriation of wealth. AI wrote to President Sajem on 30 April 1976 to ask for a transcript of their trial before the martial law courts. The letter also referred to the Martial Law Amendment Regulations made by the new government, especially the limitations on constitutional guarantees for freedom of speech and conscience. The wide definitions used in both amendments, AI argued, would open the possibility for misuse by the detaining authorities for personal or political ends, and would thus contravene article 9 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. AI expressed deep concern that such severe punishment as the death penalty could be imposed for offences of a political nature, and urged that the government consider repealing these provisions before the elections scheduled for 1977.

On 7 November 1975, President Sajem had announced that political prisoners who had been detained for reasons of political ideology would be released without delay. And on 11 November, some prominent political prisoners, including Major Abdul Jalil and Abdur Rahim, both leaders of the Jatiya Samajtantrik Dal, whose cases were being investigated by AI, were released. On 5 December 1975, AI wrote to the President and all civilian members of the Council of Advisers to the government, congratulating the government on the amnesty and requesting details of the review committee which had been set up to examine the cases of political prisoners against whom criminal
BHUTAN

According to information received by Amnesty International, 21 persons are still detained in Bhutan on charges connected with an alleged conspiracy to assassinate King Jigme Singye Wangchuk (see Annual Report 1974/1975). Death sentences on six have been commuted to life imprisonment. There have been serious allegations of torture and at least two persons are believed to have died as a result of maltreatment and lack of medical attention.

In September 1975 Al prepared a summary of information concerning the situation of those detained in Bhutan. Andrew Blaine, Al's representative to the United Nations and a member of the International Executive Committee, met with the Bhutanese ambassador to the United Nations on 17 March 1976. He presented the summary and asked that it be transmitted to his government for comment.

Unfortunately, there has been no official response from the Bhutanese authorities to an earlier representation made to the Bhutanese embassy in New Delhi in March 1975 by Muntaz Soysal, a Turkish lawyer and member of the International Executive Committee.

BRUNEI

Over the past year Amnesty International groups have continued to press for the release of 26 adopted political detainees in Brunei. Since September 1974, when the Sultan of Brunei, Hassanal Bolkiah Muizzaddin Waddaulah, announced the setting up of a special advisory committee to review the cases of the detainees, a total of 23 of 49 adopted prisoners have been released. All the released prisoners have taken oaths of loyalty to the Sultan and to the government of Brunei.

Most of the 26 men have been held without trial for over 12 years. They are members of the Parlii Rakyat (People's Party) who were detained following the suppression of a revolt organized by the Parlii Rakyat in December 1962. They have never been brought to trial, and they are held under emergency orders which have been in force since 1962.

Individual Al groups continue to write to the Sultan welcoming the releases as they take place. They also urge the release of the men who remain in detention.

BURMA

Rangoon University was again the scene of unrest in June 1975 only a few months after the university had re-opened following demonstrations at the funeral of United Nations Secretary General U Thant in December 1974. On 11 June, 213 students were reported to have been arrested, and the university was again closed.

According to reports in September 1975, military tribunals had sentenced those who had participated in the June riots to terms ranging from 10 to 14 years' imprisonment and several hundred students received sentences of between 4 and 7 years.

At the end of March 1976, 2,000 students demonstrated in Rangoon at the continued detention of some of their colleagues. A student leader, Tin Maung U, was arrested at this time and reports on 4 April said that a special tribunal had been set up to try him.

PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

In July 1975, the Research Department presented a program of research and diplomatic initiatives to the International Executive Committee, based on existing information in Amnesty International's files on specific features of political imprisonment in the People's Republic of China. Al has now designed a number of non-public initiatives and also a research project to determine the institutional structure of imprisonment in China. As a result of these research initiatives, more information has become available during the last 12 months on "reform-through-labour" and the legal system, revealing some of the features described below.

In January 1975, the Fourth National Congress of the People's Republic of China, meeting for the first time since 1964, adopted a new constitution which replaced the constitution of 1954. Chapter 3 of the new constitution is devoted to the "Fundamental Rights and Duties of the Citizens", of which the basic principles are defined in articles 26: "The fundamental rights and duties of citizens are to support the leadership of the Communist Party of China, support the socialist system and abide by the constitution and the laws of the People's Republic of China". However, article 28 of the new constitution, which deals with fundamental rights such as "freedom of speech, correspondence, the press, assembly . . . . freedom to believe in religion . . . ." etc, added...
Svenska Dagbladet, after he was permitted along with other foreign journalists to visit a prison in Shenyang (Liaoning province) in 1972. Members of the prison administration classified the prison's 2,000 prisoners into non-political cases and "counter-revolutionary" cases. The latter category was further divided into "historical counter-revolutionaries" (people who worked for the former Kuomintang régime, for the wartime Japanese occupation forces, or other foreign agents before 1949), and "modern counter-revolutionaries". These are "people who are still affected by bourgeoisie ideas, dreaming of re-establishing capitalism and overthrowing the socialist system".

As appears to be the rule in all prisons and labour camps in China, a strong emphasis is given to the "reform" of prisoners, who daily spend one or two hours in their cells. Ingemar Lindmarker reported that torture is forbidden. In the Shenyang prison, the most severe punishment, that followed an attempt to flee, consisted of a fortnight in solitary confinement with "hand-shackles". The prison administration admitted to the visitors that "opposition" existed among the prisoners, taking for instance the form of "sabotage against production by destroying machines".

In serious cases, the prison administration may present a demand to the judicial authority to increase the sentence. On the other hand "good behaviour" may result in a reduction of sentence. This follows a directive from Chairman Mao Tse-tung, which says: "Mildness will meet all who confess their crimes, but severe punishment for those who refuse to confess and who continue to commit crimes."

On 5 April 1976 supporters of late Premier Chou En-lai gathered in Peking's Tian An Men Square in a demonstration in memory of the prime minister. Funeral wreaths and poems with political overtones were put on the Monument to the People's Heroes. During the demonstrations clashes seem to have occurred between militia and some demonstrators. Later the New China News Agency reported that a group of people had been arrested. The report, dated 7 April 1976, said that "active criminals and major suspects" were detained, some of whom "hurriedly handed over their daggers, knives and notebooks on which they had copied the reactionary poems".

On 17 May 1976, Al wrote to Prime Minister Hua Guo-feng to inquire about these arrests. Al noted that according to the news agency some of the people arrested may have used violence against militia men or police guards who were present at Tian An Men Square. But Al expressed its concern that people who merely posted poems on the Monument to the People's Heroes and were non-violent demonstrators may have been arrested as well.

REPUBLIC OF CHINA (TAIWAN)

In May 1975, Amnesty International sent a mission to the Republic of China (Taiwan) to inquire into a nationwide commutation of prisoners' sentences ordered by Prime Minister Chiang Ching-kuo in memory of his late father, President Chiang Kai-shek. Dr James Seymour, the American professor delegated by Al, had extensive talks with Minister of Justice Wang Jen-yuan and other officials of the Republic of China (ROC) and discussed particular cases and groups of cases of political prisoners in which Al had taken an interest. Dr Seymour was told in particular that, under the commutation, death sentences would be reduced to life imprisonment and lesser sentences would be cut by a third or a half. The proposed amnesty, only the second in Taiwan since 1949, would apply to all prisoners, thus including for the first time
political prisoners.

Following the mission, AI wrote to Prime Minister Chiang Ching-kuo on 1 July 1975, welcoming the act of clemency and urging the Prime Minister to reconsider a number of restrictions attached to the amnesty. AI noted that the "Statute for Commutation in 1975", which was to become effective on 14 July, specifically excluded certain categories of "criminals". For example, "those who joined the Chinese Communist Party and committed the crimes described in item 1, article 2 of the Statute for the Punishment of Rebellion" should not be granted commutation on the basis of the "current basic anti-communist national policy".

AI subsequently requested details on the procedures by which individual cases were to be assessed for the commutation and recommended full observance of the provisions for individual rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Republic of China Constitution of 1947, which are now under permanent abrogation by martial law in Taiwan.

AI urged that the restriction of article 4 of the statute, which made the commutation conditional, be dropped and recommended that the "right to leave any country" guaranteed by article 1(2) of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and by article 10 of the ROC constitution under "freedom of residence" be applied to released prisoners. When the law was implemented, it appeared that some of these restrictions were lifted in at least a number of individual cases.

In July, some 7,600 prisoners were released, among whom less than 200 were political prisoners, and a smaller number had their sentence reduced without qualifying for release. In August, AI learned from official sources how the commutation affected some investigation and adoption cases. Of 35 prisoners, 13 were released on 14 July, eight were reported to have been released earlier and 23 had their sentence reduced by one-third. A few other cases remained unclear; four well-known political prisoners in particular seemed to have been excluded from the commutation.

However, on 15 September 1975, these four detainees and four other prisoners appeared in a military court in Taipei for appeal hearings reported to have been initiated by the prosecution. James Seymour again went to Taiwan to observe the trial, which took place in Taipei from 15 to 20 September 1975. Although he was not allowed to attend the trial, which was held in camera, Dr Seymour learned from official and private sources that the eight defendants received reductions in their sentence. As of September 1975, the remaining term to be served was well under two years for all of them.

This appeal trial was interpreted by many observers as a further sign of the "liberalization" which the government seemed to have initiated with the announcement of the amnesty measure in April 1975. There were reports that talks were going on abroad between ROC officials and representatives of the Taiwanese exile community. In Taiwan itself a monthly magazine, the Taiwan Political Review, which carried articles reflecting an independent political line, was allowed publication in August 1975. There was speculation that further change towards liberalization could culminate with the elections to the Legislative Yuan (Taiwan legislative body) which were to take place at the end of December 1975.

However, on 23 October Pai Ya-tsan, a candidate for one of the supplementary seats in the Legislative Yuan elections, was arrested after publishing a leaflet as a campaign statement. The leaflet, which consisted of 29 questions addressed to Premier Chiang Ching-kuo with the request that he answered these questions publicly, covered matters of foreign policy as well as internal issues. It urged the Prime Minister, for example, to abolish martial law and to release all political prisoners in Taiwan. Several other people were also arrested in connection with the printing of the leaflet, but were released after questioning during the following weeks.

Reports in February 1976 said that Pai Ya-tsan had been sentenced to life imprisonment in November during a trial held in camera by a military court, and confirmation was received from official sources. AI sent a cable to President Yen Chia-kan, urging him to grant Mr Pai an open retrial with full rights of defence, as had been previously asked in an earlier appeal in December. Mr Pai was sentenced for "plotting to overthrow the government", a charge falling under the Statute for the Punishment of Rebellion. This statute was drawn up in the context of martial law and effectively provides for the suppression of all dissent.

Further indications of political tightening were given by the banning from publication of the Taiwan Political Review for a year after the elections for the Legislative Yuan had been held on 20 December 1975, and by several "exemplary" executions of common criminals in January and February 1976.

In September 1975, appeals were sent by AI groups and national sections on behalf of Hsieh Te'ing-min, a well-known editor adopted by AI, who was reported to need urgent medical attention as a result of torture inflicted on him after he was arrested in 1971. In March 1976, as reports reached AI that he had not yet been granted access to hospital, a further appeal on his behalf was sent by AI to Premier Chiang Ching-kuo. Other prisoners, allegedly tortured during interrogation period and whose health is reported to have seriously deteriorated after several years in prison without proper medical attention, have also been the object of appeals and campaigns in 1975-76.

AI groups with Taiwanese prisoners are currently working on some 80 adoption and investigation cases. Group inquiries often remain unanswered, except in a few cases where the ROC authorities have been responsive or when contact was established with private sources in or outside Taiwan. In spite of the releases which took place during the summer of 1975, it is believed that several hundred political prisoners are still detained in Taiwan. However, estimates of the total number of political detainees vary from 200-300, according to sources close to the government, to several thousands, according to Taiwanese abroad.

INDIA

The large scale arrest of members of all opposition parties in India (except the Communist Party), which followed the declaration of a national state of emergency on 26 June 1975, was perhaps the most significant event of the year in terms of human rights in Asia. The state of emergency was declared because of "internal disturbances". It added a new dimension to the emergency declared for external reasons which had existed since the Bangladesh war in 1971.

The declaration followed a growing anti-corruption campaign led by the widely respected veteran politician Jaya Prakash Narayne, a follower of Mahatma Gandhi, which had attracted support from most opposition parties. The immediate cause for the imposition of the emergency was a call by the
the Parliament in April 1976. He stated:

"The number of persons detained under emergency legislation was recently summed up by the Home Minister Brahmananda Reddy when presenting his annual report to Parliament. He stated:"

"the number of persons detained under emergency legislation was recently summed up by the Home Minister Brahmananda Reddy when presenting his annual report to Parliament. He stated:"

On the day following the emergency declaration, 27 June, Amnesty International made a public appeal to Prime Minister Indira Gandhi to free all political prisoners arrested under the MISA. In a cable, AI said the arrests constituted a "departure from the long standing traditions of democracy in India". AI national sections visited Indian embassies to express their concern. One month later, on 16 July 1975, AI proposed to Foreign Minister Y. B. Chavan that an AI mission should visit India to discuss the measures taken under the emergency. However, no response has yet been received.

On learning of the first arrests, the Research Department began to collect data on individual prisoners as the basis for a large scale adoption program.
AI groups are now working for 120 adopted prisoners, a figure which is expected to rise in the near future.

On 6 October 1975, five members of parliament presented a report to Minister of Home Affairs Brahmananda Reddy requesting an independent inquiry into reports that political prisoners had been seriously beaten in New Delhi's Tihar Jail on 2 October. On 8 October, AI launched an urgent action campaign through its national sections asking parliamentarians to send telegrams to the minister requesting that a full and independent inquiry be made into allegations of ill-treatment.

The Indian authorities have shown considerable sensitivity in the face of these approaches.

In August, in an interview with Socialist India, Prime Minister Gandhi charged that AI was “very active in the hate India campaign”. Deputy Secretary General Hans Ehrenstrale, in a letter of 15 August, replied that the work of AI was well known to the Indian government. He said AI was concerned about the detention of political prisoners in all countries, irrespective of political, ideological or geographical considerations. “Any suggestion that we are engaged in a hate campaign against any country is totally unfounded”, he said. But on 19 September the Prime Minister charged that AI was among the organizations “not at all worried about events in countries under open authoritarian rule where people were killed, but raised its voice if some people were detained”.

The strict censorship regulations in force, by prohibiting publication of news on political imprisonment, have encouraged widely varying unofficial estimates of the numbers detained, which range as high as 175,000. Government claims that many detainees have been released are certainly true. Equally, although there is no comprehensive official figure for arrests under the emergency, the government has conceded that a large number of political prisoners remain in detention.

On 23 August 1975, Minister of Information V. C. Shukla stated that the total of arrests since the emergency did not exceed 10,000. He claimed that the majority of arrests since the emergency had been made among economic offenders, of which a number were arrests made on purely political grounds. In one of India's 22 states, Maharashtra, alone, Chief Minister S. B. Chavan stated on 17 November 1975 that 3,000 persons remained in detention out of the 13,000 originally arrested in that state.

But large scale arrests continued to take place over the year. More recent examples include the arrest of thousands of persons taking part in a satyagraha (non-violent) program which was initiated in November 1975, the arrest of 16,000 persons in West Bengal, mainly trade unionists, and on 6 January 1976 for participating in strikes against the government's Bonus Act, and the arrest of hundreds of opposition members in Tamil Nadu following the recent imposition of president's rule on 31 January 1976. Most recently, Minister of State for Home Affairs Om Mehta announced on 17 May the arrest of more than 7,000 people in a government move to stop circulation of clandestine literature opposing the emergency.

On the basis of these and other official figures made in various states, AI is certain that a minimum of 40,000 persons are now detained without trial under emergency regulations for political reasons, although many more may actually be held. Reports by independent observers, estimating the total of...
INDONESIA

The treatment of political prisoners in Indonesia continues to show a consistent pattern of gross and persistent violation of basic human rights. More than 55,000 prisoners, perhaps as many as 100,000, remain in prison, held without charge or trial since 1965. Despite a small number of releases in the past year, the continuing drift of government policy continues to leave the vast number of prisoners without any prospect of release.

The government denies the problem by insisting that there are no political prisoners in Indonesia. Prosecutor General Ali Said told a news conference in December 1975 that the people detained since 1965 were “criminal detainees”. He said they were not detained because they were members of the banned Communist Party of Indonesia (PKI), but because they were suspected of involvement in the “attempted coup” in 1965. The prosecutor general did not explain why the prisoners have not been charged or tried even though they are now in their 11th year of captivity.

One year ago, the government re-designated political prisons “rehabilitation centers”, but it has still not made public any program which would constitute a release or rehabilitation process.

The authorities state that they only intend to try about 2,000 detainees whom they classify as “category A” prisoners. Of the remaining tens of thousands, the government has consistently declared that it does not have evidence which could be used in court to establish those offences allegedly committed by the prisoners. The trials of the “category A” prisoners continue at an extremely slow rate. Since 1965, the total number of prisoners who have been brought to trial is probably about 2,500. Over the years, government ministers and senior officials have repeatedly promised that the machinery of justice would be expanded to speed up the trials, but the annual average of trials has remained at less than 100 cases. The government claims that it will now try to bring 200 cases to trial annually. Even this is a deplorably slow rate, and it should be remembered that repeated government promises of this kind made previously had proved to be of no substance.

Moreover, a number of trials held in the past year have illustrated that even for those relatively few prisoners who are in fact brought to trial after 10 years of detention, the proceedings and the decisions of the court involved clear miscarriage of justice. The trial of four women began in February 1975. The defendants were former leading members of organizations affiliated with the PKI, which were banned in 1966. The chief defendant, Sulami, was a leading member of Gerakan Wanita Indonesia (GERWANI), the women’s organization. Sri Anbar Rukmiati was head of the women’s bureau of Gerakan Pekerja Seluruh Indonesia (SOBSI), the trade union federation. Suharti Harsono was on the staff of Barisan Tani Indonesia (BTI), the peasants’ union. Sudjinah was on the staff of GERWANI, responsible for education and culture. Two of the prisoners, Sri Anbar Rukmiati and Sudjinah, were long-standing Amnesty International cases, and all four were featured in AI’s Indonesia Women’s Campaign of April 1976.

The indictment against the four prisoners alleged participation in the “coup attempt” of October 1965 and additionally alleged that they tried to restore the leftwing movement after the banning of those organizations early in 1966. However, the evidence produced against them in court related mainly to their activities after October 1965. They were alleged to have published and distributed an illegal bulletin, obtained false identity cards and been involved in providing assistance to the children of political prisoners. In addition, Sulami was accused of having recruited women to go to Lubang Buaya, to help in cooking and sewing. According to the prosecution, this was sufficient evidence to assume that she had known about the 1965 attempted coup which was said to have had its base at Lubang Buaya.

The trial of Asep Suryaman began in June 1975. Like the four women defendants, he was charged under a 1963 decree of former President Sukarno, which was only passed as law by legislative process in 1969 as the Subversion Act. One of the defence lawyers at the trial, Yap Thiam Hien, who was himself detained for a year under this law in 1974, described the act as a “rubber law”. He said it was too easily stretched and was so vague and broad in its application that virtually any political or social activity could be indictable. For example, when 40 traders were arrested in March 1976 for smuggling, this was alleged to be economic subversion and resulted in the 40 people being detained on the penal island of Nusakembangan.

The second objection to the Subversion Act was that people like the four women prisoners and Asep Suryaman, charged with offences connected with the events of 1965, had faced trial and imprisonment according to a law which, having been passed by the legislature only in 1969, was therefore applied to their cases retroactively.

Asep Suryaman was accused of being a leading member of the PKI special bureau and of complicity in conspiracy to overthrow the government. No evidence was brought that he had taken an active part in the “attempted coup” of 1965 beyond the fact that he was a party lecturer in Marxist theory. In 1967, when the PKI membership was being hunted by the authorities, he took refuge in East Java and he admitted that he took part in guerrilla activities, which he maintained were in self-defence. The defending lawyers presented legal arguments stating that:

- the detention of the prisoner since his re-arrest in September 1971 was illegal because no application had been made to a court after the first year of detention without trial, as required by law,
- the panel of judges, being officials appointed by the government which had incorporated many decrees affecting members of leftwing organizations which had been legal up till 1966, could not judge such cases impartially and according to the law. The defence lawyer, Yap Thiam Hien, who presented the argument was cited for contempt of court,
- the legislative act under which the case was tried was only passed...
four years after the alleged offences occurred, and retrospective application of the act was unconstitutional.

— there was no proof of direct personal involvement or complicity in the 1965 events.

Asep Suryaman was convicted and sentenced to death. Mr Yap in the final defence speech described the prisoner's experiences in detention as not unique. Like Asep Suryaman, political detainees in Indonesia were:

Treated like the dregs of society, deprived of the most elementary rights enjoyed by all other citizens, like mere objects that can be moved from one place to another, put out "on loan" to another authority for interrogation, to give evidence or to meet the personal needs of some official; and they are not even told why they are put out "on loan" or where they are being taken. They have no power and no voice, no right to complain or protest against their interminable imprisonment, against torture, insult, hunger or disease. They have no power and no voice in the face of this abuse against their dignity and person.

Mr Yap continued:

Many of them have become automatons, going to sleep, getting up and taking their meals like persons without any spirit, for they are not permitted to read newspapers, magazines, or books, except religious literature, nor are they allowed to write to their loved ones. Such a life leads them to break down under the strain. Some have become insane, others have committed suicide, some have tried to rebel against their predicament with horrifying consequences.

Continuing his plea, Mr Yap said that a prisoner had told him:

We are like leaves on a tree, just waiting to fall to earth and become one with it. Help us to get our freedom back, to rejoin our unprotected families. Help us at the very least to be brought to trial so that this soul destroying uncertainty can end. Whatever they want, we are ready to sign, so long as we can be released.

AI referred to the Asep Suryaman trial in a letter to President Suharto in April 1976, asking for a presidential pardon in view of the unsatisfactory nature of the trial.

