

Report
of an
Amnesty International
Mission
to
Singapore

30 November to 5 December 1978



an amnesty international publication

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL is a worldwide movement which is independent of any government, political grouping, ideology, economic interest or religious creed. It plays a specific role within the overall spectrum of human rights work. The activities of the organization focus strictly on prisoners:

- It seeks the *release* of men and women detained anywhere for their beliefs, colour, sex, ethnic origin, language or religion, provided they have not used or advocated violence. These are termed "*prisoners of conscience*".
- It advocates *fair and early trials* for *all political prisoners* and works on behalf of such persons detained without charge or without trial.
- It opposes the *death penalty* and *torture* or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment of *all prisoners* without reservation.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL acts on the basis of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international instruments. Through practical work for prisoners within its mandate, Amnesty International participates in the wider promotion and protection of human rights in the civil, political, economic, social and cultural spheres.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL has over 2,000 adoption groups and national sections in 39 countries in Africa, Asia, Europe, the Americas and the Middle East, and individual members, subscribers and supporters in a further 86 countries. Each adoption group works on behalf of at least two prisoners of conscience in countries other than its own. These countries are balanced geographically and politically to ensure impartiality. Information about prisoners and human rights violations emanates from Amnesty International's Research Department in London.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL has consultative status with the United Nations (ECOSOC), UNESCO and the Council of Europe, has cooperative relations with the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States and is a member of the Coordinating Committee of the Bureau for the Placement and Education of African Refugees of the Organization of African Unity.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL is financed by subscriptions and donations of its worldwide membership. To safeguard the independence of the organization, all contributions are strictly controlled by guidelines laid down by AI's International Council and income and expenditure are made public in an annual financial report.

© Amnesty International Publications 1980
ISBN: 0 86210 002 X
AI Index: ASA/36/10/79
First published January 1980
Original language: English
Published by Amnesty International Publications

Copies of Amnesty International Publications can be obtained from the offices of the national sections of Amnesty International. Office addresses and further information may be obtained from the International Secretariat, 10 Southampton Street, London WC2E 7HF, England. Printed in Great Britain by Russell Press Ltd., Forest Road West, Nottingham.

**REPORT
OF AN
AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL
MISSION
TO
SINGAPORE**

30 November to 5 December 1978

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1. Recommendations	6
2. Political Background	14
3. Legal Background	18
Preventive Detention	18
Trials	24
4. Arrest and Interrogation	26
5. Long Term Detention	34
Moon Crescent Detention Centre	34
Release of Long Term Detainees	40
6. The Professions in Singapore	41
Journalists	41
The Legal Profession	43
7. The Death Penalty	44
8. A Selection of Prisoner Case Histories	46
APPENDICES	
A. Articles of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights	51
B. Draft Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials	54
C. Order of Detention Under Section 8 (1) (a) of the Internal Security Act: Restrictive Order Under Section 8(1) (b) of the Internal Security Act	59

INTRODUCTION

This report is based on the findings of an Amnesty International mission which visited the Republic of Singapore from 30 November to 5 December 1978. The delegation consisted of an American lawyer who is a member of the National Advisory Council of Amnesty International's United States Section, Thomas C Jones, and a member of Amnesty International's Asia Research Department, Michael C Williams. This was the first official Amnesty International delegation to the country, but the organization has been concerned for many years with serious human rights violations in Singapore. Specifically, Amnesty International has focused on preventive detention under the Internal Security Act (1960) and the Banishment Act (Banishment Ordinance) 1959 and the systematic use of these Acts as a means to detain political opponents of the Government for long periods of time without charge or trial. Amnesty International has also been concerned over the ill-treatment of political prisoners during the 30-day interrogation period which the Internal Security Act allows prior to the serving of a detention order. Amnesty International found evidence of widespread physical and psychological ill-treatment, in some cases amounting to torture.