The trial of Oei Tju Tat, a long-standing AI adoptee, was held in Jakarta in February and March 1976. He was charged under the Subversion Act and was accused of undermining the authority of the government. Mr Oei was a minister in the cabinet of the late President Sukarno, and it was alleged that he had issued a statement in October 1965 which said that the "attempted coup" was an internal affair of the army.

At that time, Mr Oei was a leading member of the Partindo (Indonesia Party), a group which had broken away from the Indonesian Nationalist Party in the late 1950s. The prosecution claimed that by issuing the Partindo statement, Mr Oei was accused of undermining the authority of the government. Mr Oei was a leading member of the Partindo Party, which had broken away from the Indonesian Nationalist Party in the late 1950s. The prosecution claimed that by issuing the Partindo statement in October 1965, Mr Oei had attempted to destroy or undermine the lawful government of Indonesia.

The defence maintained that the government at the time of the alleged offence was that of President Sukarno, and that Mr Oei was not condemned by the then President nor discharged from the cabinet because of the Partindo statement. Moreover, witnesses at the trial stated that Mr Oei was not personally responsible for drafting the statement. The defending lawyers, including Yap Thiam Hien, repeated arguments presented at the Asep Suryaman
In April 1976 there was an international campaign on behalf of women prisoners. Many national sections, notably the Japanese, Nigerian, Canadian, Swiss and Danish sections, coordinated and adopted groups sent appeals and petitions to the government for the release of these women. The plight and the difficulties faced by the detainees were publicized in national and local news media during this campaign.

The Indonesian authorities have claimed publicly that 1,309 prisoners were released in the past year. The majority of those released were stated to be in the Central Java region. However, despite requests to the authorities for details of the releases, so far only the names of 40 prisoners released in the past year have been made available to the Research Department. All these prisoners had been adopted by AI. Less than half of this number were 1965 prisoners, and the remainder were prisoners arrested in connection with riots of January 1974 during the visit to Indonesia of former Japanese Prime Minister Kakuei Tanaka. In view of the past distortions in official release statistics, it is difficult to accept the figure of 1,309 releases at face value, given the government’s reluctance to make known the names and details of these persons.

According to the latest official detention statistics in February 1976, 29,480 "category B" prisoners were still detained. Additionally it was stated that 1,745 "category A" prisoners remained. This appears to be a serious underestimate of the numbers actually held. It is known for example that large numbers of "category C" prisoners (scheduled for release by President Suharto since 1971) are still imprisoned.

On the basis of information available to the Research Department, AI’s earlier figure of 55,000 prisoners in detention without trial, now appears an underestimate in the light of evidence that political detention centers are to be found in all administrative centers throughout the country, often in one part of common prisons for penal law prisoners. According to knowledgeable observers, the total number of those detained throughout Indonesia is much closer to 100,000.

Those who are released are subjected to house arrest which can extend over arbitrary periods of time. Moreover, large payments are on occasion demanded by the military officers who process the cases of those scheduled for release, and the current scale of these bribes lies between one million and 1½ million Indonesian rupiahs (about £2,000 and £3,000) per prisoner. This also has the effect of slowing down the possible rate of releases since most families cannot obtain such a sum. They live in penury as a result of the enforced absence of the breadwinner of the family for so many years. There are severe official restrictions still in employment of released prisoners, and private employers including foreign firms are known to be encouraged to discriminate against employing released prisoners.

A pattern of brutal treatment of prisoners continues, especially during interrogation (which goes on even for those arrested 10 years ago), and also in those detention centers where torture is permitted by the local military commanders. First-hand accounts are rare because of the real danger of reprisals against prisoners, released prisoners and their families. But the AI Newsletter in February 1976 featured the case of a young woman called Tjiou who left Indonesia in 1975 after spending several years in political imprisonment. Following her arrest in 1968, she was severely and sexually tortured. Tjiou also described what she saw of other prisoners being tortured. She

"witnessed the brutal treatment of a village headman who died under electrical torture, a woman who had boiling water poured over her head and another woman whose nipples were cut off.

AI groups now work for a total of 267 cases. Since the first reported release of AI cases in December 1974, 45 adopted prisoners have been released in the last two years.

DEMONSTRATIVE KAMPUCHEA (CAMBODIA)

One year after troops from the National United Front of Cambodia (FUNK) entered the capital Phnom Penh on 17 April 1975, it remains hard to assess the human rights situation in Cambodia in the absence of independent inquiries. Information comes from two main sources: refugees now in Thailand and the official Phnom Penh radio. During the 12 months that elapsed since the Royal Government of National Union Khmer (GRUNK, now called Government of Democratic Kampuchea) came to power, an increasing number of reports from refugees have been published in the international press. They allege widespread executions.

Earlier reports concerned seven leaders of the former Lon Nol government, termed "super-traitors" and condemned to death by the Second National Congress of the Cambodian People in February 1975. Four of the seven had fled the country before the liberation army entered Phnom Penh. In November 1975, Deputy Premier Yeng Sary confirmed during a visit to Bangkok that three leaders of the former regime had been executed. They were former Premier Long Boret, Prince Sisowath Sirik Matak and Lon Non, brother of former President Lon Nol. Later in November, the Cambodian Head of State, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, stated in an interview that "no one had been executed in Cambodia after the communist take-over except several of the seven 'super-traitors' who fell into their hands".

New allegations of large scale executions were made at the beginning of 17676 by refugees arriving in Thailand. A number of these testimonies seem to be based on the belief, rather than evidence, that people who disappear from a village or other place of work have been taken away by the army to be executed. Few refugees seem to have actually witnessed executions. However, some accounts cite eye-witness reports. According to a report in the British newspaper The Guardian on 9 February 1976, a refugee from Battambang province named Soum Hoap stated that during the summer of 1975, he and other people from his village witnessed the execution of soldiers from the former Lon Nol army, allegedly beaten to death by Khmer Rouge guards at Arak Bok Kor (Battambang province). Another press report (Le Monde, 17-18 February 1976) stated that new executions took place in January 1976. It mentioned in particular a textile factory in Battambang where 27 workers were executed. However, neither the source nor details are given clearly.

On 18 February 1976, Amnesty International wrote to Cambodian Prime Minister Penn Nouth, expressing deep concern at these reports and urging GRUNK to make enquiries into a number of allegations. In the letter, AI reaffirmed its opposition to the death penalty as it had previously stated in a cable to GRUNK on 16 May 1976.

The letter also referred to the Constitution of Democratic Kampuchea which came into effect on 5 January 1976. Noting that article 20 of the new constitution introduced a clause forbidding "reactionary religions", AI
Appeals added 2 months to the sentence passed on Cho Seun-hyuk by the organization considered the funds were properly used. The pastors had all been to 8 months.

German donor organization "Bread for the World" testified in court that the pastors were given 6 months each, and Reverend Kwon Ho-kyung was sentenced to 4 years. Although on 23 December 1975 Hahn Seung-hun was released from prison after the sentence had been suspended for 3 years by the Seoul High Court. His case is still before the Supreme Court.

The trial of the poet and writer Kim Chi Ha, who was first adopted as a prisoner of conscience in 1972, resumed in March 1976 but was then adjourned. Kim Chi Ha was re-arrested on 14 March 1976 (only a short time after being released from prison) and charged with violations of the Anti-Communist Law after he had published an article describing the torture of fellow-prisoners. A trial began in May, but it was postponed and the period of pre-trial detention allowed under law expired in September without the trial having resumed. A military court reinstated Kim Chi Ha's earlier life sentence, which had been suspended, as a means of keeping him in prison. Kim Chi Ha, who suffers from tuberculosis, may face a death sentence if convicted. Proceedings were due to resume on 18 May 1976, and at the time of writing AI is organizing extensive campaigns in many countries to try to ensure that Kim Chi Ha is given a prompt and fair trial.

On 10 March 1976 AI cabled President Park to protest against the arrest and interrogation of more than 20 prominent men and women in connection with a declaration calling for the restoration of democratic rights in South Korea. Eighteen of these highly respected citizens have been indicted under Emergency Regulation number 9 on charges of agitating to overthrow the government. At the time of writing, 11 of the indicted dissidents are under detention. The 11 include Kim Dae Jung, the former opposition presidential candidate, who is seriously ill; four Presbyterian ministers, including Moon Ik Kwan and his brother Steven Moon; three Roman Catholic priests, including Hahn Se Woong; and three university professors, including the well-known theologian Ahn Byung Moo.

The other seven indicted dissidents are not detained at present. They include former President Yun Po Sun, the distinguished Quaker leader Hahn Suk Hun, known as the "Gandhi of South Korea", former foreign minister Chung II Hyoung and his wife Dr Lee Tai Young (South Korea's first woman lawyer),...
Malayan Communist Party (MCP). Among the detainees are members of some branch of the illegal and underground national security. With few exceptions they are alleged by the government to be members or sympathizers of the illegal and underground national security. The Internal Security Act of 1960, under which the detainees are held, invests the Malaysian government with sweeping powers of arbitrary detention without trial. The detainees in Malaysia as a whole, who number several hundred men and women, are held on the basis of the allegation that they pose a threat to national security. With few exceptions they are alleged by the government to be members or sympathizers of the illegal and underground Malayan Communist Party (MCP). Among the detainees are members of

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF LAOS

In December 1975 a People's Democratic Republic of Laos was proclaimed. In January 1976, Amnesty International wrote to the new President of Laos, Prince Souphanouvong, and presented the organization's work to the government. AI expressed the hope that the new government would show clemency towards members of the administration and army belonging to the “Vientiane side” (generally described as “conservative” or “rightist”) of the former coalition government. In September 1975, 31 leaders of the “conservative” administration, who had left the country before the trial, had been tried and condemned in absentia to sentences ranging from 20 years imprisonment to the death penalty for “treason, corruption and gross abuse of power”.

Many prominent leaders and senior officials of the former Vientiane administration had fled the country during the months which saw the gradual collapse of the coalition government in spring 1975. The policy of the victorious Pathet Lao authorities towards military and civil officials of the former government does not seem to have taken forms of harsh repression in a majority of cases. Many have now to undergo some form of “re-education”. However, the length and nature of “re-education” does not seem to be clearly defined. According to one press report, of between 5,000 and 10,000 people who have been moved to “re-education centers” in the former Pathet Lao zone, only eight were known to have returned to their homes by March 1976.

MALAYSIA

Work on Malaysia in 1975 was marked by the taking up of a large number of cases of men detained without trial for long periods in the Batu Gajah Special Detention Camp in the state of Perak, West Malaysia. Two men, one formerly a member of the opposition Labour Party of Malaya, have been held in the Batu Gajah camp since 1964. The average length of detention of the 60 men whose cases have not been taken up is 8 to 9 years without trial. In all about 140 men are held in two blocks in the Batu Gajah camp. Essentially, these cases typify a violation of basic human rights which is of major concern to Amnesty International: extremely long term political detention without trial. The Internal Security Act of 1965, under which the detainees are held, invests the Malaysian government with sweeping powers of arbitrary arrest and detention by executive order.

The detainees in Malaysia as a whole, who number several hundred men and women, are held on the basis of the allegation that they pose a threat to national security. With few exceptions they are alleged by the government to be members or sympathizers of some branch of the illegal and underground Malayan Communist Party (MCP). Among the detainees are members of opposition parties, including the Labour Party of Malaya and the Partai Sosialis Rakyat Malaysia (the People's Socialist Party of Malaya), students, manual workers and tradespeople.

During 1975 AI groups were active on the cases of 75 political detainees. Four adopted prisoners of conscience, three of them women, were released from detention. Two adopted students, Khoo Ee Lian and Juliet Chin, were released separately in December. One adopted prisoner who remains in detention is Professor Syed Husein Ali of the Department of Anthropology and Sociology, University of Malaya, who was arrested following student demonstrations against the government in December 1974 and who is detained in the Kamunting camp in Perak state.

In East Malaysia, three candidates of the opposition Social Justice Party, who were detained in the state of Sabah shortly before general elections began in 1974, have now been released. In March 1976, however, AI learned that Mohamed Noor Mansor, secretary general of the Berjaya Party, had been detained for questioning under the Internal Security Act. The Berjaya Party is an important Sabah opposition group which won more than half of all the seats in elections for the state assembly in April 1976. The reported detention is under investigation by AI.

Datuk James Wong, deputy president of the opposition Sarawak National Party (SNAP), who was detained in Sarawak with other SNAP members in October 1975 and subsequently adopted by AI, was released from the Kamunting detention camp in West Malaysia on 30 January 1976. He has returned to Sarawak, although he is prevented by a restriction order from resuming any political activities.

On 4 October 1975 the government of Malaysia enacted new regulations governing trials for alleged offences against national security. Entitled the Essential (Security Cases) Regulations, 1975, they introduce special procedures for dealing with cases certified as security cases by the public prosecutor. One article of the new regulations shifts the burden of proof onto the defence, with the effect that defendants in security cases will be presumed guilty until proved innocent. Witnesses will be permitted to give evidence in the absence of the accused and the defence counsel. Trials in security cases will be held without juries, and judges will be restricted by having their discretionary powers curtailed. Upon conviction, the judges will be obliged to pass maximum sentence, which may include the death penalty.

Since the early months of 1975 there has been a significant escalation of guerilla violence by the underground Malayan Communist Party in West Malaysia. In this situation, the exact application and practical effects of the new regulations are not yet clear. However, AI is deeply concerned at the possibility that, among others, adopted prisoners of conscience - men and women who are detained without trial for the non-violent expression of their political beliefs - may now be brought to trial under provisions which deny many of the most basic legal principles.

AI has urged that all men and women detained under the Internal Security Act in Malaysia should either be brought to trial with any evidence against them being presented openly and in full accordance with recognized norms to ensure a fair trial, or be released immediately and unconditionally.
NEPAL

The release of political prisoners under amnesties declared by King Birendra of Nepal to mark his 31st birthday constituted a major advance in the field of human rights. Shortly after the new cabinet, headed by Prime Minister Tulsi Ghimire, came in power in December 1975, the release of political prisoners began.

On 15 December Krishna Prasad Bhattarai was released with 15 other prisoners. Mr Bhattarai, a former speaker of Nepal's first parliament and former secretary general of the Nepali Congress party, had been imprisoned for 10 years without trial since 1960, was re-arrested in August 1972, and was adopted on both occasions by Amnesty International.

Another 27 political prisoners were among the 250 prisoners released under a royal amnesty on the King's birthday on 31 December 1975. Those released included Rani Prasad Singh, a Supreme Court lawyer who had been elected to parliament in 1971, but had been held without trial under the Security Act since 14 October 1971, and Sher Bahadur Deuba, a president of the Nepali Students Organisation and member of AI, who had been imprisoned without trial since June 1974. AI wrote to King Birendra on 31 December 1975, congratulating him on the amnesty.

Shortly before the official amnesty announcement, AI's Asian Field Secretary, Richard Roach, was received by the Prime Minister, and informed that all political prisoners detained under the Security Act would be released in the next three months, excluding those who were thought to have committed acts of violence. It was anticipated that this program would also relate to political prisoners held under the Raj-Kai Act, whose total number was estimated at the time to be approximately 200. (This statement corresponded with a suggestion made by AI one year earlier for a general amnesty in a letter to the King of 24 October 1974.)

In a letter of 26 January 1976 to the Prime Minister, AI asked for the official list of political prisoners so far released under the royal amnesties. AI asked whether the government planned to revoke the Special Powers Act and the Raj-Kai Act, legislation providing for detention without trial, under which all prisoners whose cases had been taken up by AI were detained. At the same time, all AI groups and national sections working for Nepalese prisoners wrote to the government congratulating it on the amnesty and inquiring about the status of their individual prisoners.

AI is still awaiting the government's list of released prisoners, but 16 of the 65 prisoners for whom AI groups were working in December, are now known to be free. Even prior to the amnesties, the government had released 10 political prisoners for whom AI groups had been working.

Earlier, in May 1975, the government pardoned 12 persons who had been sentenced to long terms of political imprisonment for alleged anti-state activities committed after the royal takeover in 1960, and for whose release AI had appealed in 1974.

On 2 December 1975, AI sent a telegram to King Birendra, requesting a pardon for Yagya Bahadur Thapa, a former army captain, who had been sentenced to death for promoting armed rebellion in the eastern districts of Nepal. AI was given to understand by the government that the risk of execution was remote.

PAKISTAN

The pattern of arrest and detention in Pakistan of critics of the government - mainly under the emergency laws - has continued over the past year. Those arrested include writers, editors, printers and, on one particular occasion, even lawyers assisting in cases of a political nature.

The National Awami Party, the main parliamentary opposition party, was banned in 1975. Its leaders, who were arrested in 1973, remain in detention. But some party workers, arrested after unrest in the North West Frontier Province in 1975, were released after a relatively short period of detention.

As a result of demands for greater autonomy for the two western provinces of Baluchistan and North West Frontier Province, many suspected activists remain detained, particularly in Cootie Camp (Quetta), Khuzdar, Loralai and Sibi, all camps in Baluchistan administered by the army.

In December 1975, Attorney General Yahya Bakhshiar stated that there were only nine political prisoners in Pakistan. Amnesty International feels that this figure in no way reflects the true scale of political imprisonment. The official figure relates only to the number of habeas corpus petitions made on political grounds and pending in the courts. But the figure does not take into account the hundreds of arrests which have been made during the past year under section 16 of the Maintenance of Public Order Ordinance and article 32 of the Defence of Pakistan Rules (DPR) - both emergency laws allowing for preventive detention - and under other DPR clauses by which prisoners can be charged with specific offences relating to the security of the state.

In addition, many are held on suspicion of having committed offences punishable under the Suppression of Terrorist Activities Act, the Explosive Substances Act and the Pakistan Penal Code (particularly in the North West Frontier Province and Baluchistan). And although an increasing number of these are being tried before special courts and special tribunals, where different rules of evidence apply, the majority of these are still held without trial.

In November 1975 unofficial estimates of the number of political prisoners in Pakistan ranged as high as 38,000. The figure appears to be based on a statement given by the government of Sindh province, giving the total of prisoners detained during 1974 under preventive detention laws (other than DPR) as 36,279. Figures of a similar range were given by the government for 1972 and 1973.

Since most preventive detention is usually for a relatively short period of time, the majority of these prisoners would now have been released. AI estimates on the basis of these and other reports, however, that at least several thousand prisoners are currently in prison for political reasons. In view of the wide range of laws under which political prisoners can be detained - including those laws applicable to criminal offences - it is difficult to give a more precise estimate.

Constitutional amendments have further restricted the powers of the high courts to grant bail to political prisoners. The constitutional Fourth Amendment, passed by the National Assembly on 15 November 1975, withdraws the power of the high courts to grant bail to persons detained under laws providing for preventive detention and to issue orders protecting persons from arrest under such laws. The amendment has severely limited the common practice of high courts of granting bail to political prisoners.

On 31 October 1975 the Supreme Court of Pakistan upheld the government's
order of 10 February 1975 banning the main opposition party, the National Awami Party (NAP). The Supreme Court found the party guilty of resorting to subversion and sabotage. It held that the party and its leaders were guilty of promoting the concept of five nations and nationalities in an attempt to destroy the idea of a single Muslim nation on which Pakistan was founded.

However, it is important to note that the Supreme Court in this case was allowed to make its own rules of evidence. Consequently, the evidence on which the judgement was based would not have been admissible in any ordinary court of law in Pakistan. Although the judgement was given against the NAP, the findings of the Supreme Court will be admissible evidence in the cases against individual members of the party now on trial in Hyderabad (see below).

In the wake of the Supreme Court judgement, the constitution was amended to introduce a five year disqualification period from public life for sitting NAP members of parliament or provincial assemblies.

On 29 December 1975 the government set up a special court, consisting of three high court judges, to try exclusively offences affecting the security, integrity or sovereignty of the state, including high treason. Under this law - Criminal Law Amendment (Special Court) Ordinance - the rules of evidence have been changed in order to allow for evidence otherwise not admissible. Contrary to customary procedures, the prosecution has been given the power to add new charges against each individual accused at any time during the case until judgement has been pronounced.

Forty-four members and office bearers of the former National Awami Party, including its leader, Abdul Wali Khan, are now being tried before the Special Court which started proceedings inside a prison in Hyderabad on 15 April 1976. Although the trial is said to be open, official permission needs to be obtained to attend it. Such permission can be refused for any security reasons. Apart from Wali Khan, whose case is at present under investigation by AI, the three Baluchistan leaders of the party, Mir Ghaus Bakht Bizenjo, Khalid Bakht Marri and Sardar Attaullah Mengal, are among those on trial. All three were adopted by AI after spending three years in detention without trial.

On 14 April 1976, one day before the trial was due to start, more prominent opposition leaders of the former NAP were arrested for trial in Hyderabad. Hashim Mohammed Gilzai, a member of the newly formed National Democratic Party and leader of the opposition in the Senate of Pakistan, was among those arrested. Also arrested were two other senators, Ghulam Ahmed Bilore and Syed Hussain Shah. Five of the 12 opposition members in Senate, a body consisting of 40, are now in detention on political charges.

An Al delegation visited Pakistan from 22 April to 12 May 1976 to discuss with government officials, members of the judiciary and the bar, as well as other contacts, recent developments affecting human rights in Pakistan. Professor Mijmatz Soysal, a Turkish constitutional lawyer and member of AI's International Executive Committee, and Yvonne Terlingen of the International Secretariat had detailed discussions with Minister of Law Malik Muhammad Akhtar, as well as with officials in the Home Department and the Advocate General's Office.

The delegates met with judges, lawyers and members of families of political prisoners. The mission was keen to establish the degree to which fundamental rights were safeguarded at trials of political prisoners. In this context, one of the mission delegates attended the trial proceedings of the Special Court in Hyderabad on 10 May 1976.

A report on the mission's findings is being prepared at the time of writing this report, and will be submitted to AI's International Executive Committee. It is expected that the report will reflect AI's increasing concern at the practice of trying political prisoners before special tribunals and courts. These trials are often held inside jails where the normal safeguards designed to ensure an open and fair trial do not apply.