The attitude of the Government of the Republic of Singapore to direct approaches from Amnesty International has been generally unresponsive. In advance of the mission of November-December 1978, Amnesty International wrote to the Government of Singapore on 9 October 1978 requesting that its delegates meet the Prime Minister, Mr Lee Kuan Yew, and the Minister of Home Affairs, Mr Chua Sian Chin. Moreover, while they were in Singapore, the delegates made efforts to contact the Office of the Prime Minister and the Office of the Minister of Home Affairs. The Singapore authorities refused all contact with the Amnesty International delegation. Requests to visit detention facilities and interview prisoners were also denied.

Amnesty International greatly regrets the refusal of the Government of the Republic of Singapore to meet with the delegates, particularly in view of the open acknowledgement by the Prime Minister that human rights within Amnesty International's mandate are curbed in the Republic.

In February 1976, Amnesty International published a Briefing Paper on Singapore, a second edition of which was published in January 1978. The preface to the second edition of the Briefing Paper noted with concern 'the increasing use of public "confession" to justify the arrest and imprisonment of men and women without any involvement of judicial process', and adds, 'Amnesty International vigorously questions the admissibility of such "confessions", particularly in view of

consistent allegations that political suspects are subjected to extreme pressure in order to secure statements of involvement in communist or pro-communist activities'.

In an interview shortly after the publication of the second edition of the Briefing Paper, Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew did not deny either that self-incriminating statements were required of detainees as a condition for their release or that extreme pressure was exerted in the process of obtaining such statements. Referring to five long-term detainees mentioned by name in the Briefing Paper, Mr Lee said they 'can walk out of detention at any time - and the others, too - by signing a simple undertaking that they will not in future, either directly or indirectly, help the Communist Party of Malaya (CPM) or any of its auxiliary organizations to overthrow the constitutionally-elected Government of Singapore'. Later in the same interview, Mr Lee acknowledged: 'all interrogations must wear down resistance of (detainees) by sustained psychological pressure, including physical fatigue, to get them to give leads to the next links in a well-established underground movement'. (Far Eastern Economic Review, 24.2.78) In an interview with the Times (London) of 25 May 1977, Mr Lee admitted that it was government policy to detain political prisoners without trial under Singapore's Internal Security Act by arguing that 'certain liberties in a developing nation sometimes have to be sacrificed for the sake of economic development and security and to prevent communist oppression'.

Amnesty International believes that fundamental rights guaranteed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights should be observed by all governments under all circumstances. In its Nobel Peace Prize address of 11 December 1977, Amnesty International stated:

'Attempts are made to justify curtailments of human rights on the ground that a larger national interest is at stake. These are often the first step in a deliberate reduction of the whole network of human rights, when these are perceived as a threat to established interests.'

The Singapore Government has repeatedly justified its use of preventive detention under the ISA and the Banishment Act by referring to alleged security threats to the Republic, in particular from the illegal Malayan Communist Party (MCP). The MCP staged an insurrection against the British colonial government in 1948, commonly referred to as 'The Emergency'. This insurrection persisted for several years but came to an

end after 1960. Singapore itself, since its independence in 1963, has faced no serious internal social unrest, apart from racial disturbances in 1964 and, to the knowledge of Amnesty International, none of those presently detained under the ISA was arrested in connection with these disturbances. There have been some serious terrorist incidents in neighbouring Malaysia in recent years, particularly during 1974-1976, when a number of well-publicized assassinations of police officials occurred. In Singapore, during the same period, a series of bomb incidents and cases of arson attributed to the MCP were reported. Moreover, the Singapore authorities announced a number of arrests during the 1974-1976 period following the discovery of arms and ammunition in the Republic.

However, the Government of Singapore has kept in preventive detention individuals whose connection or links with terrorism or the Malayan Communist Party has been asserted but has never been proven in an open court. The Singapore Government has resorted to wide powers of detention under the ISA without a State of Emergency being in force. Detainees have been subjected to physical and psychological ill-treatment, including torture. Amnesty International would like to draw the attention of the Singapore Government to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights where it states in Article 4 that 'even in time of public emergency which threatens the life of the nation and the existence of which is officially proclaimed', governments may only take measures derogating from their obligations under the Covenant 'to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation'. No government may, under any circumstances, derogate from certain specific rights guaranteed under international law. These rights include:

- the right to life and the right to be arbitrarily deprived of one's life;
- freedom from torture;
- the right not to be tried for an act or omission which was not an offence at the time it was committed;
- the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion.