AI is now working on a relatively small number of cases, which in no way reflect the scale of political imprisonment in Pakistan. There are 15 adoption and 23 investigation cases, but it is envisaged that the adoption program will be enlarged in the near future.

Among those AI has adopted as a prisoner of conscience is member of parliament Chaudri Zahir Elahi who, together with members of his family, has been charged with more than 100 alleged offences under criminal and emergency laws. He is now being tried in Karachi Central Jail before a special tribunal on charges of making "objectionable speeches". Two other adopted prisoners are Altaf Hussain Qureshi and Dr Ijaz Hussain Qureshi, editor and printer respectively of the Urdu Digest, who have been arrested many times. Their latest arrest, for publishing articles critical of the government, took place in March this year under article 49 of the DPR.

Also adopted are Tariq Ashraf, a journalist and editor of the Sindhi language paper Sahni, arrested in September after participating in a campaign for the defence of Sindhi literature and demanding the lifting of the ban on all publications, and 86 year old Abdul Ghaffar Khan, the veteran opposition leader and father of Wali Khan. He has been held in preventive detention since April last year. Hassan Hameed, one of the lawyers defending the NAP leaders, was arrested on 24 September and involved in a gambling charge which was not brought to court. AI believes that, after his arrest, pressure was put on him to withdraw from assisting in defending Wali Khan. He was adopted by AI and released in December.

Many AI members made special appeals for the release of Sardar Attaullah Khan Mengal, a former chief minister of Baluchistan. He is a heart patient who was reported to be in a serious condition last summer.

Over the year, AI has received a number of allegations of police brutality against persons alleged to have committed offences under the Explosive Substances Act, particularly in the North West Frontier Province and Baluchistan. One of these allegations related to Mohammed Aslam Kurd, a member of the NAP arrested on 23 September 1975 without warrant in Quetta. It was alleged that during the first seven days of his interrogation he was ill-treated and that his beard was pulled out. AI sent a cable to the Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto requesting that the report be immediately investigated. AI asked for an assurance that Mr Kurd be held in accordance with basic constitutional rights. No such assurance has been received.

THE PHILIPPINES

Since September 1972, the Philippines has been governed under martial law imposed by President Ferdinand Marcos, with the Department of National Defense and military units responsible for almost all aspects of detention of martial law prisoners. Since 1972, more than 50,000 people have been detained...
at one time or other by the martial law authorities.

In November 1975, Thomas C. Jones, an American lawyer and member of the board of Amnesty International's United States Section, went to Manila with Huang Wen-hsien of the Research Department, both as AI delegates. The mission discussed questions relating to the imprisonment of martial law detainees with President Marcos, Secretary of National Defense Ponce Enrile, Solicitor General Estela Mendoza, Commanding General of The Philippines Constabulary Fidel V. Ramos and military officers responsible for martial law detention.

The delegates requested interviews with specific prisoners and interviewed 107 people held without trial in detention centres in Luzon. Of those prisoners interviewed, 71 gave detailed accounts of torture and ill-treatment, especially during the interrogation process. It was clear from their testimony that newly arrested prisoners were likely to be taken out for interrogation by various military intelligence and national security units. Often to undesigned houses where the prisoners were subject to brutal treatment. It was a pattern that disclosure of arrest was not made to families of prisoners until a relatively long period had elapsed, and prisoners had extremely restricted access to their lawyers.

Although the government does not publicly discriminate between common law and political prisoners, in the generic description of martial law detainees, in practice political prisoners are kept in special detention centers and are investigated by specialized units. Most of the prisoners were alleged to be members of or associated with the Communist Party of The Philippines. It is remarkable that in the four years since the imposition of martial law by President Marcos, not a single case of a prisoner alleged to have taken part in rebellious activity has been concluded in the courts. In many cases the prisoners have merely been charged, while others have not been charged at all. Of those actually brought to trial, no legal proceedings have been concluded to demonstrate the official case against the prisoners. The mission report was sent on 24 May to President Marcos, together with 15 detailed recommendations for the release of prisoners and the prevention of torture.

The prisoners interviewed by the delegates are being taken up as AI cases. Of the long-standing Al cases, Benigno Aquino was interviewed by the delegates in his prison quarters, to which he was restricted in solitary confinement and which were subject to constant bugging. Mr Aquino said that he could not expect a fair trial before the special military tribunals set up to try cases of political prisoners under martial law. In May 1975, Mr Aquino went on a hunger strike lasting 40 days in protest against his continued detention and his trial before a military tribunal.

SINGAPORE

Amnesty International estimates that more than 60 men and women are presently detained without trial in the Republic of Singapore. Among these are four men who have been held without trial since 1963. Others have been held for periods of up to 10 years.

Although more than 20 detainees were released in 1975 (including the lawyer T. T. Rajah, who was adopted by Al and who was released with others in December), arrests have continued. The detainees are alleged by the government to be members or sympathizers of the illegal Malayan Communist Party (MCP) or of MCP satellite organizations. They are held without trial under the provisions of Singapore's Internal Security Act.

The detainees include a number of prominent opposition politicians, particularly members of the Barisan Sosialis (Socialist Front) party, journalists, trade unionists and students.

At the time of writing, individual AI groups are active on the cases of 45 men and women who are believed to be detained without trial in Singapore, including a number held indefinitely under banishment orders.

On 28 January 1976 AI wrote to Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew strongly urging that Said Zahari, Dr Lim Hock Siew, Ho Toon Chin and Lee Teck Tung, four adopted political prisoners who have been detained without trial since 1963, should be released immediately and unconditionally. AI urged that men and women who are held without trial in Singapore should either be brought to a fair trial or released from detention. AI noted that no reply has been received from the Prime Minister in response to a letter of 25 September 1974 which pressed for the ending of the practice of caning certain convicted criminals. AI urged that steps be taken to abolish the death penalty in Singapore. No reply to this second letter has yet been received.

In February 1976 AI published a Briefing Paper on Singapore. The briefing paper describes the use of the Internal Security Act and complex citizenship and banishment laws as means of repressing and discouraging legitimate, non-violent political activity in the island. It notes the use of caning which leaves permanent scars, the practice referred to in AI's letter of 28 January 1976, as punishment for certain criminal offences, and the frequent imposition and carrying out of the death penalty as punishment for certain crimes in Singapore.

The briefing paper also draws attention to the control and intimidation of the press by the government, which has led to the arrest and detention of journalists. In addition, it refers to consistent allegations by ex-detainees and detainees' families that political prisoners are subjected to "mental and physical tortures", primarily for the purpose of breaking their resistance and securing statements of political confession and recantation. The briefing paper notes the consistent complaint that detainees wearing only light clothing are interrogated in very cold air-conditioned cells, and that during round-the-clock questioning they are often forced to do repeated and strenuous exercises, resulting in severe strain and fatigue.

SRI LANKA

Trials by the Criminal Justice Commission of prisoners detained for their alleged involvement with the 1971 insurgency have continued at a slower rate than anticipated. On 31 December 1974, 399 prisoners were awaiting trial before the commission and, on 25 November 1975, Minister of Justice Felix Dias Bandaranaike stated in parliament that 300 persons were still awaiting trial. But, he added, 200 could be released on bail.

At its April 1976 meeting, the International Executive Committee of Amnesty International decided to make public the report of the 1975 Al mission to Sri Lanka. The report describes in detail the trial of political prisoners before the Criminal Justice Commission. Its major findings and recommendations were published in last year's annual report. However, the updated report also points out that 12 prisoners have now been sentenced to
death before the ordinary courts for acts committed during the insurrection.

The report refers to the fact that the judgement of the Criminal Justice Commission passed in "Inquiry number 1", the so-called main case of alleged leaders of the insurrection, has not yet been published, although the verdict was handed down in December 1974. This seriously hampers attempts by those then sentenced to make representations to the president. Although the Criminal Justice Commission Act does not provide for appeal, the president has the constitutional right to grant pardon to any persons sentenced in any court in Sri Lanka. Moreover, prisoners sentenced in "Inquiry number 1" can no longer consult their lawyers, since visits to these prisoners have been restricted to blood-relations. The AI mission report recommends that political prisoners should have the same rights as ordinary prisoners, without any restrictions as regards to who visits them.

AI has made available an initial grant of £1,000 (US $2,000) for legal aid to political prisoners awaiting trial before the Criminal Justice Commission. The grant, which is available in instalments, is now being used to contribute to the defence costs of prisoners awaiting trial before the commission. The Legal Aid Committee of the Bar Association of Sri Lanka is assisting with this project.

AI has further made available a grant to the central prison library in Colombo for the purchase of textbooks in Sinhala, Tamil and English. The first instalment of the grant has been used to buy books which are now available to political prisoners in Magazine, Welikada, Mahara and Bogambara prisons. AI has also sent some 200 titles in English, requested by the prisoners, to Magazine prison, Colombo.

At the time of the 1975 AI mission, most of the Tamil prisoners who had been detained without trial for periods up to 3 years were being released. By the summer of 1975, no more than five were still in detention. But when the mayor of Jaffna was assassinated on 27 July 1975, 200 young Tamils were arrested on suspicion under the emergency regulations, including nearly all those who had been released over the last year.

On 2 September 1975, Deputy Minister of Defence and External Affairs Lakshman Jayakody stated in parliament that "about 30" of these prisoners have been kept in prison for security reasons. But the Research Department knows of 46 Tamils detained under the emergency regulations, none of whom has so far been charged with a specific offence. Of the 46, nine have been adopted by AI groups. Among them is Anandis Vinyaganam, a prisoner who had spent three years in detention without access to a lawyer. He was re-arrested in June 1975 and was on Al's Prisons of the Month Campaign in October 1975. Another 23 cases are currently being investigated.

THAILAND
The influx of refugees into Thailand following the communist advances in Indochina in April 1975 numbered some 70,000 or more by April 1976. In August 1975, it was reported that many thousands of these refugees would face arrest if they failed to register with the Thai immigration authorities. Amnesty International wrote to former Prime Minister Kukrit Pramoj on 26 August 1975 seeking assurance that the plight of the refugees would be considered fairly by the government.

In February 1976, the Thai government announced that refugees crossing the borders from Cambodia and Laos would be arrested and tried as illegal immigrants. Following reports that 1,800 Vietnamese had been arrested since the application of this new prohibitive order, AI wrote in April 1976 to Prime Minister Seni Pramoj expressing concern regarding the arrests.

In February 1976, two journalists were arrested on charges of writing articles which were allegedly offensive about the Thai royal family. Both of them were found guilty and sentenced to prison terms of 14 months and 3 years.

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM
Amnesty International groups continue to work for a small number of adopted prisoners in North Vietnam. These include members of a music band who were tried by the Hanoi People's Tribunal in January 1971, on charges of spreading "imperialistic culture and counter-revolutionary propaganda". They were sentenced to terms of imprisonment ranging from several months to 15 years. One of them was due for release in January 1976, but inquiries made by the AI group working on his case have remained unanswered.

Other adopted cases concerned two members of the so-called Nhan-Van Giai-Pham group of artists and writers (named after two reviews called Nhan-Van and Giai-Pham) who were arrested in 1957-58. Both were given a 15-year sentence in January 1960 on charges of "espionage and anti-revolutionary activities". One of these two cases is Mrs Luu Thi Yen, known under the pen name of Thuy-An. In June 1975, AI learned from a private source that Mrs Luu Thi Yen had been released in 1974. However, her present status is not known and no official confirmation of the release has yet been received.

All attempts made by AI groups and by the International Secretariat to discuss these cases with North Vietnamese representatives have so far been unsuccessful.

REPUBLIC OF SOUTH VIETNAM
During the weeks that followed the access to power of the Provisional Revolutionary Government (PRG) in South Vietnam on 30 April 1975, Amnesty International received confirmation from official and unofficial sources that political prisoners detained under the defeated Thieu regime had been released. However, direct news from some of the released prisoners was not received before the autumn of 1975, when postal communications were re-established with South Vietnam.

One of the letters received by an AI group at the end of October 1975 was signed by a former prisoner on Con Son island, Nguyen Trieu Dung, who described the liberation of Con Son at midnight on 30 April 1975, a few hours after the National Liberation Front troops entered Saigon. His letter confirms press reports on the evacuation in several stages of the island. Mr Dung says that he "left Con Son on the third ship on the evening of 16 May 1975 and arrived in Saigon the next evening". Nearly 2,000 prisoners were evacuated from Con Son in May 1975.

Later confirmations of releases and news of former prisoners were also received from the Committee for the Improvement of the Prison System in South Vietnam — which announced that after the release of prisoners in its task had come to an end — and from the World Salvation Religion, a Buddhist congregation. Many Buddhist monks had been imprisoned under the former
regime for refusing to be drafted into the army.

In May and June 1975, the press reported on public executions of thieves and looters in the Saigon area. These, however, concerned a small number and were interpreted by observers as an attempt to curb a wave of crime which affected Saigon after the change of government. Journalists also recalled that the city had no police force and that, when the prisons were opened at the end of April, common criminals had been released as well as political prisoners.

On 10 June 1975, AI wrote to the PRG Foreign Minister, Mrs Nguyen Thi Binh, inquiring about the new government's policy on capital punishment, and reaffirming AI's opposition to the death penalty. It recalled the assurance given in May by a PRG representative in Paris to AI Secretary General Martin Ennals that it was contrary to the policy of the PRG to execute a person or to use a policy of retaliation towards Vietnamese citizens. The letter also made reference to an earlier proposal that an AI mission should visit South Vietnam.

In an interview published on 22 July 1975, Mrs Nguyen Thi Binh stated that the PRG's policy “is one of clemency, national concord, for those who repent... but we are determined to punish all acts which affect the revolutionary power of the people. And unfortunately, there are also a few cases which we must punish severely at the command of the population.” Mrs Binh also said that acts of sabotage were still carried out by supporters of former President Nguyen Van Thieu, referring to soldiers and officials of the former government who had gone into hiding and kept weapons, sometimes engaging in an armed resistance to the new authorities.

Hence, according to the official Liberation Radio, on 4 July 1975 the Military Court of the Military Management Committee of Chau Doc city condemned to death Le Nhat Thanh, formerly a first lieutenant in the defeated army, accused of “counter-revolutionary activities” for “boarding arms and joining others to steal money and state property”. During the trial, which was public and attended by 10,000 people, ex-Lieutenant Thanh refused to admit his guilt in spite of his father’s plea. The report however did not say whether the sentence had been carried out.

Later in September, the South Vietnamese newspaper Giai Phong announced that death sentences had been passed by military courts on two war criminals in Rach Gia, on the Gulf of Thailand, and on two former intelligence agents in Can Tho, 120 kilometers south of Saigon.

However, whereas the press and radio gave quite regular reports on arrests of people accused of being involved in intelligence work, of forming “underground cells” with a view to “instigating armed resistance against the revolutionary forces”, etc, very few accounts mentioned executions or death sentences.

In a letter sent on 20 February 1976 to PRG President Huynh Tan Phat, AI inquired about a few problems arising from the “re-education” process.

In June 1975 the Military Management Committees, which replaced the old municipal administrations, announced in several cities that all soldiers and personnel of the “puppet armed forces”, as well as policemen, intelligence agents and personnel of the former administration below the rank of bureau chief, who had previously reported for registration, should attend “reform study” for three days.

Likewise in the countryside dozens of “reception centers” were set up for military and civil officials of the former regime to register. “Re-education” was carried out in the same fashion either in the villages themselves, or at the district re-education centers for higher officials. For ordinary soldiers and low ranking persons of the former administration the period of three days appeared to have been respected, and a certificate allowing them to seek employment was given to them after they had completed the course.

On the other hand, the length of “re-education” seemed not to be strictly defined as regards high ranking military and civilian officials. It varied from province to province, depending on the former rank and also apparently on the willingness to undergo “reform”. It was reported to be longer for military and police officers.

Concerns about the fate of officers who were taken away from Saigon in May after surrendering to the revolutionary forces was voiced in July 1975 by their wives or other members of their family who had since remained without news and did not know where they were. There were even rumours that the officers had been taken away to be executed, but one source stated this was founded on the news that several officers were reportedly killed in a truck accident when they were carried out of Saigon. In his letter to President Huynh Tan Phat, however, Secretary General Martin Ennals mentioned the case of a general of the Rangers Division of the former regime’s army, General Do Ke Giao, whose family reportedly remained without news several months after he was taken away by the revolutionary forces on 8 May 1975.

News of releases of military officers from re-education centers or camps started appearing in the press in September 1975. A first group of 800 were allowed to return to their families on 9 September. The releases then seem to have been continued through the following months, but the total number of those released, as well as of those still undergoing re-education, is not known in the absence of official figures.

On 20 December 1975, foreign and local journalists were invited to watch the reunion of 120 released officers with their families at Song Tahn camp and reported that a camp official had said the returning officers would be kept under surveillance by local authorities before the restoration of their full rights as citizens. This was confirmed by an article in Le Monde on 14 February 1976, according to which military and civil officials of the former regime would recover their civil rights after completing their “re-education stage”, except for “high-ranking” military and civil officials who would have to undergo a “provisionary period of six months to one year” under the control of their local revolutionary committee before being allowed to exert their civil rights.

In his letter to the PRG President, AI Secretary General inquired about the criteria according to which the local revolutionary committees will recommend the restoration of civil rights for these people. He also noted particularly the principles which guided the policy of the PRG towards officials of the former regime and welcomed the recent releases.

The letter also referred to reports which reached AI in the autumn of 1975 concerning people detained in the central highlands after the end of the war. Two cases in particular concerned a Roman Catholic nun and an evangelical pastor, allegedly arrested in June 1975 in Cong Tum (Kon Tum province) for having been previously in contact with foreigners. They had reportedly not been engaged in propaganda or violent activities against the PRG. AI requested...
details of these cases, while recalling that it does not adopt persons who have used violence, or cases of espionage. However, the Secretary General expressed AI's concern to see all persons arrested tried in conformity with international judiciary principles, such as those presented in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

On 23 March 1976, the Saigon Press Agency announced that the PRG was setting up people's tribunals, appeal jurisdictions and reorganizing police forces as a basis for a "democratic and progressive judiciary". Three decrees containing the basis for a future penal code put an end to the exceptional military jurisdictions which were functioning since the end of the Vietnam war in April 1975.

One of the decrees outlaw "counter-revolutionary crimes", defined as all acts "endangering national defence, the national democratic people's revolution and the construction of socialism", which might be punished by a term of imprisonment or the death penalty, depending on the gravity of the case. Another of the decrees concerns guarantees given to individuals by the penal legislation, and mentions the obligation for the "relevant authorities" to provide a written warrant before arrest, search or inquiry, except when people are "caught red-handed".

Europe

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights came into force on 23 March 1976 three months after its ratification by a 35th state, Czechoslovakia. A number of West European states have not yet ratified this central instrument of international human rights legislation. Since the countries of Western Europe adhere to the European Convention on Human Rights, all European states except Albania are party to global or regional pacts safeguarding the fundamental rights of conscience.

On 1 August 1975 in Helsinki representatives of all the states of Europe (except Albania) signed the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The participating states declared inter alia their determination "to respect and put into practice" a number of "Principles Guiding Relations Between Participating States". Among them was the principle of "respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief". The text of this principle is unequivocal in its affirmation of "the freedom of the individual to profess and practice, alone or in community with others, religion or belief acting in accordance with the dictates of his own conscience".

The provisions of the Final Act are not legally binding on the participating states. Its human rights undertakings are not supported (as are guarantees in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights or the European Convention on Human Rights) by provisions for the establishment of international mechanisms for hearing complaints of violations. However the section of the Final Act devoted to freedom of conscience includes confirmation of "the right of the individual to know and act upon his rights and duties in this field". This, at least by implication, invites citizens of participating states to register complaints with domestic authorities regarding violations of the undertakings in the Final Act.

Furthermore, through the Final Act, the states of Europe have agreed that the human rights situation in any participating state is a subject of legitimate interest for and discussion with the other participating states. Most important of all, perhaps, is that the Final Act elaborates in the European context norms of governmental behaviour in the field of human rights which are applicable to all of the participating states and compatible with all the political and judicial systems of the region.

The rights of conscience guaranteed or affirmed in the above-mentioned international agreements are violated in many states of Europe, although with varying degrees of frequency and intensity.

The present report illustrates those violations which involve imprisonment and are therefore the subject of action by Amnesty International. However
there are also patterns of violation of freedom of conscience which do not necessarily involve imprisonment. For example it is common practice in a number of countries, especially in Eastern Europe and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic, to dismiss from state employment persons whose loyalty to the established order is suspect on account of their having criticized official practice or applied to emigrate. In the Federal Republic of Germany in recent years a similar practice (Berufssperre) has become institutionalized. Under this, official investigations have been carried out on the political activities and views of hundreds of thousands of state employees or applicants for state jobs in order to assess their "loyalty to the constitution".

The incidence of political imprisonment varies from one state to another. But it is common to all of Europe that almost all prisoners of conscience are tried, sentenced and imprisoned under domestic legislation which specifically restricts the exercise of freedom of conscience.

In Spain, the death of Generalissimo Francisco Franco was followed by official statements of intention to implement a program of liberalization. This began with a royal pardon allowing the release of a considerable number of political prisoners. Nonetheless the law against illicit association and many provisions of the loosely-formulated Decree Law Against Terrorism remain in force so that political imprisonment is continuing on a large scale as this report is being written. Al observed trials in Spain both before and after the accession of King Juan Carlos I.

In Yugoslavia political arrests and trials of whole groups of people continued in 1975-76. Citizens suspected for their sympathies towards the Soviet Union formed a primary target. Most prisoners of conscience are imprisoned under Yugoslav laws related to "crimes against the state and nation". These include "hostile propaganda", "association against the people and state" and other exercise of freedom of conscience officially declared to be "anti-state".

Al sent trial observers to two trials in Yugoslavia, and AI representatives met with Yugoslav authorities to discuss the cases of particular prisoners.