The focus of Amnesty International's concern regarding human rights violations in the Republic of Singapore since its independence in 1963 has been the widespread use made by

the Government of the powers of detention without trial invested in it by the Internal Security Act (ISA) and the Banishment Act. Derived from British colonial legislation, the two Acts have been used over the years to systematically curb dissent in Singapore.

Under the ISA and the Banishment Act, detained persons have no recourse to legal safeguards nor any opportunity to question the allegations and accusations levelled against them by the authorities. Furthermore, detainees can be imprisoned indefinitely under the ISA which allows for detention orders to be renewed at the discretion of the Minister of Home Affairs. Under the Banishment Act (Banishment Ordinance) 1959 any Singapore citizen who is a subject by registration or naturalization can be deprived of his citizenship if the Government is satisfied that continued citizenship is not 'conducive to the public interest'.

At least three men - Dr Lim Hock Siew (now exiled on the island of Pulau Tekong Besar), Ho Piao and Lee Tse Tong (both detained at Moon Crescent Detention Centre) - have been in detention without trial for 17 years, ie throughout the whole period of the existence of an independent Singapore and are now among the longest term political prisoners in the world. On 18 November 1978, Dr Lim Hock Siew and Said Zahari (former newspaper editor and poet) were conditionally released and sent into exile to the islands of Pulau Tekong Besar and Pulau Ubin respectively. In August 1979 Said Zahari was unconditionally released. Ho Piao remains imprisoned however. Amnesty International estimates that at least 50 persons are presently detained under the ISA at Moon Crescent Detention Centre while an unknown number of persons are detained at the Whitley Road Holding Centre, the main Special Branch interrogation centre in Singapore.

Although the number of persons held in preventive detention may seem small in comparison with many Asian countries, the Singapore authorities have used preventive detention ever since independence on a selective basis as a means of repressing and discouraging legitimate, non-violent opposition in Singapore. When the Government has felt that it faced growing criticism from influential circles, such as lawyers, journalists or students, it has often reacted by arresting and harassing individuals prominent in those fields, and so reduced them to the role of acquiescent observers.

Amnesty International believes that the Singapore Government has employed a variety of techniques to induce mental and spiritual collapse, including the denial of

medication to persons suffering from diabetes and epilepsy, with the aim of extracting self-incriminating statements which can be portrayed as 'confessions'. It is common practice in Singapore for the authorities to have broadcast on television interviews with or statements from political prisoners purporting to be 'confessions'. Amnesty International cannot accept that such interviews and statements have any legal validity and vigorously questions the assertion that they justify detention for indefinite periods without trial under the Internal Security Act. Such televised interrogations are, in the view of Amnesty International, never a substitute for fair, open trial. The practice of imputing guilt by such means, through media controlled by the Government instead of establishing the validity of evidence through normal legal procedures, violates elementary rules of law. Amnesty International draws the attention of the Government of Singapore to the international standards laid down in Article 14 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which states that everyone shall be entitled 'to a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent and impartial tribunal established by law' and be entitled to the minimum guarantee 'not to be compelled to testify against himself or confess guilt' (see Appendix A, Article 14 (g) International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights).

In submitting this report to the Singapore Government, which was one of the signatories of the petition circulated in 1977 by Amnesty International in the United Nations General Assembly to mark Prisoner of Conscience Year, Amnesty International respectfully urges that the Government give speedy consideration to the recommendations that follow in order that long-standing human rights violations in the Republic of Singapore be rectified forthwith.

1. RECOMMENDATIONS

I. International protection of human rights

Throughout its existence, Amnesty International has endeavoured to ensure the right for everyone to hold and express his beliefs. It particularly seeks to ensure the observance of the right of freedom of thought and conscience, of the freedom of opinion and expression, and the right not to be subjected to torture and arbitrary arrest or detention. These rights are laid down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 10 December 1948. They are specifically protected in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the Optional Protocol to the first Covenant. The Government of the Republic of Singapore has so far failed to sign or ratify the International Covenants for the protection of fundamental rights. Amnesty International has found that internationally-guaranteed human rights are seriously violated in the Republic of Singapore.

Amnesty International believes that the adherence of the Singapore Government to these International Covenants of human rights would constitute an important step towards the establishment of the rule of law in Singapore. The importance for governments in the Asia region to adhere to United Nations instruments in the field of human rights, and the International Covenants in particular, was recently underlined by the Lawasia Conference, at its meeting in Colombo in August 1979.*

* The 6th Lawasia Conference, held from 27 to 30 August 1979 in Colombo, Sri Lanka, resolved to set up a Permanent Standing Committee for Human Rights for the implementation of human rights in the Asia region, whose function would be 'to take steps towards the implementation of the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in specific form within the Asia region' and 'to urge the ratification of the International Covenants relating to Human Rights by the Governments within the Lawasia region, and to work towards the adherence to the UN instruments in the field of human rights including those concerning law enforcement and refugees'.

Lawasia is an association of lawyers drawn from the Asian and Australian region. It seeks to promote 'understanding and friendship and a mutual assessment and appreciation of the law systems prevailing in the region'. Lawyers from the following countries in the region attended the 6th Lawasia Conference in Colombo: Australia, Fiji, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Iran, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Nepal, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Taiwan and Thailand.

- 7 -

- (i) Amnesty International therefore recommends that the Government take immediate steps to sign and ratify, or accede to both these Covenants, as well as the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

II. Preventive detention

Amnesty International has consistently opposed long-term preventive detention for political purposes throughout the world. The use of the Internal Security Act by the Government of the Republic of Singapore as a justification for prolonged indefinite detention without trial, in some cases for up to 17 years, violates the basic human rights to freedom from arbitrary arrest, to the presumption of innocence, and to a fair, open and speedy trial before an independent and impartial tribunal.

Amnesty International recognizes that governments may on occasion be obliged temporarily to take steps to ensure the safety and security of the state when faced with a public emergency. These may include provisions for a speedy means to try offences committed in furtherance of such serious acts as sabotage or terrorism. Amnesty International, however, is concerned that in the case of Singapore, long-term preventive detention is used to curb legitimate political dissent. Its use is not in accordance with the requirements of international law. Article 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights states:*

- (1) Everyone has the right to liberty and security of person. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest or detention. No one shall be deprived of his liberty except on such grounds and in accordance with such procedure as are established by law.
- (2) Anyone who is arrested shall be informed, at the time of arrest, of the reasons for his arrest and

* The full text of the relevant Articles of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, cited in this report, is reproduced as an Appendix.

shall be promptly informed of any charges against him.

- (3) Anyone arrested or detained on a criminal charge shall be brought promptly before a judge or other officer authorized by law to exercise judicial power and shall be entitled to trial within a reasonable time or to release

- (ii) Amnesty International recommends that the Government introduce legislation at an early date for the abolition of the Internal Security Act.

Amnesty International found that legal safeguards to protect individuals from arbitrary arrest, prolonged imprisonment without trial and torture and other cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment, are wholly inadequate. The absence of an independent judicial authority to examine and restrain arbitrary or lawless executive action has led to serious abuses of internationally-recognized human rights. Article 9 (4) of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights states:

- (4) Anyone who is deprived of his liberty by arrest or detention shall be entitled to take proceedings before a court, in order that that court may decide without delay on the lawfulness of his detention and order his release if the detention is not lawful.

- (iii) Amnesty International recommends that until the Internal Security Act is abolished, the ISA be revised with a view to establishing an independent and effective machinery with full power and duty to inquire into the legality of detention in every case. If the detention is found to be unlawful its order to release should be binding on the Executive.