Work on the Soviet Union was marked by the publication of a major report in late 1975. After official Soviet assertions that no-one is imprisoned for exercising freedom of conscience in the USSR, the Research Department prepared and distributed documentation on the application of criminal laws against "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda" and "anti-Soviet slander", as exemplified by the imprisonment of two Moscow Al members. The Soviet authorities did not reply to Al's applications to be allowed to send an observer to the trials of these persons.

In Turkey the past year saw many defendants imprisoned under criminal laws prohibiting communist organizational and propaganda activities. Citizens of a number of East European countries continue to suffer arrest and imprisonment for attempting to leave their country without official permission. Persons imprisoned on this charge in the German Democratic Republic, the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Romania are under adoption by Al.

Laws against communicating dissident ideas and information to serving soldiers have been applied in the past year to over 50 citizens of France and more than 20 persons in the United Kingdom (UK). Al sent an observer to the trial of 14 of the UK defendants, all of whom were acquitted.

Many states in East and West Europe continue to prosecute and imprison male citizens who, for reasons of conscience, refuse to serve in the armed forces

or civilian alternative service. A major report on imprisonment of conscientious objectors in Europe is due for publication around the end of 1976.

At the beginning of the period covered by this report only two countries were known to practise large scale detention without trial. In Portugal most of the almost 2,000 persons detained without trial after the revolution of April 1974 had been released by May 1976. An Al mission visited Portuguese authorities in June 1975 to express Al's concern at this and related problems. Al subsequently submitted to the Portuguese government a report detailing the abuses noted by Al and suggesting ameliorations. In the UK the last terrorist suspects detained in Northern Ireland under the Emergency Provisions Act without trial were released in December 1975.

In 1975-76 Al devoted considerable attention to the conditions in which prisoners of conscience are held. The report Prisoners of Conscience in the USSR: Their Treatment and Conditions focused on mistreatment of prisoners. In April 1976 the Research Department translated and distributed material documenting the disturbing conditions to which prisoners of conscience in Czechoslovakia are subjected. Subjection of prisoners to prolonged solitary confinement has occurred in several countries, and Al took action on such occurrences in the UK, the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic. Al is exploring possibilities, in collaboration with others, of writing and publishing a report on conditions in maximum security prisons in West Europe.

Many countries in Europe continue to pass sentences of capital punishment for a variety of offences. In 1975-76 death sentences were passed for acts of political terrorism in Spain and Yugoslavia. Al intervened against these death sentences and against others in the Soviet Union, France, Bulgaria and Romania.

ALBANIA

It remains more difficult to obtain detailed, reliable and up-to-date information on human rights violations in Albania than in any other country in Europe. It is also particularly difficult to obtain an adequate understanding of official attitudes there to human rights problems, to international concern regarding such problems and to the type of work undertaken by Amnesty International. Because of both of these factors, Al has not yet been able to design and implement a program of effective actions for prisoners in Albania.

Prerequisite to future actions for Albanian prisoners is persistent research on patterns and individual cases of human rights violations there. During the past year the Research Department continued to work on this task as a priority. At the end of 1975 details were supplied to Al by a former political prisoner who had recently managed to leave Albania. He had served 12 years of a 16-year sentence, with hard labour, for anti-communist activity and assisting others trying to escape Albania. He claimed to have been systematically tortured during pre-trial detention in the early 1960s.

Many of the reports of torture which have reached Al in the past also related to cases several years old. However, the relative frequency of such reports, corroborated by more recent evidence has led Al to the judgement that torture of political prisoners is still being used for the purpose of extracting testimony or confessions.

General prison and labour camp conditions are reported to be very poor.
Charmurlisky, a clerk in a cooperative who was arrested in Sofia in September 1974, was sentenced to death but was eventually pardoned after a major international campaign and is presently living in Israel. 

Al's Annual Report 1974/75.

Dr Spetter was sentenced to death, hut was eventually pardoned after an appeal (reduced on appeal from 15 years). 

Among prisoners reported to AI were three brothers who, in the 1960s, had tried to escape with their families, but were caught and returned to the Albanian authorities by Yugoslav border guards. After being exposed before the public in Shkoder, they were sentenced to long terms of hard labour, one of them to 25 years.

It appears that religious persecution is intense in this “first atheistic state in the world”. A clause on religion in the new draft constitution now under discussion claims that Albania “recognizes no religion and supports and develops atheistic propaganda for the purpose of implanting the scientific materialist world outlook”.

AI has received details regarding the imprisonment of several Roman Catholic priests and a Moslem imam.

As pointed out in AI’s Annual Report 1974/75, it is impossible to estimate with precision the total number of political prisoners in the country, although they appear to number in tens of thousands. AI has identified 31 labour camps and prisons in Albania, although this figure should not be seen as comprehensive. The number of prisoners in each labour camp appears to be around 1,500 and what reports have reached AI indicate that some of these camps hold only political and religious prisoners.

Most political prisoners are employed in industrial labour such as copper mining, but the ex-prisoner mentioned above has stated that he was kept in solitary confinement for two years in a small camp near Shkoder. Visits to prisoners from their relatives are reportedly extremely rare, perhaps only once a year for about five minutes in the presence of officials.

Despite this evidence of human rights violations in Albania, and the fact that Albania, although a member of the United Nations, has not signed the 1966 International Covenants on Human Rights, the review of the Albanian Communist Party recently attacked the “extraordinary” strengthening of repression in the Soviet Union, and referred to “the increase in prisons, concentration camps, psychiatric clinics, militia and army” there.

BULGARIA

Amnesty International groups are now working for the release of seven Bulgarian prisoners and are investigating the cases of 13 others. A disturbing pattern has emerged whereby some Bulgarian citizens who have had extended contact with West European countries have been convicted of espionage on what appear to be specious or non-existent grounds. The case of Dr. Heinrich Spetter and Solomon Ben-Joseph (both officials) were described in AI’s Annual Report 1974/75. Dr. Spetter was sentenced to death but was eventually pardoned after a major international campaign and is presently living in Israel. Mr Ben-Joseph is still serving a 12-year prison sentence (reduced on appeal from 15 years).

A similar case which came to AI’s attention in 1975 is that of Nicolas Stefanov Charmurlisky, a clerk in a cooperative who was arrested in Sofia in September 1974. Mr Charmurlisky was charged with espionage on the basis of his contact with an employee at the Italian embassy in Sofia through whom he sent letters to relatives in the United States of America. His arrest appears to be directly related to his attempts to obtain a passport and to his openly critical views. He was sentenced to death, and in February 1976 AI appealed to Bulgarian President Todor Zhivkov urging commutation of this death sentence. The appeal against the sentence was heard by the Supreme Court in March 1976, but the result is not yet known. Mr Charmurlisky is being held in the Vratza city prison and his case has been assigned to an AI group for investigation. It should be noted that all three of the above-mentioned defendants are Jewish.

AI received a report in January 1976 that the prison camp at Belene was again being used to house political prisoners. Belene, an island in the river Danube, was a notorious prison in the 1950s, but was then reportedly closed. However, a former Bulgarian citizen who was imprisoned there until autumn 1974 has provided detailed information about its present operation, including the statement that around 1,500 prisoners are being held there, most of them for political reasons. Of these prisoners, it is alleged, about 500 are Pomaks, ethnic Bulgarians of Moslem faith, many of whom have resisted official efforts to assimilate them by (for example) forcing them to change their Moslem names to Bulgarian names. Another 300 prisoners are Macedonians from the south-west of Bulgaria, who do not have official rights as an ethnic minority.

Apart from these imprisoned members of cultural minorities, it has been reported that another 280 prisoners in Belene include former social democrats, members of the Peasant Party, and dissident communists. A further allegation is that torture is being used in the Belene prison and that some prisoners are reported to have died from this treatment.

Bulgaria still practises banishment or “compulsory settlement” to labour corrective communities. At present eight of AI’s adoption and investigation cases are known to have been banished to remote towns or villages. They include Christo Kolev, a distinguished trade unionist and anarchist communist who was transferred to the village of Balvan in the district of Velik Trnov in the spring of 1975 and whose case was brought to the attention of the World Confederation of Labour in the second half of that year. He is one of a group of several libertarian or anarchist communists (who played an important part in the Bulgarian anti-fascist resistance during World War Two) to be deported without trial for an indefinite term of “corrective labour”.

CYPRUS

During the past year Amnesty International has continued to press for an investigation into the whereabouts of nearly 3,000 Greek Cypriots, missing since the events in the summer of 1974. Although many of those missing may have died during the fighting, there is evidence that some were taken prisoner and were alive after the cessation of hostilities.

In some cases the men were known to have been taken to the Turkish mainland. In July 1975 AI Secretary General Martin Ennals visited the Turkish embassy in London to hand over a list of missing persons, which he asked to be sent to Ankara for investigation. On 1 August 1975 and 23 January 1976 the subject was again raised in letters to the Turkish embassy in London.

On 27 October 1975, in a letter referring to the AI Secretary General’s visit to the Turkish embassy, Osman Orek, a Turkish-Cypriot spokesman, stated that “... there are no individuals currently held as prisoners of war or as detainees.
by the Turkish Peace Force, or by the authorities of the Turkish Federated State of Cyprus either in Turkey or in the Turkish controlled north.”

**CZECHOSLOVAKIA**

As of June 1976 Amnesty International adoption groups were working for 35 prisoners in Czechoslovakia (CSSR). But this figure should not be taken as an indication of the total number of prisoners of conscience in that country. It reflects rather the difficulty of obtaining information on political imprisonment in the CSSR.

During the past year a number of people, including many known dissenters, were repeatedly brought in for questioning and warning and their homes were searched and their papers taken away from them. This was especially the case in the tense atmosphere before the 15th Congress of the Czechoslovak Communist Party which opened on 12 April 1976.

Continued harassment of religious believers was evident. A number of Roman Catholic priests were forbidden to carry out their ministry and there were cases of short term arrests and prolongations of interrogations. Reportedly Roman Catholic nuns were barred from attending state schools of nursing and receiving diplomas. In October 1975 two Roman Catholic laymen, one of them a scientist, were accused of influencing young people towards religious faith.

Al's Annual Report 1974/75 stated that political prisoners had been excluded from the amnesty of 8 May 1975. After completion of the report, AI learned that five AI-adopted prisoners of conscience with sentences of up to three years had been released under article 1 of that amnesty. Among them was a Silesian priest, Father Frantisek Jurecka, who had been sentenced in April 1974 to 15 months’ imprisonment for his religious activities. He was dangerously ill during his imprisonment, and his AI adoption group had made repeated but unsuccessful attempts, including an approach to CSSR diplomatic authorities, to send him medicine necessary for his recovery. In March 1975 he suffered a stroke and half of his body was paralyzed. Father Jurecka was released under the amnesty of 8 May 1975. After a short stay in hospital, he died in August 1975.

A citizen of the German Democratic Republic who attempted to escape to the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) via Czechoslovakia and two FRG citizens who helped in this and other escape attempts were all adopted by Al.

The first trial in Czechoslovakia of a conscientious objector known to Al was held in December 1975. Frantisek Matula, a student of theology, was expelled in May 1974 from the Comenius theological faculty in Prague for taking part in a protest action. When called up for military service in April 1975 he refused to obey on grounds of conscience. He was arrested in September 1975 and in December 1975 sentenced to 15 months’ imprisonment, suspended for three years.

Foreign news agencies reported from Prague on 2 April 1976 that 19 young people, members of two “boat” groups performing anarchist music, had been detained and charged with creating public disorder. Evidently they had not engaged in politics, but manifested their protest against the established order by their appearance, by their way of life and by creating an artistic and cultural milieu of their own. Al is investigating their cases.

**FRANCE**

The French judiciary continues to pass severe sentences on conscientious objectors (COs). Amnesty International at present has 21 imprisoned COs under adoption, most of them sentenced to the maximum of 2 years’ imprisonment for refusal to obey call-up to military service or an officially designated civilian alternative service.

During the last year there has been an intensive campaign on the part of the many CO and new anti-militarist groups against the Tribunaux Permanents des Forces Armées (TPFA), the military courts in which objectors who have been refused CO status are tried. The cases of two leading activists in this movement, Bernard Remy and Jean-Louis Soulié, have received widespread publicity. Bernard Remy was released on 31 March 1976 after serving an 18-month sentence for refus d'obéissance (refusal to obey). Jean-Louis Soulié was given the relatively light sentence of one year’s imprisonment on 3 February 1976 for “refusal to obey” and “insubordination”. He was released in April but was at once re-arrested and charged with “refusal to obey”.

In November a large number of conscripts and some civilians who had taken part in attempts to form a trade union movement within the army were arrested under article 84 of the penal code for “participation in a venture to democratize the armed forces”. On 18 December Al wrote to President Giscard d’Estaing calling for the release of all those detained who had not been also accused of violence or other common law crimes. The Al appeal, which was made public, stated that although Al could take no stand on the question of structural reforms within the French armed forces, “the imprisonment of persons advocating such reforms was Al’s concern in that it violated the principle of freedom of expression.” Al also expressed concern at the fact that the accused faced proceedings in a special state security court (Cour de Sécurité de l’Etat).
On 5 March 1976 the last of these “syndicalists” (whose number since December had increased to 53) was released from prison. AI continued, however, to receive reports of soldiers being detained in their barracks instead of at the prisons. Although none of those arrested has yet been tried, many of them remain under indictment.

On 15 January AI appealed to President Giscard d’Estaing on humanitarian grounds for commutation of the death sentence passed on a 17-year-old minor, “Bruno T.” “Bruno T” was sentenced to death by the court of Beaufays in October 1975 for the murder of an elderly woman, and his death sentence was confirmed by the supreme appeal court, the Court of Cassation. The AI appeal also expressed AI’s opposition to any use of the death penalty and was supported by action on the part of several AI national sections. On 11 February 1976 it was announced that the President had commuted “Bruno T”’s death sentence to life imprisonment.

AI’s attention was also drawn to the imprisonment of eight members of the Breton autonomist movement at the prison of La Santé in Paris. These and four others, who were not imprisoned but were under “judiciary control”, were formally charged with reconstituting a banned movement (the Front de liberation de la Bretagne) and variously with attempts to cause an explosion or with illegal possession of explosives. One of the prisoners, the well-known Breton leader Yann Fournié, was about to be adopted by AI (which was satisfied that he had not used or possessed explosives for any violent or criminal purposes) when news came early in February of his release. This followed wide publicity and protest, including questions in the European Parliament from two United Kingdom members, Tom Ellis and Mrs Winifred Ewing. However, at the time of writing, Yann Fournié, who has dual French-Irish citizenship, still faces the charge of reconstitution of a banned movement and is not allowed to leave France.

GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

No official statistics are available on the incidence of political imprisonment in the German Democratic Republic (GDR). It is reasonably estimated that several thousand GDR citizens are imprisoned for exercising those fundamental rights contained in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. By far the greatest proportion of such prisoners are GDR citizens who were convicted of attempting legally to emigrate, usually directly to the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG), but in a number of cases via other East European countries such as Hungary and Bulgaria. The latter two states invariably refuse to grant any protection for would-be escapers who come into their custody and instead hand them back to the GDR authorities for inevitable prosecution.

There are also a number of prisoners in the GDR who are imprisoned for exercising their right to free expression. The latter right is restricted by article 106 of the GDR penal code under which citizens of the GDR may be charged with “incitement hostile to the state” (staatsfeindliche Letzte) for activities which are interpreted as “harming the socialist order of state and society of the GDR.”

Presently Amnesty International groups are working with some 130 adopted GDR prisoners, most of them imprisoned for attempting to leave the country. Sometimes imprisonment is simply for planning to emigrate, and in other cases it is for helping others to escape. There are occasions on which whole families try to leave illegally with the consequence that both husband and wife are sentenced to several years in prison. Another disturbing fact is that sometimes when prisoners are released and allowed to leave the country, they are faced with long uncertainty as to whether their children will be allowed to join them or whether the children will be taken into the care of the state authorities on the grounds that their parents are disqualified from bringing them up.

Many prisoners benefit from the continuous negotiations between the GDR and the FRG authorities to “buy out” GDR citizens who seek emigration to the FRG. A large proportion of prisoners are released and allowed to emigrate after they have served half of their prison sentence. AI has no involvement in this process, which reportedly led to the early release of some 1,200 prisoners in 1975.

One example of an AI adoption case involving imprisonment for exercising freedom of expression is that of the writer Siegmar Faust. Herr Faust (born in 1944) was arrested in 1971 on suspicion of “incitement hostile to the state”, but was released under an amnesty in 1972. He was arrested in 1974 on the same charge, based on his persistently nonconformist literary activity, his application to emigrate to the FRG (which he formally justified with reference to his harassment by security police) and his having collected signatures for a petition advocating greater civil liberties in the GDR. Herr Faust was sentenced to 41 years’ imprisonment. While serving his sentence in Cottbus prison he has been subjected to long periods of solitary confinement as punishment for continuing his dissident activity among fellow prisoners. AI is particularly concerned that Herr Faust has been kept in solitary confinement in spite of the fact that, according to recent reports, he is seriously ill (after a heart attack he is suffering from impaired blood circulation and failing eyesight).

Another example of intervention by AI is the case of Dr Wolfgang Dietrich, on whose behalf AI addressed a written appeal to GDR Attorney General Josef Strelt in December 1975. Dr Dietrich and his wife Erika were arrested in August 1973 for allegedly preparing to leave the GDR illegally. In November 1974 they were given to understand that they were due to be released under a pardon. But they were subsequently told that this decision had been reversed, and the full sentence would have to be served until February 1976. Subsequently, after a suicide attempt, Frau Dietrich was released from prison, although she was denied custody of the three Dietrich children. To support his wife’s demands to be reunited with her children, Dr Dietrich began a hunger strike in January 1975. For this he was severely punished, segregated from his fellow prisoners and, from February or March 1975, detained in solitary confinement reportedly under unhygienic conditions and without an adequate diet. Dr Dietrich was released in December 1975.

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

In 1975-76, Amnesty International gave considerable attention to the case of four Turkish citizens charged in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) with “participation in a criminal association”. The charge was in connection with their activities in the Turkish Liberation Front (Patriotisches Einheitsfront Turkei), a Marxist-Leninist organization of Turks living in Western Europe. The four Turks, Omer Ozerturgut, Hatice Yurtdas, Mustafa Tunatan and
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POLAND
Freedom of expression is limited in Poland by the existence of such legis-
lization as article 271 of the penal code, which prescribes imprisonment for
**PORTUGAL**

Since the assumption of power by the Armed Forces Movement (AFM) in 1974, the emphasis of Amnesty International's work has been on direct contacts with members of the new government and other relevant authorities.

A mission including AI Secretary General Martin Ennals went to Portugal in June 1975 to discuss the situation with President Francisco da Costa Gomes and other officials as well as with the Ordem dos Advogados (Order of Advocates) and the families of prisoners. The main issues in the talks were

The apparent irregularities in the arrest and detention procedures for political prisoners and what appeared to be a lack of any judicial procedure governing their release.

As a result, AI sent a memorandum in November 1975 to President Costa Gomes. While acknowledging the progress made in establishing a judicial machinery to handle the trials of political prisoners, the memorandum urged the Portuguese government to introduce human rights guarantees effectively embodied in law. It specifically recommended that this should be done jointly with the Order of Advocates and the judiciary. The aim should be the reconciling of the rights of the individual and the collective needs of society. Furthermore, it urged that certain prisoners, held without charge, should either be tried in open court or released. The President's office, in reply, stated that AI's recommendations were under consideration and that the government felt that the issues raised could soon be resolved.

AI estimated that at the time of the mission there were approximately 1,600 people imprisoned for political reasons. This figure included more than 1,000 members of the former political police (PIDE), 200 members of the "Maoist" Party (Movimento Reorganizativo do Partido do Proletariato - MRPP) and more than 100 people suspected of being involved in the attempted coup d'état of 28 September 1974 and 11 March 1975. In addition, there were a small number of bankers and businessmen and also former government ministers. Following the attempted uprising of 23 November 1975, more than 100 military personnel and civilians were arrested. By the end of May 1976 the majority of prisoners in these very diverse categories had either been released or were free on remand. The few prisoners remaining are mostly former PIDE personnel.

In December 1975 disturbing press reports mentioned possible deportations of foreign refugees resident in Portugal. AI therefore wrote to the Council of the Revolution and the leaders of the four main political parties expressing its concern at the reports. It requested that the greatest care be taken to avoid returning political refugees to countries where they might face persecution. So far AI has received no reports that any persons have been exposed to this risk. But a decree law was issued in March 1976 permitting the expulsion of foreigners whose activities are contrary to the interests of national security and public order.

AI also welcomed the establishment of a committee to investigate reports of violent treatment of prisoners held by the military authorities and finally the recognition given in the new constitution, published in April 1976, to human rights. The new constitution guarantees the right to strike, habeas corpus (which had been suspended) and conscientious objection. It also states that the death penalty (abolished in Portugal in 1867) must never be applied, and it prohibits the use of torture.

**ROMANIA**

Amnesty International is currently working on 14 Romanian cases, of which the two main categories remain persons imprisoned for religious beliefs and members of ethnic minorities, in particular the Hungarian and German communities.

Two of AI's best known adopted prisoners, Zoltan Kallos and Vasile Rascol were both released in 1976, and both before completing their sentences. Zoltan
Kallós, an eminent folklorist and musicologist of Hungarian origin had been sentenced in December 1974 to 21 years’ imprisonment for alleged homosexual connections. AI adopted Mr Kallós as a prisoner of conscience because it was probable that the genuine reason for his imprisonment was his persistent efforts to preserve and compile works of Hungarian culture. He was released on 26 June 1976.

Vasile Rascol, a Pentecostal minister sentenced in July 1974 to 2 years’ imprisonment, was released on 12 October 1975. After his arrest, according to reports, he had been first detained in a common law prison in Bucharest, subjected to hard labour and interrogated on the charge of distributing bibles printed abroad – regarded as illegal in Romania. He was later moved to the prison of Jilava after having been declared a political prisoner. In Romania it is customary for sentences to be reviewed half way through their course. Mr Rascol, who retained his religious beliefs, was refused parole at this half way point, but it was granted after a second review of the case. An indication of the importance attached to world public opinion in this case is that the Romanian consular service issued specially printed forms with notification of Vasile Rascol’s release.

Typical of cases involving those who were apprehended trying to flee across the border is that of a whole family, members of the German ethnic minority in Romania. This family, Elisabeth and Konrad Formanek and their son, together with the daughter and son-in-law, Edeltraut and Richard Didicher, were sentenced to terms ranging from 14 months to 12 months’ imprisonment after being arrested on the Romanian-Yugoslav border. Another family, Willy and Hildegard Krich were also sentenced to 14 months’ imprisonment after trying to cross the border in a caravan together with their two small sons. All were adopted by AI as prisoners of conscience.

It is now known that Richard Szattinger, against whose death sentence AI appealed in 1974, has had his sentence on the charge of industrial espionage reduced to 18 years’ imprisonment and is in the military prison of Bucharest. AI’s Research Department is trying to obtain more information about this trial.

Romanian criminal law includes articles prescribing imprisonment for disseminating politically “subversive” literature. It is disturbing that a number of literary critics have been subjected to official attacks in the context of a governmental campaign for ideological conformity which became especially vigorous after the summer of 1975. It may have been in connection with this campaign that Camil Demetroscu was arrested in the autumn of 1975. Mr Demetroscu, who had been imprisoned for 16 years from 1946, was charged with propagation of subversive material. This was in connection with some critical notes which he had written in a copy of a book describing the role of the Romanian Communist Party in the 1944 coup against the then-fascist government of Romania. He was sentenced to 6 years’ imprisonment but was released early in 1976.

Spain

Widespread hopes of an improvement in the human rights situation accompanied the accession to power of Prime Minister Carlos Arias Navarro in January 1974. Furthermore, it was felt that a certain liberalization might follow the death of Generalísimo Francisco Franco on 20 November 1975.
forces or other public officials, the maximum sentence for the particular
offence had to be applied. In cases of the death of any people in these
categories, or the death or mutilation of a kidnapped person, the decree
law laid down that the death penalty was mandatory. The terminology used in
the decree law permits the classification as terrorists of communists, anarchists and
separatists. Because of the procedure laid down for trial, defence lawyers are
severely restricted. In the "most summary" procedure before a military tribunal,
the defence lawyer may have as little as four hours in which to prepare his
client's defence.

This decree was subsequently amended in February 1976. Fourteen of the
21 clauses were abolished, including the use of the "most summary" procedure.
However, the right to search without a warrant and to detain suspects for up
to five days - which, on the authority of the competent judge, can be extended
to 10 days - remained.

In 1975-76 the criminal law against "illicit association" remained the principal
legal grounds for political imprisonment in Spain. In July 1975 AI sent Dr
Kurt Madlener, professor of law at the Max Planck Institute in the Federal
Republic of Germany to observe the trial in El Ferrol of 23 shipyard workers
adopted by AI groups. The workers had been arrested in March 1972 and
charged with illegal association, illicit propaganda, public disorder and sedition.
Ten of the accused were sentenced to terms of imprisonment ranging from one
to 7 years.

In September 1975 a French lawyer, Aimé Léaud, was sent to observe at
the trial in Madrid before a public order court of four AI-adopted prisoners.
The four were charged with "illicit association in a leading role" (asociación
jurídica en grado dirigente) in the Frente Revolucionario Anti-fascista y
Patriota (FRAP - Revolutionary Anti-fascist and Patriotic Front), a splinter group
of the Communist Party in Spain. Three of the accused were sentenced to 15
years and the fourth to 18 years. Leave to appeal was refused. Subsequently
Maître Léaud was detained for 18 hours by the police and then expelled
from the country on the grounds that he had taken notes during the trial.

During the period covered by this report, death sentences were carried out
on five people found guilty, at four separate trials, of the murder of police
officers.

AI sent Dr Madlener as an observer to the trial in Burgos of José Ignacio
Garmendia and Angel Otaegui Etcheverria. They were accused of the murder
of the local chief of the intelligence service near San Sebastian in April 1974
and of being members of Euskadi Ta Azkatasuna (ETA - Basque Homeland
and Liberty). Dr Madlener in company with other international observers was
refused entry to the trial which lasted just five hours. The two defendants
were sentenced to death.

Señor Garmendia was found guilty of having committed the murder on the
basis of his confession. This had been obtained while he was still in hospital
following a shot in the head at the time of his arrest. He was physically unable
to sign his confession so his fingerprint was placed on it. He subsequently
denied the confession. AI appealed to the Spanish Head of State, Generalísimo
Francisco Franco, for commutation of the sentences. Señor Garmendia's
sentence was subsequently commuted to 30 years' imprisonment on appeal.

But Señor Otaegui was one of the five men shot by firing squad on 27 Sep-
tember 1975, despite worldwide appeals to the government.
TURKEY

The First. Army Commander in Istanbul, General Adnan Ersöz, about the respective. These sentences were heavier than the penalties which had pre-
jectors. Only those whose religious beliefs prevent them from bearing arms
surrounding these allegations" was requested.

There is a strong movement in Switzerland to amend the law. There is a
procedure usual for new laws and constitutional amendments. A final draft

will have to be approved by parliament before the Swiss people vote on it.

TURKEY

Many arrests and imprisonments have taken place over the past year of
people charged under articles 141 and 142 of the Turkish penal code. These
prohibit forming organizations "aimed at establishing the domination of a social
class over other social classes" and making "communist propaganda.

As the number of arrests has increased so have the allegations of torture.
On several occasions Amnesty International wrote to the Turkish authorities
to express concern at reports of torture in Turkish prisons. A letter of 11 July
1975 to Minister of Justice Ismail Muftuoglu urged that an official investigation
should be held into the alleged subjection of a prisoner to electrical shocks.
On 5 March 1976 two further cases of alleged torture were raised with Prime
Minister Süleyman Demirel and again "a formal inquiry into the circumstances
surrounding these allegations" was requested.

In April 1976 a considerable amount of detailed information about alleged
torture was received by AI. On 26 April 1976 Secretary General Martin Ennals
once again raised the question of torture in a letter to Mr Demirel: "... the
amount of detailed information that we have received suggests that at least
two police stations - Ankara Emnity Sarayı and the First Bureau of the
Istanbul Police at Gayrettepe - the torture of political prisoners has become
routine practice." Examples of allegations relating to 1976 were provided, as
were the names of alleged torturers. In conclusion, the Secretary General said:

The number of allegations and the circumstantial detail contained in them
are in themselves most convincing and I understand have given rise to
demands within Turkey for an investigation. I urge you most strongly to
initiate an investigation as soon as possible.

On 13 January 1976 letters were sent to Minister of Defence Ferit Melen and
the First Army Commander in Istanbul, General Adnan Ersöz, about the
alleged medical neglect of Yusuf Kupeli, a political prisoner, who had pre-
viously suffered from tuberculosis and rheumatism of the heart and who was
reported to be in extremely bad health.

AI groups are working for the release of 23 Turkish prisoners and other

cases are under investigation by the Research Department. The exact number
of political prisoners in Turkey at the present time is not known.

UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

In November 1975 Amnesty International published a major report, Prisoners
of Conscience in the USSR: Their Treatment and Conditions. The report
described the treatment of Soviet prisoners of conscience primarily in its legal
context and showed both the deficiencies in Soviet legislation related to im-
prisonment and psychiatric detention and the ways in which this legislation is
applied in violation of proclaimed human rights standards both domestic and
international.

Most Soviet prisoners of conscience are detained in the colonies and prisons
of the corrective labour system. According to Soviet law the corrective labour
system aims at the "correction and re-education" of prisoners rather than at
"inflicting physical suffering or degrading human dignity". However, the
conditions described in the AI report are such that "medical neglect dovetails
with chronic hunger and with overwork to give to Soviet penal institutions
a more punitive character than is justified by any standards, let alone by the
high standards proclaimed by Soviet authorities."

The report ascribed mistreatment of Soviet prisoners in part to deficiencies in
current legislation which, for example, legitimizes the use of hunger as a means
of punishing and disciplining prisoners. Additionally, prisoners are subjected
to the punitive tradition of the ministry of Internal Affairs (MVD) officials
who administer the places of imprisonment. Prisoners who refuse to recant
dissenting opinions and voice them to others are especially liable to be punished
by confinement to punishment cells (with reduced rations), deprivation of
correspondence and visiting rights and a variety of forms of harassment.

A large part of the Al report dealt with the confinement of some political
and religious dissenters to psychiatric institutions. The brunt of Al's criticism
was directed at Soviet legal norms regarding the detention of persons charged
with criminal offences and suspected of being mentally ill. The report stated
that Soviet law is wholly inadequate in this respect and lays the way open
for wrongful incarceration either on account of political considerations or
through the errors and prejudices of psychiatrists and courts. The report stated
that in a number of cases examining psychiatrists and courts have ruled
Soviet citizens to be mentally ill on direct account of their having expressed
or acted upon dissenting political or religious beliefs.

Often when the friends and relatives of such persons have argued against the
verdict of insanity, they have been told that "seeming normality" is not a
decisive criterion of mental health. Most political or religious dissidents whom
Al knows to have been forcibly confined to mental hospitals have had no
record of violent activity. Yet, at least until recently, Soviet courts have
usually chosen the most severe course of treatment for such persons: confine-
ment to a special psychiatric hospital.

The report was deeply critical of the latter institutions, which it describes
as being more like prisons than like hospitals. The inmates have no access to
any mechanism of appeal or complaint. Convicted criminal prisoners are
employed as orderlies in a number of special psychiatric hospitals, and there
have been regular reports that these have abused and beaten inmates. Inmates
have no influence over their medical treatment and their families have no power
to countermand the decisions of the doctors, who may even remain anonymous. In special psychiatric hospitals, where patients are kept in almost total isolation from society and where non-medical criteria influence the appointment of psychiatrists, the anonymity of psychiatrists and the unchallengable character of their decisions invite medical practices which are positively dangerous for patients. The report described the treatment of some political inmates with powerful drugs, which are frequently administered without sound medical justification and without regard for the inmates' medical safety.

Since publication of the report, information reaching AI has confirmed its findings. In an important development a number of samizdat documents have emerged describing, in greater detail than was previously available, conditions of daily life, compulsory labour and disciplinary punishment in Vladimir prison, a maximum security prison in which around 40 political prisoners are held. (Samizdat are unofficially-published materials which are circulated on the chain letter principle.)

Important information has also been provided by Leonid Plyushch, who emigrated from the USSR immediately after being released from the Dnepropetrovsk (Ukraine) special psychiatric hospital. Mr Plyushch, a Ukrainian cybertechnician and a Marxist by conviction, was arrested in early 1972 and charged with "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda" on the basis of his authorship of a number of samizdat writings on political and human rights questions in the USSR. He was officially diagnosed as suffering from "creeping schizophrenia" and confined from July 1973 to January 1976 in the Dnepropetrovsk institution. A widespread international campaign led by a committee of mathematicians and supported by AI contributed to his ultimate release.

Among the most important revelations made by Mr Plyushch since his release is his estimate that around 60 of his fellow-inmates in the Dnepropetrovsk special psychiatric hospital had been arrested and declared mentally ill in connection with their political or religious actions, although he added that some of these same inmates may genuinely suffer from mental disorders. Mr Plyushch has also given the opinion that there may be as many as 1,000 political inmates of psychiatric hospitals in the USSR. Both of these figures are higher than AI's previous estimates of incidence of this form of political imprisonment.

It remains difficult to obtain reliable information on prisoners of conscience detained in this way, partly because of the unwarranted secrecy which surrounds psychiatric hospitals (especially the "special" variety) and partly because Soviet citizens who attempt to make known details of such cases are liable themselves to be imprisoned for spreading "slander", as happened to current AI-adopted prisoners Vladimir Bukovskiy, Senyon Ghalam, Sergei Kovalyov and Andrei Tverdokhlebov.

One new case of psychiatric detention for clearly political reasons which came to AI's attention in 1975-76 was that of Vyacheslav Ignatov (born in 1947), an electrician from Odessa. Mr Ignatov was arrested in March 1975 and charged with "anti-Soviet slander" on the basis of his having possessed and circulated several samizdat documents. During the investigation which followed, Mr Ignatov refused to answer questions. He was examined by an officially-appointed forensic psychiatric commission which diagnosed him as "schizophrenic". This diagnosis was approved by a court in Odessa in early 1976. In
have been carried out. Although Al knows of no recent death sentences being
passing in political cases, it continued in the past year to protest death penalties
the organization's view that the Incitement to Disaffection Act "constitutes
the death penalty was carried
an unacceptable limitation on freedom of speech" and urged an end to court
served in prison as convicted criminals. All of them receive trials (or in some cases court hearings which
decide on their mental fitness), all are imprisoned under sentence, and all are
released from imprisonment exactly on expiry of their sentence, unless, as
happened to the Crimean Tatar Mustafa Dzhemilyov, the prisoner is faced
with new charges before his release.

While Al knows of some cases where prisoners of conscience are serving
sentences passed for alleged criminal offences not formally related to political
or religious activity (for example "accepting bribes" in the case of Dr Mikhail
Shtern, or "hooliganism" in the case of Alexander Feldman), the charges most
often preferred relate specifically to exercise of freedoms of conscience: for
example "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda", "anti-Soviet slander", "flight
abroad or refusal to return from abroad to the USSR", or articles limiting
religious freedom. Al has never heard of any defendant being acquitted by a
Soviet court on any of these political charges.

In the face of international criticism during the past year official Soviet
spokesmen on a number of occasions denied that such laws provide imprison-
ment for expression of opinion. Illustration to the contrary is provided by the
cases of Dr Sergei Kovalyov and Andrei Tverdokhlebov, respectively a member
and the secretary of Al's Moscow group. Dr Kovalyov, who was arrested in
December 1974, came to trial in December 1975 in Vilnius (Lithuania) on
charges of "anti-Soviet agitation and propaganda". The accusation was that Dr
Kovalyov had spread information which he knew to be false and slanderous, one
indicted instance of this being statements in A Chronicle of Current Events to
the effect that Leonid Plyushch (see above) was detained in a psychiatric hospital
without medical justification. Dr Kovalyov was convicted and sentenced
to 7 years' imprisonment in a strict regime corrective labour colony to be
followed by 3 years in internal exile.

His Al colleague Andrei Tverdokhlebov was brought to trial in April 1976
on charges of "disseminating fabrications known to be false which defame the
Soviet state and social system". Mr Tverdokhlebov too was found guilty of
circulating information in defence of persons imprisoned for political actions.
The indictment against him specified as "lying slanders" statements by him that
former prisoners of conscience Victor Finshberg, Pyotr Grigorenko and Leonid
Plyushch were not in need of compulsory psychiatric treatment. The indictment
similarly cited a collection of documents which he had edited and which alleged
misreatment of inmates of Soviet corrective labour institutions. Mr Tverdokhle-
bov was sentenced to 5 years in exile (effectively reduced to 2 years in
exile because of the length of time he had already spent in detention).

Al adoption groups and national sections campaigned vigorously on behalf
of both Mr Tverdokhlebov and Dr Kovalyov. The organization was not success-
ful in persistent efforts to obtain permission to send an observer to their trials.

The Soviet news media announced the passing of a number of death sentences
in 1975-76, and it is clear that in at least some cases, the death penalty was car-
rried out. Soviet criminal law allows application of capital punishment for 18
different offences in peacetime, including a number of non-violent crimes. In
the past several years the Soviet media have announced around 30 death
sentences each year, although it is impossible to estimate how many of these
have been carried out. Although Al knows of no recent death sentences being

In a novel development, a number of sanitized documents emerged in 1975
which provided a highly credible record of systematic beatings and tortures of
non-political prisoners in a Georgian prison. The central document was an
unofficial transcript of the April 1975 trial of two inmates of Investigation
Prison Number 1 in Tbilisi on charges of beating a fellow inmate to death. One
of the defendants, Yuri Tskiridze, testified that he had beaten the victim on
instructions from prison authorities, and that he had undertaken this sort of
task many times since 1958 to help obtain "confessions", mostly from prisoners
charged with corruption or spying.

The trial transcript and other materials indicate that investigative officials
of the prison, abetted by certain local officials, had employed convicted prisoners
in this way. Among the methods allegedly used were beatings, burning victims
with cigarettes and subjecting them to homosexual rape. The material further
indicated that over the years several prisoners had died as a result of such
treatment.

When this situation came to light in connection with the Tskiridze case
several officials were transferred from their positions, and the judge in the
Tskiridze trial said that some implicated officials should be brought to criminal
responsibility. In November 1975 Al wrote to USSR Procurator General Roman
Rudenko requesting a full investigation of these allegations and that the officials
responsible be brought to justice. Issue number 36 of A Chronicle of Current
Events (dated 31 December 1975) reported that criminal charges had been
brought against two members the prison's staff.

At the time of writing Al has around 300 Soviet prisoners of conscience
under adoption or investigation.

UNITED KINGDOM

The past year saw more than 20 United Kingdom (UK) citizens brought to
court under the Incitement to Disaffection Act. This legislation makes punish-
able by imprisonment any attempt "maliciously and adversely" to "seduce any
member of Her Majesty's forces from his duty or allegiance to Her Majesty".
It also makes it a crime to possess "any document of such a nature that the
dissemination thereof among members of Her Majesty's forces would constitute
such an offence".

During most of the time since its enactment in 1934, this law has only rarely
been applied. However in recent years some British citizens, notably pacifists
who oppose the British military role in Northern Ireland, have communicated
their views to British soldiers and have subsequently been charged under the
act. Amnesty International has adopted any persons imprisoned for "incitement
to disaffection".

Among those brought to trial in 1975 on this charge were 14 members of
the British Withdrawal From Northern Ireland Campaign (BWNIC). All were
additionally charged with conspiracy to violate the act, and this charge in-
creased the maximum possible sentence to life imprisonment. In June 1975 in a
letter to Attorney General Samuel Silkin and in a press statement, Al reiterated
the organization's view that the Incitement to Disaffection Act "constitutes
an unacceptable limitation on freedom of speech" and urged an end to court
proceedings against the 14. Al also stated that it would adopt as prisoners of
disciplinary offences is laid down by UK prison regulations. While each award

award of solitary confinement is limited to a maximum of 56 days, the award may be

YUGOSLAVIA

In 1975-76 one manifestation of the efforts of the Yugoslav government to

ensure the future stability and security of their state was a dramatic series of

political arrests and trials. The number of prisoners whose cases are under

adoption or investigation by Amnesty International groups has risen to over

100, and a considerable number of other cases are being studied by the Re-

search Department.

Most known political arrests and trials in the past year have been of groups

rather than single individuals. According to a statement in early 1976 by the

Yugoslav Federal Minister of the Interior, Franjo Herlev, 200 people were

arrested in 1975 in connection with "activities against the people and state". To

these must be added an estimated 86 persons arrested for political offences in

the first four months of 1976. As this report is being written, AI has 101

prisoners in Yugoslavia under adoption or investigation by its groups.

President Josip Broz Tito, in a March 1976 radio interview in Sweden, admitted

the scale of the problem when he acknowledged the existence of a

considerable number of political prisoners in Yugoslavia, most of whom he
described as "Stalinists". Indeed, the high rate of arrest of communists officially
regarded as sympathetic to Moscow (and therefore referred to as "Comin-
formists", after the international communist organization from which Yugo-

slavia was expelled in 1948) was the principal element in the increase of poli-
tical imprisonment in Yugoslavia in 1975-76.

Over the past year the Yugoslav authorities have continued to allow AI
officials to come to Yugoslavia to study and discuss with them cases of political
imprisonment. Professor Fris Ritter, of Amsterdam University in the Nether-
lands, who had earlier attended the trials of Dr Djura Djurovic and Mihajlo
Mihajlov (see AI's Annual Report 1974 (75) twice visited officials of the ministry
of justice, who allowed him to see the prisoner Dr Djurovic in December 1975.
At the same time agreement in principle was reached for an AI mission to
visit Belgrade in the summer of 1976 to discuss with high level Yugoslav autho-
rity human rights problems in the Yugoslav and international contexts.

In February 1976 AI sent an official observer, Dr Marius Broekmeyer of the
University of Amsterdam, to the trial in Belgrade of four "Cominformists"
charged with "crimes against the state" in connection with their alleged criti-
cism from the Cominformist point of view of developments in Yugoslavia
since 1948. The trial was officially designated as closed to the public and Dr
Broekmeyer was not admitted to the proceedings, although he was courteously
received by state officials and allowed to inform himself about the case from
official documents.

The four defendants, Duljan Brkić (a former prime minister of the Croatian
 republic), Milovan Stevanović (an ex-editor of the national news agency
Tanjug), Ljubomir Radulović and Radovan Zigarić, were sentenced respectively
to 8, 10, 7 and 61 years' imprisonment. From information available to AI,
it appears that they were convicted for expressing their critical opinions to acquaintances, and there was no substantial evidence that they were involved in any insurrectionary conspiracy warranting such sentences.

Other Cominformist trials in the past year have invariably produced guilty verdicts, and sentences have ranged from several years' to 15 years' imprisonment. In December 1975 AI's Research Department produced and circulated a comprehensive background paper regarding the imprisonment of "Cominforms" with a view to informing the international public of the nature and extent of the problem.

In addition to the campaign against "Cominformists", other Yugoslav citizens have been imprisoned in the past year for offences related to nationalist activities or other types of political dissidence. Such cases vary from Serbs, Croats and Albanians (in the autonomous region of Kosovo) imprisoned for pursuing nationalist aims, to Yugoslav lawyers imprisoned for their civil rights activities.