Amnesty International is gravely concerned about the case of three prisoners first arrested in 'Operation Cold Store' in February 1963. These three prisoners are Ho Piao, Dr Lim Hock Siew and Dr Poh Soo Kai. Ho Piao has now been held in detention continuously for nearly 17 years and is imprisoned at present in Moon Crescent Detention Centre. Dr Lim Hock Siew was also imprisoned in Moon Crescent until 18 November 1978 when he was exiled to the island of Pulau Tekong Besar.

Dr Poh Soo Kai was released in November 1973, only to be rearrested in June 1976 under the Internal Security Act and reimprisoned once again in Moon Crescent. A fourth person, Lee Tse Tong, was arrested in October 1963 and has been imprisoned without trial ever since, first under the Internal Security Act, then under the Banishment Act, and now under the Internal Security Act again. The length of time in detention without trial that all four men have now endured is almost without parallel in the modern world.

- (iv) Amnesty International recommends that Ho Piao, Lee Tse Tong and Dr Poh Soo Kai be released from Moon Crescent Detention Centre immediately and unconditionally.

Amnesty International further recommends that all restrictions imposed on Dr Lim Hock Siew be lifted immediately and that he be allowed to leave his island of exile forthwith.

As indicated in the report many other detainees have also now spent long periods of imprisonment without trial in Singapore under the provisions of the Internal Security Act.

- (v) Amnesty International recommends that all persons held at present under the ISA in Singapore be released immediately and unconditionally or be brought to trial at an early date in an open court.

Like the Internal Security Act, the Banishment Act (Banishment Ordinance 1959) allows the Government of the Republic of Singapore to detain individuals indefinitely without trial. Under the terms of the Act a person can be held sine die 'awaiting deportation'.

- (vi) Amnesty International recommends that the Government introduce legislation at an early date for the repeal of the Banishment Act.

Amnesty International further recommends that all persons presently detained under the Banishment Act be released immediately and that their rights to Singapore citizenship be restored.

In Singapore, the 1966 Constitutional Commission specifically recommended that a provision for 'freedom from torture or inhuman treatment' be included as an additional provision in the Singapore Constitution, a recommendation which, so far, has remained unimplemented, despite a government commitment to do so.

- (vii) Amnesty International recommends that the Government take immediate steps to implement the recommendation of the 1966 Constitutional Commission by making the right of freedom from torture a specific provision of the Constitution, and that the Government take all other effective measures to prevent torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment in line with Article 4 of the United Nations Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from being subjected to Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.

Amnesty International specifically recommends that the Government institute immediate and full open commissions of inquiry into the torture and maltreatment of detainees in Singapore, and especially at the Whitley Road Holding Centre, taking all necessary steps to end such brutal and inhumane practices at once. Such commissions should consist of respected, impartial and independent members of the legal and medical professions whose objectivity is unquestionable. The findings and recommendations of the commissions thus established should be made public.

Amnesty International further recommends the establishment of a code of conduct for police officials, particularly concerning the period of interrogation in keeping with various proposed international draft codes for police and other law enforcement officials, the text of which is reproduced as an Appendix to this Report.*

* Appendix B (p 54), United Nations Draft Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials, currently before the United Nations General Assembly.

III. Torture

Amnesty International has found convincing evidence that torture has been used during interrogation at the Whitley Road Holding Centre (see Chapter 4). The Government itself has referred to the use of extreme pressure during interrogation which it justifies by the existence of an alleged 'well-established underground movement' in Singapore (see Introduction). But the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights lays down that even 'in times of public emergency which threatens the life of the nation and the existence of which is officially proclaimed' no government can derogate from specific obligations under international law, which are listed in Article 4 of the Covenant. The rights from which no derogation can be made under any circumstances include:

- freedom from torture and from cruel, inhuman or degrading punishment. (see Introduction)

The absolute prohibition of the use of torture was confirmed by the United Nations Declaration of the Protection of All Persons from being subjected to Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, Resolution 3452, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 9 December 1975. Article 3 states:

'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.'