In the latter category the cases of Srdja Popovié, a Belgrade lawyer who has defended many persons charged with political "offences" in the past 10 years, attained considerable international prominence because his was the first known case in which a Yugoslav lawyer was convicted and imprisoned directly on account of his courtroom defence of a client. AI's Swedish Section sent an observer, Gunnar Berg, to the March 1976 trial of Mr Popovié. It was charged that Mr Popovié had "spread hostile propaganda" during the 1974 trial of Professor Dragoljub Ignjatovié (who was adopted by AI) when he had argued that Mr Ignjatovié's critical statements about the Yugoslav political and economic situation should be considered true unless they could be proved in court to be false. Mr Popovié was convicted and sentenced to one year's imprisonment. AI protested publicly against the conviction. In May 1976, an appeal court suspended Mr Popovié's prison sentence. But at the same time he was disbarred from legal practice for one year.

On 6 December 1975 two adopted prisoners of AI, the leading dissident writer Mihajlo Mihajlov and the Croatian Christian writer and French citizen Mirko Vidovié, began a hunger strike in the prison of Sremska Mitrovica together with an Orthodox priest. They embarked upon this hunger strike as a protest against underheated cells, lack of reading material and the fact that political prisoners are not recognized by the Yugoslavs as a separate category. The hunger strike was marked throughout by conflicting reports. In view of unofficial information that one of the three, Mr Mihajlov, was in very bad health, AI adoption groups and national sections undertook a press and letter campaign on behalf of the three prisoners.

Less is known at the time of writing about the present circumstances of Mirko Vidovié, who was sentenced on 16 July 1971 to 4 years' imprisonment on a charge of undermining the unity of Yugoslavia and its system, and whose sentence had been increased after he apparently had refused to give evidence against other prisoners. It is known that he is already suffering from severe stomach troubles, and that his health has deteriorated during his imprisonment.

At the beginning of 1976 AI learned that the Croatian Mijinseko Hričić had been sentenced to death for the fourth time in connection with his alleged role in a bomb explosion in a Belgrade cinema in 1968. In February 1976 national sections of AI cabled and wrote to President Tito urging commutation of the death sentence on humanitarian grounds.

Middle East

The greatest obstacle to Amnesty International's work for political prisoners in the Middle East is still the lack of reliable and detailed information. This is particularly true for some countries, such as Iran and Iraq, where the human rights situation gives the greatest cause for concern, and, to a somewhat lesser extent, for Oman, Syria and Libya. Allegations of torture, or reports of death sentences may come too late for AI to initiate the necessary action on a prisoner's behalf. Equally, information on political arrests may be too vague to enable the Research Department to identify prisoners of conscience or to intervene effectively on their behalf with the governments concerned. In the case of Saudi Arabia, the Yemen Arab Republic and some of the Gulf States, the inadequacy of information inhibits any informed assessment of the human rights situation in these countries.

The reasons for this general paucity of information on political imprisonment in the Middle East are various. In the case of Iran and Iraq, and also to some extent Libya and Syria, repressive systems have intimidated the population, including the legal profession, into silence. Strict press censorship imposed by most Middle Eastern governments is another reason and Lebanon, once the Arab world's center for information and the news media, is no longer able to function as such since fighting broke out in mid-1975.

There is also a general lack of awareness in the Middle East of individual legal rights, both nationally and internationally. There is also no tradition, when human rights have been violated, of seeking the assistance or intervention of independent legal institutions. There is also a general lack of information about - and in some cases a suspicion of - international, humanitarian organizations like AI.

AI's activities this year have therefore focused as much on finding ways to increase awareness of its statute and activities as on work for individual prisoners. Attempts have been made to disseminate more information into the Middle East about AI and its activities, particularly material in the Arabic language. A 12-page booklet in Arabic entitled "Amnesty International, Its Aims and Activities" was published in April 1976, and a version in Farsi is being considered. A briefing paper on the legal and human rights situation in the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, published in May 1976, is also to be translated into Arabic. Both publications are being widely distributed to Arab governments, embassies, the news media, lawyers' associations and universities.

Attention is also being paid to the importance of keeping individuals and organizations in the Middle East informed about AI's concerns, and of increasing Middle Eastern participation in AI's activities. Every opportunity is taken to
The Egyptian authorities claim the Egyptian Communist Party has been responsible for this opposition. Dissolved in 1966, the party, according to a Beirut proclamation in August 1975, has now been reconstituted to mobilize the "patriotic and Nasserist forces within the regime". (All parties other than the Arab Socialist Union have been banned in Egypt.)

Those arrested this past year therefore have either been alleged members of illegal left-wing or communist organizations, or workers and trade unionists. Early in July 1975, 20 Trotskyists were arrested in Cairo. They were allegedly leaders of the "International Communist League" which is said to have connections with the Revolutionary Communist Party in Lebanon and the French Communist Party. They were charged under article 98 of the criminal law with aiming to overthrow the country's political and economic system. Most were released shortly after their arrest. Al took up the cases of four who were initially refused bail: two Iraqi school teachers and two Egyptian textile workers detained in Cairo. In April 1976 they were granted bail, and the Iraqis have now been allowed to leave the country. No date has been fixed for a trial.

In March 1976 worker strikes and demonstrations in Alexandria, Mahalla Al Kubra and Damietta led to reports of wide scale arrests, particularly of trade unionists. In April it was reported that 20 "communists" were arrested in Alexandria and charged with subversion. Further details, and the names of the detainees are being sought so that their cases may be taken up.

This year the trial of two groups of alleged communists, arrested in 1972 and 1973, finally took place. In March 1976, four persons were sentenced to a total of 11 years' imprisonment with fines amounting to E £1,800 (US $3,600). They included an Iraqi national sentenced in absentia. They had been arrested in 1972 and charged with setting up a communist front called the Arab Socialist Party and inciting workers against the government. Al is in the process of taking up their cases.

On 27 May 1975, 19 persons for whom Al groups have been active were finally acquitted, reportedly for lack of evidence. They had been arrested in June 1973 and charged under article 98 of the criminal law with forming, or being members of, a communist organization with the aim of overthrowing the government. The court had ordered their release on bail only on 23 March 1975. (Al had sent an observer to these proceedings.) Their trial however was postponed to 22 June, when Al sent another observer, a Turkish lawyer, Dr Ugur Alacakaptan, but the proceedings were again postponed.

On six occasions during the past year Al has sent cables to President Sadat urging the commutation of death sentences. Four persons were charged with spying for Israel and were subsequently sentenced to death. One of them, Samir Basili, had been sentenced to death in January 1975, when Al made its first appeal. The date of execution was postponed until 12 January 1976. It was further postponed after Mr Basili claimed he had been tortured while in detention and the public prosecutor ordered an investigation. On 23 January Al again appealed for commutation.

Two others sentenced to death by a military tribunal for spying were Ibrahim Saeed Shahin and his wife Insrah Ali Musa. In January 1976 Al learned that President Sadat had ordered the release of Insrah Ali Musa to allow her to bring up her children. On 28 January, Al, while commending this act of leniency, urged President Sadat to commute the sentence of her husband. The
third person was Ragub Abdul Ati. AI sent a cable on 2 June 1975 urging
commutation of sentence. It is not known whether either sentence has been
carried out.

Three members of the underground Islamic Liberation Party were sentenced
to death by the State Security Supreme Court in May 1975. They had been
involved in an armed attack on Cairo Military Academy in April 1974 in
which 11 people were killed and 27 wounded. AI sent a cable on 2 June 1975
appealing for clemency, and one of the death sentences was later commuted to
life imprisonment, but the two others were confirmed by President Sadat on
12 October 1975. AI again appealed on 16 October 1975, but the result is not
known.

The Egyptian government has continued to award compensation to prisoners
tortured during President Gamal Abdul Nasser's regime to prosecute
responsible officials. In July 1975 the trial was announced of President Nasser's
chief of intelligence, Salah Nasr, and two of his assistants, on charges of
ordering the torture of Mustapha Amin. Mr Amin, a journalist, had been
arrested in 1965 on spying charges and was released only in 1974.

In September the family of a man who had died in prison after torture
was awarded £10,000 (US $20,000) compensation. And on 22 May 1976 the
trial started of three retired generals, formerly associated with Cairo military
prison. They were charged with torturing imprisoned army officers in August/
September 1967 to force them to confess to complicity in a plot against the
state security.

Two major amnesties were declared in 1975. The first, on 8 July 1975,
benefited those who had been tried and convicted of political crimes, or who
had been deprived of constitutional rights for political reasons, before 15 May
1971. On this occasion AI sent a cable to President Sadat welcoming the news
of the amnesty, but requesting that clemency be extended to political prisoners
arrested since that date. The second amnesty, on 23 July, when 1384 criminal
prisoners were released, marked the anniversary of the 1952 revolution.

AI has four cases under investigation in Egypt, all are currently released on
bail pending trial. AI believes there may be several hundred persons currently
detained for political reasons. Further information is being sought about them
so that their cases can be taken up.

IRAN

Amnesty International has continued to study with deep concern the treat-
ment of political prisoners in Iran. There has been an identifiable increase in
the repression of opposition within Iran and an extension of the activities of
SAVAK (Iranian National Intelligence and Security Organization) to countries
in which Iranians are living abroad, in an attempt to prevent criticism of the
Iranian regime.

The exact number of political prisoners in Iran is not known, but AI believes
it to be several thousands. Other sources have given approximate numbers
which range from 25,000 to 100,000. The Shahanshah of Iran Mohammed-Reza
Pahlavi himself has stated publicly (National Broadcasting Company of the
United States of America television program, "Meet the Press", 18 May 1975)
that fewer than 3,000 persons were imprisoned in Iran on charges related to
"terrorist" actions. However, AI has reliable information about many prisoners
who have clearly not been involved in any violence. These include Nasser
Rahman-Nazar, who was arrested while preparing a production of Maxim Gorki's play
"The Lower Depths". They were sentenced in November 1975 by a military
tribunal to between 2 and 11 years' imprisonment. Nasser Rahman-Nazar,
who received the 11-year sentence, was alleged to have been severely tortured.

The torture of political prisoners during interrogation appears to be routine
practice, but prisoners may also be subjected to torture again at any time during
their imprisonment. On two occasions appeals were made on behalf of alleged
victims of torture. In August 1975 AI received reports of the renewed torture
of Abbas Shehadi, a doctor of medicine, about whom previous reports of
torture had been received in 1973. Dr Shehadi has himself been outspoken
in the past about the use of torture in Iran and was arrested in 1971 because
he spoke publicly against torture.

In January 1976 information was received about the alleged torture of
Ayatollah Hoseinali Montazeri, a 65-year-old religious leader who was arrested
in late 1974. Ayatollah Montazeri is said to have lost his hearing because both
his eardrums have been perforated. It is also reported that his 85-year-old
father was beaten up and severely injured because he refused to cooperate
with the security police, SAVAK.

As in previous years the number of executions in Iran has been a matter
of great concern to AI. In June 1975 two political prisoners were executed,
and in the first two months of 1976 alone 15 executions were reported. In most
cases AI received no prior information about the executions. But in the case
of 10 political prisoners who were sentenced to death on 31 December 1975,
AI cabled an appeal for commutation of the sentences to the Shah and
Secretary General Martin Ennals visited the Iranian embassy in London to ask
that an AI observer should be allowed to attend the appeal hearing in Tehran.
Appeals were also sent to the Shah from many of AI's national sections. Only
one of the 10, Mehdi Gheyouran, was reprieved. The remaining nine prisoners
were executed on 24 January 1976.

On five separate occasions in the past year amnesties have been declared
for prisoners tried by military tribunals. A total of nearly 1,200 prisoners are
reported to have been released, but it is not known whether any of these
were adopted prisoners of conscience.

AI groups are working on 118 cases of prisoners in Iran.

IRAQ

Iraq remains one of the most serious violators of human rights in the Middle
East. Amnesty International continues to receive reports of arbitrary arrests,
routine torture, summary executions and inadequate legal safeguards. It is,
however, difficult to give a comprehensive picture of political imprisonment
because of the paucity of detailed and reliable information. This is due largely
to the secrecy which surrounds arrests, detentions and executions in Iraq.
Equally, it is difficult to apply traditional AI techniques where information is
so inadequate, and where the government tends to be highly sensitive about
what it considers as interventions in its internal affairs.

There are no official or unofficial figures for the number of persons cur-
rently imprisoned for political reasons. Throughout the eight years of Baath
Party rule, all opposition has been systematically suppressed, and has been
considerably reduced as a result. But the government continues to react strongly
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The Iraqi News Agency on 4 November reported that he was executed on 24 October. The Iraqi ambassador to the Netherlands two days later confirmed that those who had been executed included:

- a number of Kurds detained before the Iraq/Iran agreement;
- some of those who fled to Iran and took advantage of the amnesty to return to Iraq, as members of the Kurdish armed forces (Pesh merGas), of the Kurdish intelligence service (Parawin), and others closely associated with the Kurdish leader, Mullaa Mustapha Barzani;
- and a member of the legislative assembly of the autonomous region in Iraq, Rauf Mustapha Ghafour, a lawyer from Soleimaniya. He was one of 34 Kurds shot in Kirkuk in May 1975, and the only one of the group whose body was reportedly returned to his family.

On 19 February 1976 the Iraqi ambassador in London replied to AI's inquiries by saying:

I would like to seize this opportunity to assure you that the faulty allegations regarding "the death sentences and executions in Iraq" referred to in your aforesaid letter are sheer fabrications of some quarters who have the intention to damage the good reputation that Iraq has been enjoying since the outset of its progressive nationalist revolution of July 1968.

He affirmed that the government of Iraq "has declared a general amnesty in respect to those who have taken part in Kurdish armed movement in the northern part of Iraq."

A more widely reported execution was that of Alexander Leon Aaronson, a 38-year-old Jewish male nurse from the Netherlands, who travelled to Kurdistan in the summer of 1974 to give medical assistance to the Kurds. He was arrested in Kurdistan in March 1975 following the Iraq/Iran agreement. He was sentenced to death by a revolutionary court on charges of spying for Israel and acting as an adviser to the Kurdish leader, Mullaa Mustapha Barzani. The Iraqi News Agency on 4 November reported that he was executed on 24 October. The Iraqi ambassador to the Netherlands two days later confirmed the death sentence but denied that Mr Aaronson had been executed.

On 7 November AI sent a letter to Foreign Minister Hammadi asking for clarification of these conflicting reports. On 19 November AI sent a cable to President Al Bakr urging that, if Mr Aaronson was still in detention, his medical condition be taken into consideration and the sentence be commuted. The Dutch government received confirmation only in mid-March 1976 that Mr Aaronson had been executed three months previously. At the time of writing, AI is awaiting a reply from the Iraqi government to its proposal to send a mission to the country during 1976.

ISRAEL

In June 1975 John Mortimer, a British lawyer, went to Israel on behalf of Amnesty International to observe the trial of Muzna Nicola, an Israeli Arab nurse. She was charged with being a member of the Al Fatah guerrilla organisation, performing services for it and gathering information likely to damage Israel's security. The trial took place before a civil court in Haifa. Miss Nicola was sentenced to 4 years' imprisonment, of which 21 years were suspended.

Many individual cases were raised during the year in letters to the Israeli authorities. In particular, an inquiry was made on 13 February 1976 about the treatment of Shawki Khathib, who is serving an 8-year sentence for alleged espionage. On 23 March 1976 AI asked for information about the reported arrests of 89 Palestinian students in the occupied territories while on vacation from their studies at Egyptian universities.

In a letter of 9 September 1975 to Minister of Justice Haim Zadok, AI referred to two allegations of torture which were the first relating to Israel received by AI for more than a year. An investigation into the allegations was requested.

On 28 May 1976 further allegations of torture were raised by AI in a letter to Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin. AI pointed out that in many cases these new allegations were supported by doctors' reports. The Prime Minister was requested to "institute an independent inquiry into the treatment of detained persons."

On 7 January 1976 AI wrote to Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin and Minister of Defence Shimon Peres about eight Jehovah's Witnesses, imprisoned because of their refusal to perform military service. They were subsequently released and in a letter to AI dated 7 March 1976, Israeli Attorney General Aharon Barak wrote:

A committee has been appointed to investigate all aspects of the problem as it appears in our country. The findings of this committee will serve as the basis for determining our future policy. We should be pleased to receive additional information on legislation in other countries concerning the Jehovah's Witnesses as well as your report* on the subject when it becomes available.

AI groups are working on behalf of 27 administrative detainees held under the Defence (Emergency) Regulations, 1945, in the occupied territories and one Israeli Jewish prisoner, Rami Livneh, who is serving a 4-year sentence for allegedly having contact with an enemy agent. There are approximately 2,500 Arabs imprisoned in Israel and the occupied territories for alleged security offences.

*Report on Imprisoned Conscientious Objectors in Europe, now in preparation by AI.

JORDAN

Amnesty International has no adopted cases in Jordan, but during the year...
initiatives have been taken on behalf of three groups of political detainees.

In early 1976, AI received disturbing reports of the detention, often without trial, of 147 Palestinians. AI wrote to King Hussein on 27 February 1976 asking for an official comment on these reports. AI has received reports that some of the men have been on hunger strike in protest against harsh prison conditions, alleged torture, solitary confinement, lack of medical care and denial of access to lawyers or families. Their health is understood to be deteriorating.

The reason for the arrests was officially said to be possession of arms and the plotting of subversive activities in Jordan. However, AI has been told that most of the detainees were members of Palestinian organizations who were in Jordan for the purpose of organizing resistance in the Israeli-occupied territories, and that their activities were within the terms of the Cairo and Amman agreements of 1970 on Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) activities.

In March AI received information on the arrest of 19 trade unionists, workers in a leather factory in Amman, who claim to have been wrongfully dismissed from their jobs and imprisoned without trial since January 1976.

AI also received the names of 12 Jordanians from the town of Al Salt reported to be under arrest since January 1976 for organizing a petition in protest against the pollution of the local drinking water supply. Deputy Secretary General Hans Ehrenstråle took up the cases of all three groups of prisoners when he visited the Jordanian ambassador in London, Ma'am Abu Nowar, on 17 March 1976. The ambassador denied the veracity of the reports concerning Al Salt but promised that an official investigation would be carried out immediately into both the case of the trade unionists and the 147 Palestinians, whose names were given to him. AI received an official denial of all the reports on 12 May 1976, but it is continuing its investigations.

LIBYA

This year has seen a decline in the human rights situation in Libya. Popular dissatisfaction with President Mu'ammar Al Gaddafi's economic and foreign policies has manifested itself in various ways: an alleged coup attempt by army officers; university student demonstrations against the government; and the emergence of opposition groups outside Libya.

In response to this growing opposition, President Gaddafi has ordered the arrest of all his opponents. He has also amended the penal code to provide the death penalty for membership of illegal political parties and has given the police wider powers to handle internal security matters.

Reports of an alleged coup attempt in July/August 1975 were followed by reports of the arrest of up to 126 officers and soldiers. They included Major Basheir Hawadi, a member of the Revolutionary Command Council (RCC) and three Libyan diplomats recalled from their posts abroad. As far as is known most are still detained, but some have been brought to trial.

At the beginning of September about 10 civilians were reported to have been arrested after an alleged secret political organization was discovered. Arrests have continued since then, and although exact numbers are not known, Amnesty International received in May the names of 25 civilians arrested since September who have not been brought to trial. They include teachers, government employees, businessmen and students. AI is in the process of taking up their cases.

At the beginning of January 1976 students from Benghazi University demon-
of reliable information and the powers of arrest and indefinite detention by Syria people currently detained for political reasons. This is due to the insufficiency (200 persons reported to have been imprisoned for political reasons.) So far no further scale of arrest has been confirmed. On 2 March 1976 AI wrote to the Libyan authorities saying: "We believe that Mr Thomas may have been detained in error, that during his period of detention he was deprived of the legal rights he is entitled to, and that the present restrictions imposed on him, in view of his acquittal, are extra-legal." According to the research of political prisoners and all political prisoners. (AI had collected the names of over 500 persons.) The number of political prisoners in Oman is not known. The only prisoner and the agreement of the Libyan authorities has also been obtained. The mission will take place later in 1976.

OMAN

Following the receipt of material alleging that some named British officers serving in Oman had been involved in the torture of political prisoners, Amnesty International wrote on 5 November 1975 to the United Kingdom Secretary of State for Defence Roy Mason requesting that an inquiry be carried out to establish the validity or otherwise of the allegations. In his reply of 8 March 1976, Mr Mason stated that:

After careful examination in consultation with our Ambassador in Oman, we have concluded that there are no reports of any incidents involving the serving members of Her Majesty's Forces, for whom Her Majesty's Government is responsible, or indeed the British officers serving in Oman.

The number of political prisoners in Oman is not known. The only prisoner for whom an AI group is working is Murad Abdul Wahab, who is thought to have been imprisoned in Oman following his deportation from Bahrain.

SAUDI ARABIA

Since the amnesty for political prisoners announced in April 1975, Amnesty International has been seeking confirmation of the release of 44 adopted prisoners and of other political prisoners. (AI had collected the names of over 200 persons reported to have been imprisoned for political reasons.) So far the release of only six adopted prisoners has been confirmed.

SYRIA

A feature of Amnesty International's work in Syria this year has been the increase in general information on political imprisonment, prison conditions, treatment of prisoners and detention procedures, and in specific information received on individual political detainees.

It is still difficult however to give an accurate estimate of the numbers of people currently detained for political reasons. This is due to the insufficiency of reliable information and the powers of arrest and indefinite detention by the security forces, which makes it probable that many cases never come to light. However, sources considered reliable by AI have put the figure at some 600, and the Research Department has the names of 323 at the time this report is being written. AI was investigating fresh reports in May 1975 of further wide scale arrests caused by internal opposition to Syria's involvement in the Lebanese civil war.

Of the prisoners known to AI, 286 have not as yet been brought to trial, although many have been detained for up to five years. Detention without trial for indefinite periods of time and without legal access has continued to be the predominant feature of the human rights situation in Syria over the past 12 months. This problem has been raised by AI Secretary General Martin Ennals with Adnan Omran, the Syrian ambassador in London, both in person on 23 July 1975 and subsequently in a letter of 20 August. The letter included a list of names of the 89 untried political prisoners known to AI at that time. No reply has yet been received.

Of the 286 untried detainees, 79 are known to have been arrested since June 1975. They include right-wing Moslem Brethren, communists, Nasserists, Palestinians and Iraqi-faction Baathists, many of them students and workers. Reports say that arrests are frequently made on suspicion of potential as well as real opposition to the government. AI is about to take up a substantial number of these cases.

AI is currently working on 34 cases in Syria, 15 of them taken up over the past year. One new case is a group adoption of seven members of the Qabani family who were arrested in November 1974 after the escape from prison of one of their relatives. Three of them are still detained. Five other new cases are of prisoners who were initially abducted from Lebanon. They include Lebanese lawyer Mahmoud Baidun, abducted in mid-1971 for his open opposition to the Syrian regime, and Zouheir Al Shulak, a lawyer and businessman, whose arrest in April 1970 was due to critical articles which he wrote in the Lebanese press.

Of the new cases there have been two releases: Muhammad Basal in January 1976 and Mahmoud Hamra during 1975. A message of thanks from a newly adopted prisoner was received by a participant in one of the AI Prisoners of the Month Campaigns in which the new adoptee was included. This is the first response AI has ever received from an adopted prisoner in Syria while still in detention.

There have been no other reported releases of adopted prisoners. Members of the former government continue to be detained in a separate cell on the first floor of AI Mezze military prison. AI has learned that the former president, Dr Nureddin Atassi, who suffers from diabetes and has spent a large part of his imprisonment in the adjacent military hospital, has lately been moved back to the prison itself. These men have now been detained for nearly six years without any form of charge or trial and, according to information received by AI, on the direct orders of President Hafez Assad.

Secretary General Martin Ennals brought up the cases of eight AI-adopted Syrian Kurds, imprisoned without trial since 1973, when he visited the Syrian ambassador Adnan Omran in London in July 1975. In his August letter, Mr Ennals asked the ambassador to transmit AI's concern about the Kurds to his government. AI has recently learned that they are thought to be currently held in Al Kussaa, one of the detention centers of the security forces on the outskirts of Damascus.
No news has been received of Albert Elias, an adopted prisoner, former head of the Jewish community in Lebanon, who was abducted in September 1971, but AI continues to work on his behalf.

There has been one instance of capital punishment in the last year. On 31 July AI sent a cable to President Assad urging him to commute on humanitarian grounds death sentences passed on four Palestinians and one Syrian, all reportedly members of the Arab Communist Organization. They were executed on 2 August after being convicted by the higher division of the Supreme State Security Court of carrying out acts of terror and sabotage. It is understood by AI that no independent legal representation was permitted.

Allegations of torture and death as a result of torture have been a cause of grave concern. During the past year AI has received numerous reports of ill-treatment and torture from a wide variety of sources. The consistent nature of the allegations indicates the routine use of severe methods of torture during the first months of imprisonment. AI has also received a first-hand account from a prisoner who alleges that he was severely tortured by electric shocks and burning.

Reports have been received of four deaths as a result of torture. On 12 September 1975 Al wrote to President Assad expressing extreme concern at reports of the deaths of Abdul Wahid Ismail Khalif, a 27-year-old teacher from Al Hasake in April 1975, and of Zuheir Shihb, a 21-year-old student from Damascus in July 1975. On 24 May 1976 AI wrote asking for an urgent inquiry to be made into the reported deaths as a result of torture of Safia Al Shatti Al Mubarak, a peasant from Al Dardara in Al Hasake province, on 12 December 1975, and of Subhi Shalaithun, a former student at Damascus University, in February 1976. In May 1976 an appeal was made for Ramadan Hajulah, reportedly to have been imprisoned without trial since June 1975 and badly tortured for the first three months at Al Kassaa.

AI has proposed sending a high-level mission to Syria during 1976 to hold governmental talks. But as of the date of writing no reply has been received from the Syrian authorities.

PEOPLE’S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF YEMEN

As a result of an Amnesty International legal and research mission to the People’s Democratic Republic of Yemen (PDRY – South Yemen) in May/June 1975 (see Annual Report 1974/75), AI submitted a report to President Salem Rubia Al in October 1975. In the report AI expressed concern at the arbitrary nature of arrests for political offences in South Yemen, the widespread use of short and long term detention without trial and the total inadequacy of basic legal and penal rights. The report noted the many allegations of torture, sometimes resulting in death or nervous or mental disorders, which were difficult to dismiss in the absence of procedural safeguards. It pointed to the frequent use of the death penalty in cases of sabotage, espionage and economic crimes.

AI also drew attention to the large numbers of detained persons who have disappeared and whose families have been unable to trace them. The report further noted the alarming number of incidents of non-judicial executions where groups of political prisoners have been killed “while trying to escape”, or where personally motivated or political murders have been committed by members of the police or security forces, or by the National Front, in abuse of their authority.

AI submitted a number of recommendations with the report, suggesting that the names of all political prisoners be published and that a general amnesty be considered for all untried political detainees against whom the government is not intending to bring immediate charges. Citing norms drawn up by the United Nations, AI recommended the formulation of official detention procedures, as well as independent investigations of interrogation methods, into all allegations of torture, and into incidents of non-judicial executions. AI said compensation should be available to both torture victims and to the families of persons who have been executed without due trial. AI suggested that abolition of the death penalty be considered and, as a first step, that the number of capital offences be reduced.

Finally, AI drew the attention of the government to the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Detensen and recommended that international humanitarian organizations be allowed regular access to all prisons in the country. (AI’s delegates to the PDRY had been allowed to visit Al Mansura prison in Aden where conditions are relatively good. The authorities however denied the existence of any other prisons in the country, although AI has collected the names of up to 50 detention centers.)

No response from the government to the report has been received. In May 1976AI published a Briefing Paper on the People’s Democratic Republic of Yemen, partly based on the report and partly on more recently acquired information. The briefing paper considers the legal and judicial system of the country in relation to political offences and the identity of those liable to arrest for political reasons. It estimates the number of political prisoners as fluctuating at any one time between 2,000 and 10,000. It describes detention centers and prison conditions which, apart from Al Mansura prison, reportedly fall short of the basic minimum requirements.

The paper in addition mentions that the indiscriminate use of torture has apparently lessened since an espionage trial in May 1975, the first to be held in public - when the defendants publicly alleged severe torture. The paper also refers to the newly drafted penal code promulgated in March 1976 which strongly advocates the observance of basic human rights and which provides for lighter sentences and fewer death penalties for political offences than does previous legislation.

AI groups have been active throughout the year on 17 adoption cases and 12 investigation cases. There has been increased activity for Tawfiq ‘Ala’izi, a lawyer from Aden who disappeared from his flat on 31 March 1972 after refusing to convict some political detainees. AI’s delegates to the PDRY were informed by the director of prisons that he had been released from Al Mansura prison in August 1974 and was now working in the Arabian Gulf. AI, however, after making inquiries into his present whereabouts, has concluded that the person referred to was another with a similar name, and that Tawfiq ‘Ala’izi is still a “disappeared” person.

Another prisoner, Ali ‘Alif Hakili, a former federal minister of health sentenced in 1968 to 10 years’ imprisonment on charges of high treason and feudalism - and whom AI delegates to the PDRY met in Al Mansura prison - was one of 12 long term detainees publicized during Prisoner of Conscience Week.

Sixteen new cases taken up this year have included Abdul Malik Ismail Muhammad, who had been the PDRY’s ambassador to Cairo since December 1972. He was arrested at Aden airport in May 1975, allegedly for his criticism
of the government's economic policies, and is being held in Al Fatih camp in Aden. Another case is that of Muzaffar Ali Azimuddin, a South Yemeni accountant of Indian nationality, who was arrested three times for refusing to disclose to the authorities the financial affairs of his clients, but who was charged with breach of profession. His last arrest in January 1975 took place as he was, apparently, attempting to leave the country illegally.

A third case is that of Hassan Ali Noobs Aulaqi, a South Yemeni pilot with North Yemeni (Yemen Arab Republic) airlines, arrested in April/May 1973 in the PDRY while visiting his family. AI groups, along with three medical groups in Denmark, Holland and the United States, have taken up the cases of three prisoners held in Al Fatih camp: Salim Al Azzami, Farag Al Kaila and Badr Salim Mahrawi. All are believed to be members of the National Front, the country's sole political party, and all reportedly have been very badly tortured. AI has received information of a number of releases which have taken place in the PDRY over the past year, but none has concerned AI adopted prisoners. An amnesty announced on 22 June concerned some imprisoned members of the National Front and two United States citizens who had been arrested in 1973 on suspicion of spying were released in September.

One of the results of the AI mission to the PDRY was a proposal submitted to the government to allow AI groups to correspond with their adopted prisoners and to send them English-language reading material on request, in particular textbooks. This proposal has been accepted in principle by the government but is not yet in effect.

YEMEN ARAB REPUBLIC

In November 1975 Amnesty International submitted a report to the government of the Yemen Arab Republic (YAR -- North Yemen) based on the findings of a legal and research mission to the YAR in May 1975 (see AI Annual Report 1974/75). During this mission AI delegates had visited three prisons in Sanaa, the capital of the country: the Citadel, Al Rada' prison, and a women's prison. They also met with Prime Minister Salih Muhammad Mutawakkel and prison officials the problem of political imprisonment, the legal system in relation to political offences and prison conditions. The report contained a list of recommendations covering prisons and prison conditions, detention and legal procedures and capital punishment.

The report drew attention to the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Offenders, recommended that government plans to build a new prison should be considered a priority, and that the Citadel, where most political prisoners are held, be closed down as soon as possible. It also recommended that facilities for workshops, literacy classes and sport should be provided where possible (none of these facilities are at present available in any prisons), that better accommodation be found for women prisoners and that separate accommodation be provided for the insane. It was further suggested that food provisions for prisoners be improved.

In connection with detention procedures, the report noted that recent official directives had limited to one week the time a detainee could be held before referral to a court, and to three months the time a prisoner could be detained without trial. But the report stressed the importance of stricter and more defined legal procedures as a means of preventing ill-treatment or torture. The detainee should therefore have access to a judicial authority within 24 hours, should be allowed regular visits from his family or someone representing his family and have someone to defend him, either a lawyer or a friend.

The report also recommended that any allegations of torture be investigated and that convicted prisoners be informed, verbally or in writing, of their sentence, so that they and their families know how long they can expect to be detained. (Two prisoners whom AI delegates met in Al Rada' prison claimed they did not know the length of their sentence.)

The report further noted that in the Yemen Arab Republic, the death sentence was regularly passed on persons convicted of murder or political acts of sabotage, and that from April to December 1973 about 50 executions had taken place. On the other hand, it appeared that a number of offences previously punishable by death, such as adultery, were now punishable by imprisonment only. Since the Yemen Arab Republic's legal system is in the process of development, AI urged the government to consider abolishing the death penalty.

Finally, the report drew attention to two documents, the United Nations Draft Principles on Freedom from Arbitrary Arrest and Detention and the 1975 Declaration of The Hague on an International Code of Police Ethics (see p 41). It suggested that they be used in the training of all police and security personnel, and that human rights, as embodied in international covenants, be included in the curricula of the many new schools currently being built in the country.

At the time of writing, no reply to this report has been received from the YAR government.

AI has no adopted prisoners in the Yemen Arab Republic. This is due to lack of information and to the difficulty of identifying those political prisoners who would come within AI's statute. It is estimated that there are several hundred prisoners, from both the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen (PDRY) as well as from the Yemen Arab Republic, who are convicted or detained for alleged political acts of sabotage. Despite plans for economic and political union between the YAR and the PDRY, reports of infiltration and acts of aggression between the two countries continue, and the PDRY authorities are alleged to take advantage of social and economic unrest in the south of the Yemen Arab Republic to recruit saboteurs.

Political opposition also comes from tribal groups, who oppose the present government's attempts to centralize authority and so reduce the traditional powers of tribal leaders. A pro-royalist coup attempt in August was followed by an unknown number of arrests. It was allegedly instigated by the exiled Prince Muhammad bin Husain, a cousin of the former Imam of Yemen, with tribal support. There is also opposition from leftwing elements in the country who are critical of the government's internal social and economic policies and its strengthening ties with Saudi Arabia and other "rightwing" countries. The only reports of arrests of leftwingers received by AI this year concern some members of the Yemeni branch of the World Peace Council, but AI has been unable to establish whether they are still detained.

According to the information available, it would appear that non-violent political opponents or critics of the government are not usually subjected to long term imprisonment. Those in ministerial or official positions are either dismissed from their posts, or dispatched abroad as ambassadors, or placed under house arrest. Those who are imprisoned, are usually detained for a very short period of time only.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Delegate</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Uğur Aluçkapta (Turkish)</td>
<td>to observe trial of 19 Alexandrians detained since June 1973, charged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>under Article 98 of the criminal law and Law 34 of 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Barend van Niekerk (South African)</td>
<td>talks with government officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>John Mortimer (British)</td>
<td>to observe trial of Muzna Nicola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>Martin Ennals (International Secretariat)</td>
<td>talks with government officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal/Chad</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>Hans Ehrenstrale (International Secretariat)</td>
<td>to attend International Conference on Namibia and Human Rights in Dakar; talks with government officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>Charles T. Duncan (USA)</td>
<td>to observe trial of SASO and BPC members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>Marius Broekmeyer (Dutch)</td>
<td>to observe trial of four &quot;Cominformists&quot; research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong/</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>Arlette Laduguie (International Secretariat)</td>
<td>to observe appeal hearings of eight leading prisoners on trial of four Turkish citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Otto Trüffler (West German)</td>
<td>to observe trial of Muzna Nicola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Helene Toledano (USA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Barend van Niekerk (South African)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Martin Ennals (International Secretariat)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Barend van Niekerk (South African)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Brian Wrobel (British)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Lisaïdre Martinez (Colombian)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Nigel S. Rodley (International Secretariat)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>Tom Jones (USA) Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>August</td>
<td>Kurt Madiener (West German)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>James Seymour (USA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Republic of Germany</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>Elizabeth Ziegler-Moller (Swiss)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>Adrian De Wind (USA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>Marie-Claire Picard (French)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya/Ethiopia</td>
<td>November/</td>
<td>Stephanie Grant (International Secretariat)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>November/</td>
<td>Tom Jones (USA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>Won-jae Hoang (International Secretariat)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>Frits Rütter (Dutch)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
News Releases 1975/76

1975
17 June, Amnesty International urges Britain to end Disaffection Act prosecutions.
26 June, Amnesty International criticizes arrest of hundreds in Dominican Republic.
27 June, Amnesty International urges India to free arrested opposition leaders.
29 June, Amnesty International releases dossier on political torture and murder in Guatemala.
3 July, Amnesty International urges Taiwan to extend act of clemency.
7 July, Amnesty International urges abolition of torture without trial in Northern Ireland and criticizes bill before British parliament.
8 July, Amnesty International welcomes Egyptian amnesty but voices concern that some political prisoners are still detained.
8 July, Amnesty International calls on Moroccan king to amnesty political prisoners.
14 July, Amnesty International sends mission to Taiwan.
16 July, Amnesty International sending US lawyer to Basque region of Spain.
23 July, Amnesty International protests executions in Sierra Leone.
28 July, Amnesty International publishes details of torture in Uruguay in strong attack on suppression of human rights in country.
3 August, Amnesty International observer confirms use of torture by security forces in Spain.
15 August, Amnesty International rejects Indian prime minister's criticism.
29 August, Amnesty International urges Spain to commute death sentences on Basques. Amnesty International observer unable to get into courtroom.
14 September, Amnesty International Annual Report lists human rights violations in 107 countries.
15 September, Amnesty International Council acts on Spain, USSR, Korea, Latin America, Ethiopia, Taiwan.
21 September, Amnesty International lists 85 lawyers detained for political reasons in 23 countries.
1 October, Amnesty International mission to Spain says torture used systematically against Basque detainees.
23 October, Amnesty International welcomes UN Working Group report on Chile.
7 November, Amnesty International concern at killing of ex-minister in Bangladesh.
9 November, Amnesty International urges Brazil to protect young prisoner threatened with murder.
10 November, Amnesty International appeals to Rhodesia to free detainees.
17 November, Amnesty International report details legal and penal abuses directed against political and religious prisoners in Soviet Union.
26 November, Amnesty International criticizes South African sentences.

1976
5 December, Amnesty International voices distress at executions in India.
9 December, Soviet Union refuses Amnesty International permission to observe trial of two of its members.
12 December, Amnesty International denounces Soviet Union court verdict on Kovalyov.
18 December, Amnesty International calls for release of detainees in France.

1976
22 January, Amnesty International asks Shah of Iran to show mercy to 10 under death sentences.
19 February, Amnesty International launches worldwide campaign against torture in Uruguay. Amnistía Internacional lanza una campaña mundial contra la tortura en Uruguay.
29 February, Amnesty International concerned at long-term detention without trial and other violations of human rights in Singapore (Amnesty International Briefing on Singapore).
25 March, Amnesty International calls for release of lawyers and trade union leaders on hunger strike in Peru (with background notes). Amnistía Internacional pide la liberación de abogados y dirigentes sindicales en huelga de hambre en una prisión peruana.
29 March, Amnesty International concerned at human rights violations in Rhodesia/Zimbabwe (Amnesty International Briefing on Rhodesia/Zimbabwe).
6 April, Amnesty International lists 111 parliamentarians detained for political reasons in 14 countries.
22 April, Amnesty International calls for an end to hangings in Rhodesia.
9 May, Amnesty International lists 67 journalists imprisoned for political reasons in 17 countries.
11 May, Amnesty International sends Uruguay petition against torture signed by 40 prominent Soviet human rights activists.
20 May, Amnesty International protests Argentine's arrest of Uruguay parliamentarians (with background notes).
23 May, Amnesty International calls for inquiry into deaths of Uruguayan refugees in Argentina.
25 May, Amnesty International calls for release of all political prisoners in Tunisia (with background notes).
Some Amnesty International Statistics

As of 31 May 1976 there were:
1,665 groups in 30 countries, an increase of 73 groups over 1974-75.
More than 97,000 individual members in 78 countries, an increase of 27,000
members and 11 countries over 1974-75. There are national sections in 33 of
these countries.
3,859 prisoners under adoption or investigation.

During the year 1975-76:
1,880 new prisoners were taken up and 1,599 prisoners released.

During 1975-76 Amnesty International:
Took action on violations of human rights in 113 countries.
Dispensed more than £80,000 (US $144,000)* in relief to prisoners and their
families.
Sent missions and observers to 32 countries.
Published a major report on the Soviet Union, mission reports on Spain, Sri
Lanka and South Korea, further numbers of A Chronicle of Current Events
and launched a new series of briefing papers on individual countries.
Issued 47 news releases.
Established a promotion campaign based in Luxembourg.
Launched a South Asia Publications Service.

* A rough approximation since groups often do not report all the money they send
to their adopted prisoners and families.
**National Sections and Committees**

**Australia:** Amnesty International, 277 Inkerman Street, East St Kilda 3182, Victoria

**Branch Addresses:**
- (New South Wales Branch) Amnesty International, New South Wales Branch, PO Box 2598, GPO Sydney, New South Wales 2001
- (Queensland Branch) Amnesty International, Queensland Branch, PO Box 162, Moorvale, Queensland 4105
- (South Australia Branch) Margaret Illman, 16 Tester Drive, Blackwood, South Australia 5051
- (Tasmania Branch) Amnesty International, Tasmanian Branch, 194 Waterworks Road, Hobart 7005, Tasmania
- (Victoria Branch) Amnesty International, Victorian Branch, 277 Inkerman Street, East St Kilda 3182, Victoria
- (Western Australia Branch) Mrs G. Graham, Box X2258, GPO Perth, Western Australia

**Austria:** Amnesty International, Austrian Section, 1020 Vienna, Franz Hochedingerlg. 8/5

**Bangladesh:** Mr Mohammad Hafizullah, c/o Orr, Dignam & Co., 195 Motijheel Commercial Area, Dacca

**Belgium:** (Dutch-speaking) Amnesty International, 202 Oudergemlaan, 1040 Brussels
- (French-speaking) Amnesty International, 185 rue Royale, 1030 Brussels

**Britain:** Amnesty International, British Section, 55 Theobald's Road, London WC1X 8SP

**Canada:** Amnesty International Canada/Amnistie Internationale Canada, 2101 Algonquin Avenue, PO Box 6035, Ottawa, Ontario K2A 1T1

**Denmark:** Amnesty International, Danish Section, Frederikshborggaed 1, 1360 Copenhagen K

**Faroe Islands:** Mrs Anette Wang, Tróndargata 47, PO Box 23, 8000 Tórshavn

**Finland:** Amnesty International, Finnish Section, Mannerheimintie 16 B 19, 00100 Helsinki 10

**France:** Amnesty International, Section Française, 20 rue de la Michodière, 75002 Paris

**Germany:**
- (Federal Republic of) Amnesty International, German Section, Stuckenstr. 70, 2000 Hamburg 76
- (West Germany) Amnesty International, Ghana Section, c/o Dr J. S. Epstein, Ilen Chambers, PO Box 6354, Accra

**Ghana:** Amnesty International, Ghana Section, c/o Dr J. S. Epstein, Ilen Chambers, PO Box 6354, Accra

**Greece:** Amnesty International, Greek Section, Formionos 2, Athens 707

**Iceland:** Amnesty International, Icelandic Section, Box 126, Reykjavik

**India:** Amnesty International, Indian Section, C-6 First Floor, Community Centre, Safdarjung Development Area, New Delhi - 110016

**Ireland:** Mrs Anne Casiman, 57 Bayside Walk, Sutton, Co. Dublin

**Israel:** Amnesty International, Israel National Section, PO Box 37638, Tel Aviv

**Italy:** Amnesty International, Italian Section, Via della Penna 51, Rome

**Japan:** Amnesty International, Japanese Section, Room 54, 3-18 Nishi-Waseda 2-chome, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 160

**Korea, Republic of:** Amnesty Korean Committee, IPO Box 2934, Seoul

**Luxembourg:** Amnesty International, Luxembourg a.s.b.l., Case Postale 1914, Luxembourg

**Mexico:** Amnistía Internacional, Sección Mexicana, Ap. Postal No. 20-217, México D.F.

**Nepal:** Veerendra Keshari, 1/227 Kalikasthan, Kathmandu

**Netherlands:** Amnesty International, Dutch Section, 3e Hugo de Grootstraat 7, Amsterdam

**New Zealand:** Amnesty International, New Zealand Section, Box 3597, Wellington

**Nigeria:** Amnesty International, Nigerian Section, c/o Samuel Ade Oyewole, 17 Kobiti Street, Surulere, Lagos.

**Norway:** Amnesty International, Norwegian Section, Akersgatan 39, III, Oslo I

**Pakistan:** Hashmat Habib, Karachi Press Club, Ingle Road, Karachi

**Peru:** Dra Laura Caller, Jiron Pachitea 279 – Of. 500-501, Lima

**Sri Lanka:** Edward de Silva, 79/15 Dr C. W. W. Kannangara Mawatha, Colombo 7

**Sweden:** Amnesty International, Swedish Section, Barnhusgatan 4, 111 23 Stockholm

**Switzerland:** Amnesty International, Swiss Section, Postfach 1051, CH-3001 Bern

**United States:** AIUSA, 2112 Broadway, Office 309, New York, NY 10023

**There are also Al members and supporters in the following countries:**

- Abu Dhabi
- Barbados
- Bermuda
- Bolivia
- Botswana
- Cameroon
- Colombia
- Costa Rica
- Cuba
- Curaçao (group)
- Dominican Republic
- Ecuador
- Egypt
- El Salvador
- Guyana

**PROMOTION DEPARTMENT**

P.O. Box 1341
3 rue des Glacis
Luxembourg

- Hong Kong
- Iraq
- Jamaica
- Jordan
- Kenya
- Kuwait
- Lebanon
- Libyan Arab Republic
- Malagasy Republic
- Malaysia
- Malta
- New Guinea
- Panama
- Paraguay
- The Philippines
- Taiwan
- Thailand
- Turkey
- USSR (group)
- Tanzania
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- U.S.S.R.
- Uzbekistan
- Venezuela
- Vietnam
- Yugoslavia
- Zaire
- Zambia
International Secretariat

Summary and Allocation of Budget for 1976-1977

Salaries and related expenditure
- Research Department: 179,006
- Campaign for the Abolition of Torture: 21,144
- Information and Publications: 30,351
- Other: 135,055

Reference Library: 2,400
South Asia Information Service: 2,100
Travel:
- Executive meetings, etc.: 6,700
- Research, missions and Field Secretaries: 14,230
Printing and stationery: 19,000
Postage: 13,250
Telephone, telex and cables: 13,250
Rent and rates: 34,000
Heating, cleaning and insurance: 5,620
Service and rental contracts and miscellaneous: 7,304
Depreciation of office fittings, equipment and office conversion: 7,800
Audit, accounting and professional fees: 5,600

497,010

Less: gross profit on publication sales
5,010

£492,000

Treasurer's Report

by Kevin T. White, International Treasurer

I first wish to record my appreciation of the finance department and administrative departments staffs whose control and operation of the accounts within their separate functions has again enabled me to report that the books and records for 1975/76 are in good order.