Amnesty International has found that isolation of prisoners during interrogation from all outside contact, including legal counsel and family, constitutes an important pre-condition for torture. The system of interrogation in Singapore, in which detainees are kept in complete solitary confinement and the most extreme methods of psychological, and often physical, torture are employed systematically, merely confirms this.

- (viii) Amnesty International recommends that, as protection against torture as well as protection against arbitrary arrest, all detainees be allowed visits by their family within 24 hours of arrest and regularly thereafter, and that they be guaranteed the right to confer with legal counsel.

Amnesty International further recommends that the arrested person be allowed at least two medical examinations, one immediately after arrest and one at the end of the period of police custody, and that the medical reports be made available to the prisoner and his lawyer.

Amnesty International further recommends that the practice of the systematic use of solitary confinement and prolonged interrogation cease immediately.

IV. Prison conditions

Amnesty International has received persistent complaints from detainees and from their families and lawyers regarding the inadequacy of medical facilities at Whitley Road Holding Centre and at the Moon Crescent Detention Centre. The death of the former prisoner, Chan Hock Hua, in March 1978 only ten days after he was released from Moon Crescent amply demonstrates the gross inadequacy of present medical facilities at the prison.

- (ix) Amnesty International recommends that doctors make regular visits to both Whitley Road and Moon Crescent detention centres and that prisoners be granted free access to the doctors at stated regular intervals, in accordance with Rules 22-26 of the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners.

Amnesty International further recommends that, subject to inspection, prisoners be allowed to receive traditional Chinese medicines from their families.

Amnesty International also recommends that the conditions of consultation between a detainee and his lawyer be immediately brought in accordance with the requirements of the United Nations

Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners, which provide in Article 93 that all untried prisoners can hand confidential instruction to his legal adviser and that interviews 'may be within sight but not within the hearing of a police or institution official.'

2. POLITICAL BACKGROUND

Singapore was a self-governing British colony until September 1963 when it joined with Malaya, Sarawak and North Borneo (now Sabah) to become one of the constituent parts of the Federation of Malaysia. Singapore's participation in the Federation was shortlived and in August 1965, it left Malaysia to become an independent republic.

Since 1959 Singapore has been governed by the People's Action Party (PAP) led by the Prime Minister, Mr Lee Kuan Yew. The People's Action Party, founded in 1954, was a broad-based political party espousing a socialist program with backing from the mass of largely Chinese-speaking unionized labour in Singapore, but also from the English-educated Singapore Chinese intelligentsia. This coalition was however always fragile and tensions occurred between the two wings of the party, particularly as the British, who were responsible for internal security until 1963, did not hesitate to detain without trial the more militant and left-wing nationalists within the PAP. In 1959 the PAP won the general elections and Lee Kuan Yew became Prime Minister.

Two years later, in 1961, the left-wing of the People's Action Party, led by Lim Chin Siong, broke away, and established its own party, the Barisan Sosialis (Socialist Front). The Singapore Government has repeatedly alleged that those who broke away were pro-communist but it is of interest to note that 80% of the PAP membership are estimated to have left the party at this time.* Soon after the split an agreement was announced, in August 1961, for the future merger of Singapore and Malaya. The Barisan Sosialis opposed merger and sought to test its strength in elections to be held in 1963. On the morning of 2 February 1963, however, the Singapore security authorities arrested 133 persons who were active in the anti-government opposition and who opposed merger with Malaya. Among those arrested were leaders of the Barisan Sosialis including Lim Chin Siong and Dr Lim Hock Siew as well as newspaper editors, trade unionists and university students. Despite this the Barisan was still able to obtain 33.5% of the votes in the 1963 elections, against the PAP's 46.9%.

Singapore's participation in the Federation of Malaysia was shortlived, as indeed the Barisan Sosialis leaders predicted, and in August 1965 Singapore left the Federation to become an independent republic. The Barisan leaders and other opposition

* For further details see Pang Cheng Lian, Singapore's People's Action Party, Oxford University Press, Singapore, 1971, pp 14-15; T J S George, Lee Kuan Yew's Singapore, Andre Deutsch, 1973, London, pp 62-63.