The revised approved budget for the financial year ended 30 April 1976 was £366,800. The actual net expenditure for the year was £373,229.

The audited accounts show an expenditure of £393,636. The apparent discrepancy between the budget figures and the audited accounts is due to inclusion by the auditors of the gross expenditure and income of the publications department, whereas the budget included the net figure only.

These accounts make provision for a possible bad debt on the publications department accounts of £4,000, thereby increasing the actual deficit from £13,840 to £17,840.

An additional expenditure during the year which could not have been anticipated, and therefore was not provided for in the budget, amounted to £2,841. This was an increase in the so-called London weighting allowance in staff salaries negotiated by the British trade union NALGO (to whose scales International Secretariat salaries are attached) in June 1976 but backdated to 1 July 1975.

These two major adjustments, together with some minor adjustments made in the course of the audit, account for the difference between the budget figure of £366,800 and the actual expenditure of £373,229.

The audited accounts show a deficit of £1,266, but had it not been for the backdated allowance and the provision of £4,000 for a possible bad debt — which I should mention is a prudent provision as distinct from an actual writing off of a debt — the accounts would have shown a surplus.

In addition to meeting contributions to the budget, national sections made contributions to the Special Project Fund. During the year these contributions amounted to £28,201. Expenditures from the fund amounted to £21,192.

This fund has proved of considerable help during the year, and I hope that national sections will continue their generous support of it.

As will be seen from the International Secretariat accounts under the heading "Sources and Application of Relief Funds" and from the attached Prisoners of Conscience Fund accounts, the distribution of relief continues to be an important element in the work of the organization.
During the year the International Executive Committee implemented the decision of the Eighth International Council held at St Gallen, Switzerland, and set up the Promotion Department to plan and conduct the 1977 promotion and fundraising campaign. For this campaign, Amnesty International was fortunate enough to obtain the services as director of the department of Guy Binsfeld, a member of the Luxembourg Section, who detached himself from his professional work as director of Interpublicité. He will report to the 1976 council in Strasbourg about progress of preparations for the campaign.

In my report last year, I made reference to the large increase which had occurred in our expenditures over recent years and that indications then were that this trend would continue and possibly accelerate. It appears from recently published official figures that since then the rate of inflation in the United Kingdom has been halved, and there are official hopes that there will be a further reduction during the next year. Nevertheless, inflation, even if held at the hoped for level, will add substantially to costs, so that without any expansion of our activities we shall incur further increased expenditures.

I referred last year to pressures upon Amnesty International to expand and to increase our activities, and I advised caution. During the year under review, I have noted pressures not only to increase our normal work, but to embark on more elaborate enterprises and on a broader front. Some of the arguments in favour of expanding present activities and taking on extra activities are seductive. But succumbing to these pressures would either result in partial suspension of the work AI was founded to perform under its statute (since our existing resources of personnel and finances cannot be stretched to encompass these suggested extra activities), or in having to increase our budget substantially to enable us to continue our normal activities while taking on new tasks.

I suggest that the time has come to consider how big do we wish this organization to grow and whether substantial growth in the International Secretariat will result in greater effectiveness and achievements. In my view it is essential that we do not allow ourselves to be blindly borne along on a wave of enthusiasm without fully considering and appreciating the consequences. Increasing the size of an organization does not automatically result in an increase in effectiveness.

It is for the 1976 council to consider whether the organization should be continuously reacting to pressures for expansion; to endeavour to evaluate AI's effectiveness at its present level of operation; and to consider whether, in the long term, the interests of prisoners of conscience may be better served by a period devoted to consolidation rather than to expansion or undertaking new tasks.

Auditors' Report

To the International Executive Committee, Amnesty International:

We have examined the balance sheet of AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL as of 30 April 1976, and the related income and expenditure account and statement of sources and applications of relief monies for the year then ended (see pages 208 to 215). Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, and accordingly included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances, except as explained in the following paragraph.

As discussed in note 2 to the accounts, payments of relief monies are destined for persons designated as prisoners of conscience in various countries. Some receipts of relief monies specify either a country or a particular prisoner for whose benefit the cash should be applied. Whilst we are satisfied that relief monies have been paid out, we have no effective means of determining, in all cases, whether or not these funds have been applied to the benefit of specific prisoners of conscience or their families. This problem is inevitable where indirect means of transmitting relief payments must be used to safeguard prisoners' interests. However, we were able to ensure that payments were made to persons whom the International Secretariat has informed us are responsible officers, employees or associates of Amnesty International. These persons accept responsibility for ensuring that relief monies reach prisoners. The International Secretariat has additional sources of information which would report back to the secretariat any significant instances where relief monies, for one reason or another, did not reach prisoners or their families. To date, no such significant instances have been reported and nothing has come to our attention to suggest that prisoners of conscience or their families did not receive relief monies as intended.

In our opinion, except for the effect of such adjustments, if any, as might have been disclosed had we been able to determine whether or not relief monies paid out have been applied to the benefit of specific prisoners of conscience or their families, the accompanying accounts present fairly the financial position of Amnesty International as of 30 April 1976, the results of its operations and the sources and applications of relief monies for the year then ended, in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles, on a basis consistent with the preceding year.

Arthur Andersen & Co.
Chartered Accountants
London EC2Y 5DD, England

28 July 1976
## AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL
### BALANCE SHEET — 30 APRIL 1976

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT ASSETS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>£96,362</td>
<td>£124,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debtors and prepaid expenses, net of reserves (note 3)</td>
<td>34,715</td>
<td>25,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivable from The Prisoners of Conscience Fund, net</td>
<td>3,014</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivable from the British Section, net</td>
<td>5,183</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications stock (note 3)</td>
<td>4,545</td>
<td>2,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Assets</strong></td>
<td>143,819</td>
<td>152,838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT LIABILITIES:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creditors and accrued expenses</td>
<td>30,905</td>
<td>36,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payable to the British Section, net</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief obligations (note 2)</td>
<td>34,681</td>
<td>44,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Project funds (note 6)</td>
<td>19,192</td>
<td>12,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT Special Project Fund (note 7)</td>
<td>10,286</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen O’Donovan Fund</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>95,881</td>
<td>94,019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net current assets</strong></td>
<td>47,938</td>
<td>58,819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>OFFICE EQUIPMENT, net (notes 3 and 4)</strong></th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9,601</td>
<td>7,395</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PAST SERVICE SUPERANNUATION LIABILITY</strong> (note 8)</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net assets</td>
<td>(10,440)</td>
<td>(11,020)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>ACCUMULATED FUND:</strong></th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amnesty International accumulated fund</td>
<td>£47,099</td>
<td>£55,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign for the Abolition of Torture fund</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Accumulated Fund</strong></td>
<td>£47,099</td>
<td>£55,194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this balance sheet.
SOURCES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific relief monies</td>
<td>£78,813</td>
<td>£50,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest income</td>
<td>3,549</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Prisoners of Conscience Fund (note 2)</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>6,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>93,462</strong></td>
<td><strong>57,256</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPLICATIONS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relief monies paid</td>
<td>86,819</td>
<td>40,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relief monies paid on behalf of The Prisoners of Conscience Fund (note 2)</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>6,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursed to British Section (note 3)</td>
<td>5,174</td>
<td>5,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>103,093</strong></td>
<td><strong>52,176</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net increase (decrease) in relief obligations  (9,631)  5,080
Balance of relief obligations at beginning of year  44,312  39,232
Balance of relief obligations at end of year  £34,681  £44,312

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this statement.

The statement does not include the relief obligations of The Prisoners of Conscience Fund represented by its accumulated fund of £38,905 at 5 April 1976 (see pages 216 to 220).

**NOTES TO ACCOUNTS — 30 APRIL 1976**

1. **AIMS AND ORGANIZATION:**

Amnesty International is an unincorporated, non-profit organization which has as its object the securing throughout the world of the observance of the provisions of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The specific objects, the methods to be applied in achieving these objects and details of its organization are covered by the Statute of Amnesty International, as amended by the Eighth International Council meeting in St Gallen, Switzerland, in September 1975.

Amnesty International consists of national sections which embrace affiliated groups and members. The authority for the conduct of its affairs is vested in the International Council. The International Executive Committee, elected by the International Council, is responsible for the conduct of the affairs of the organization and for the implementation of the decisions of the council. The day-to-day affairs of Amnesty International are conducted by the International Secretariat under the direction of the International Executive Committee.

National sections may be established in any country with the consent of the International Executive Committee. One such section is the British Section, which has its offices in London in the same premises as those of the International Secretariat.

The objects of Amnesty International include providing assistance to and working towards the release of persons who, in violation of the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, are imprisoned, detained, restricted or otherwise subjected to physical coercion or restriction by reason of their political, religious, or other conscientiously held beliefs or by reason of their ethnic origin, colour or language (provided that they have not used or advocated violence). These persons are referred to as “prisoners of conscience”. One of the main functions of the International Secretariat is to carry out research to identify such prisoners of conscience and to report on its findings. These prisoners of conscience receive relief monies both through Amnesty International and through a United Kingdom registered charity, The Prisoners of Conscience Fund. Both the International Secretariat and the British Section work closely with the managers of The Prisoners of Conscience Fund in matters of administration and payment of relief monies.

Amnesty International is financed principally by contributions from national sections. The Amnesty International accounts embrace those finances for which
the International Executive Committee and the Secretary General, as chief executive of the International Secretariat, are responsible, and accordingly exclude amounts related to individual national sections’ resources.

In 1976, a promotion and fundraising campaign was initiated under the aegis of the International Executive Committee. The campaign, which is to be launched in December 1976 has the objective of raising substantial funds in 1977, which is to be “Prisoners of Conscience Year”. At 30 April 1976 no costs relating to the launching of this campaign had been incurred and no revenues had been received. Funds, when received, are to be held in a special bank account in the name of Amnesty International, under the control of the International Executive Committee.

2. RELIEF MONIES:

The International Secretariat is responsible for the administration and disbursement of relief monies. Not all such monies received have been applied, as yet, towards relief. These unpaid funds are held in a separate bank account (the relief account). Relief obligations are reflected as a current liability of Amnesty International.

Certain relief funds are contributed by the managers of The Prisoners of Conscience Fund. To ease administration, these relief monies are paid out through the channels of Amnesty International, using the International Secretariat’s relief bank account. Although the managers are advised by Amnesty International, they retain complete discretion as to how these relief monies are disbursed, both as to quantum and direction.

Payments of relief are usually made via intermediaries to prisoners or their families. This relief activity involves entrusting responsible persons with relief monies and relying extensively on their integrity and dedication to ensure that the proper persons benefit from relief. It is often impractical to obtain receipts from beneficiaries of relief monies, but the International Secretariat does have additional sources of information which would report back to the secretariat any significant instances where relief monies, for one reason or another, did not reach prisoners or their families. To date, no such significant instances have been reported.

3. ACCOUNTING POLICIES:

a) Income

National sections contributions represent the committed share of each section towards the International Secretariat’s budget. Adequate reserves have been provided against certain unpaid contributions which national sections have stated they will not or cannot meet.

Donations are accounted for on a cash basis. The amounts recorded as income represent cash received during the year.

Publications revenue represents the value of sales to third parties during the year. The related expenditure of this loss making publications activity is included in total expenditure.

b) Office equipment

This is recorded at cost less accumulated depreciation. Depreciation is provided on a straight-line basis at an annual rate of 15%.

c) Publications stock

Amnesty International publications stocks are stated at the lower of actual cost and net realizable value.
Receipts £28,201
Payments (21,192)
Fund, beginning of year 7,009
Fund, end of year 12,183
Comprising:
Amount allocated to identified projects £17,813
Unallocated portion 1,379
£19,192

Compared to:
Receipts £38,041
Payments (25,858)
Fund, end of year 12,183
Comprising:
Amount allocated to identified projects £17,813
Unallocated portion 6,236
£24,049

1976

7. CAMPAIGN FOR THE ABOLITION OF TORTURE (CAT)
SPECIAL PROJECT FUND:

In prior years specific finance had been obtained for this campaign. Its accumulated surplus had been carried forward separately from that of the International Secretariat. During the year the campaign's activities have been incorporated into those of the International Secretariat. CAT income and expenditure are included in the Amnesty International income and expenditure account. A summary of this CAT income and expenditure follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries</td>
<td>£14,165</td>
<td>£10,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office costs</td>
<td>6,704</td>
<td>3,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>1,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less—Specific CAT income, consisting mainly of national section commitments</td>
<td>(21,870)</td>
<td>(15,416)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net expenditure (surplus) for year</td>
<td>£21,870</td>
<td>£(4,370)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The accumulated surplus at 30 April 1975 has been allocated to a CAT Special Project Fund, which is operated in the same way as the Special Project funds (see note 6) and is financed by specific CAT project donations. Activity on this fund during the year was as follows:

8. PAST SERVICE SUPERANNUATION LIABILITY:

The International Secretariat's Retirement Benefits Scheme became effective in January 1974. The scheme is fully insured and covers certain employees who elected to join. The past service liability at inception of the scheme amounted to £11,600. A provision of this amount was made in 1974, and is being amortized over 20 years on a straight-line basis; the unamortized balance at 30 April 1976 is £10,440.

9. TAXATION:

Amnesty International is regarded for tax purposes as a body corporate and is chargeable to corporation tax on profits arising from any trading activity and on interest income. No provision for corporation tax has been made in these accounts as trading losses (from publications) exceed interest income.

10. SUBSEQUENT EVENT:

After 30 April 1976, the International Executive Committee agreed to accept the Erasmus Prize totalling approximately £20,000, which was awarded for Amnesty International’s services to humanity. The prize money must be applied towards specified projects, distinct from the normal activities of the organization.
The accompanying notes are an integral part of this balance sheet.
### THE PRISONERS OF CONSCIENCE FUND

**INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT**
**FOR THE YEAR ENDED 5 APRIL 1976**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INCOME (note 3):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donations</td>
<td>£9,658</td>
<td>£5,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>£2,016</td>
<td>£4,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>£15,050</td>
<td>£15,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>£27,524</td>
<td>£25,748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURE:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relief payments (note 2)</td>
<td>£11,100</td>
<td>£6,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises (note 5)</td>
<td>£15,050</td>
<td>£15,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>£3,052</td>
<td>£576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit fees</td>
<td>£1,080</td>
<td>£1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee for secretarial assistance and facilities (notes 1 and 3)</td>
<td>£2,888</td>
<td>£2,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>£33,170</td>
<td>£25,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus (deficit) for the year</td>
<td>(£5,646)</td>
<td>£322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ACCUMULATED FUND, beginning of year | £44,551 | £44,229 |
| ACCUMULATED FUND, end of year      | £38,905 | £44,551 |

The accompanying notes are an integral part of this account.

---

**1. AIMS AND ORGANIZATION:**

The Prisoners of Conscience Fund is registered as a United Kingdom charity. Its objects, as set out in the trust deed dated 11 October 1962, cover:

a) The relief of poverty of persons throughout the world, who are imprisoned as a result of their political or religious beliefs, and their families, but excluding those guilty of crimes of violence, inciting violence, or fermenting hatred between races. Such persons are known as prisoners of conscience.

b) The provision of funds for the assistance of those of the prisoners who are poor and who are granted asylum; this includes travelling expenses and arrangements for resettlement and employment.

The Managers of the Fund work closely with Amnesty International in matters of administration and necessarily rely on Amnesty International's expertise to identify prisoners of conscience, their families and their needs. Amnesty International is also responsible to the Managers for the distribution of the relief monies to prisoners of conscience and their families. The Managers, however, retain complete discretion as to how these relief monies are distributed, both as to quantum and direction.

Amnesty International charges a fee to the Fund for the secretarial assistance and facilities rendered to the Managers. The basis for assessing a fee was not agreed until 1975. A charge of £5,100 in respect of years prior to 1975 is being billed to the Fund over a three-year period from 1975 to 1977; £1,700 of this charge remains to be billed at 5 April 1976.

The British Section of Amnesty International has charged The Prisoners of Conscience Fund £1,500 for administrative assistance rendered.

Amnesty International is an unincorporated non-profit organization which has as its object the securing throughout the world of the observance of the provisions of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

**2. RELIEF PAYMENTS:**

The Prisoners of Conscience Fund pays relief monies to Amnesty International, which is responsible for the distribution of the relief monies through its normal channels to prisoners of conscience.

Payments of relief are usually made via intermediaries to prisoners or their families. This relief activity involves entrusting responsible persons with relief monies and relying extensively on their integrity and dedication to ensure that
the proper persons benefit from relief. It is impractical to obtain receipts from beneficiaries of relief monies, but Amnesty International does have additional sources of information which would report back to the Managers of the Fund any significant instances where relief monies, for one reason or another, did not reach prisoners or their families. To date, no such significant instances have been reported.

3. ACCOUNTING POLICIES:

a) Donations are recorded on a cash basis, whereby the amount recorded as income represents cash received in each year.
b) Rent is recorded on an accrual basis, whereby the amount recorded as income represents the rent receivable from Amnesty International and the British Section in each year.
c) Leasehold improvements are recorded at cost. The cost is amortized on a straight-line basis at a rate which will recover the cost of the improvements over the remaining life of the lease.

4. LEASEHOLD IMPROVEMENTS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement on the account was as follows:</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Amortization</th>
<th>Net</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance, as 6 April 1975</td>
<td>£18,867</td>
<td>£12,729</td>
<td>£6,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization provision during the year</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance, at 5 April 1976</td>
<td>£18,867</td>
<td>£16,979</td>
<td>£1,888</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. LEASE COMMITMENTS:
The Fund is committed to an annual rental of £10,700 under the lease on its premises at 53 and 55 Theobald's Road. The lease expires on 25 December 1976.

6. TAXATION:

As a registered charity, The Prisoners of Conscience Fund is not chargeable to corporation tax on the income it receives. The Fund has submitted claims to the Inland Revenue totaling £7,994 covering income tax recoverable on covenanted donations. Amounts totaling £4,554 have been recorded in income in previous years. The remainder will be recorded as and when the total claim is agreed by the Inland Revenue.

Amnesty International Publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prisons of Conscience in the USSR: Their Treatment and Conditions, A5, 154 pages, November 1975: £1.00 (US $2.50).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Chronicle of Current Events (Journal of the Human Rights Movement in the USSR), numbers 17, 18, 21, 24, 27 published individually: 65 pence (US $1.60); double volumes 19-20, 22-23, 25-26: 85 pence (US $2.10); numbers 28-31 in one volume: 95 pence (US $2.50); numbers 2-33, one volume, £1.95 (US $4.95).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Reports. Also available are individual A1 mission reports in A4 stencilled form on Republic of Korea and Sri Lanka. 50 pence (US $1.00) each.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBSCRIPTIONS


Many of the above publications are available in a number of languages. Orders to Amnesty International national sections in your country or to Amnesty International Publications, 53 Theobald's Road, London WC1X 8SP, England. Please send payment with your order, adding 20% (minimum 20 pence - US $0.50) for postage and packing.