- 15 -

figures arrested in 'Operation Cold Store' were however to remain in detention without trial under the Internal Security Act for many years to come. The Barisan leader, Lim Chin Siong, was released in 1970, after spending many years in solitary confinement. Reportedly administered drugs which intensified depression, Lim Chin Siong left prison and went into exile in England.

Whilst the bulk of the 'Cold Store' detainees were released in the late 1960s and early 1970s, five men remained in prison in 1978 who had been arrested in 1963. The five were Dr Lim Hock Siew, Dr Poh Soo Kai, Lee Tse Tong, Ho Piao and Said Zahari. All five have consistently refused to make the ritual 'confession' that the Singapore Government insists upon as a precondition of their release. One of the five, Dr Poh Soo Kai, was released in November 1973 only to be rearrested in June 1976. Two others however, Dr Lim Hock Siew and Said Zahari, former editor of the Malay-language newspaper, Utusan Melayu, were unexpectedly conditionally released on 18 November 1978 and exiled respectively to the offshore islands of Pulau Tekong Besar and Pulau Ubin. In August 1979 Said Zahari was released unconditionally and allowed to return to his home in Singapore. Meanwhile, Dr Poh Soo Kai, Ho Piao and Lee Tse Tong remain incarcerated in Moon Crescent Detention Centre.

Following the establishment of an independent Republic of Singapore on 9 August 1965 Singapore embarked upon an ambitious program of economic development which has brought considerable benefits and achievements to the country. It is internationally recognized that living standards in Singapore are second only to Japan in Asia. The Republic's housing and welfare policies have likewise gained widespread international praise. At the same time however advances on the social side have been accompanied by rigorous internal political repression that has led not only to the virtual elimination of opposition political parties but also to the emasculation of any critical thought in the newspapers, trade unions, universities and legal profession.

The People's Action Party, which has now governed the country for twenty years, has not faced any effective political challenge since the Barisan Sosialis' defeat in the 1963 elections. With the Barisan Sosialis enfeebled by the detention and exile of its leaders, no other political party has emerged to take its place. In the last three general elections the PAP has captured all the seats in the Singapore parliament.

The PAP government has rigorously harassed all dissent and any potential opposition grouping in Singapore. One of the chief instruments of this policy has been the Internal Security Act. From 1963 to the early 1970s the number of political

prisoners in Singapore fluctuated between a maximum of 250 and a minimum of 70. In the years 1963-1965, arrests far exceeded releases, whereas in the late 1960s this pattern was reversed. New waves of arrests occurred in 1970 and in the period 1974-1976.

The approach to preventive detention adopted by the Government of Singapore is both selective and sophisticated. When the Government has felt that it faced growing criticism among certain circles, it has often reacted by arresting prominent individuals in those fields. A variety of techniques are then employed to extract 'confessions' designed primarily to discredit those individuals. A number of illustrative cases may be cited.

T T Rajah is a well-known Singapore lawyer who was active for many years as one of the few members of the local Bar willing to defend political prisoners. In particular, T T Rajah was prominent in the defence of political prisoners at Moon Crescent who went on hunger strike in 1970-1971. The detainees had been told by the authorities that they had to work, but the prisoners rejected this on the grounds that it was incompatible with their status as political prisoners. Several of them were beaten and they were force-fed with their hands tied behind their backs. T T Rajah was not allowed access to them and he therefore brought court proceedings by way of mandamus and took out summonses against individual Special Branch and prison officials who had allegedly beaten prisoners. It was the first time ever that such summonses had been issued. However soon after the court proceedings began disciplinary proceedings were brought against T T Rajah by the Attorney-General on the grounds of contempt of court. Several months later, on 20 June 1974, T T Rajah was arrested and detained for eighteen months without charge or trial under the Internal Security Act. Following his release on 12 December 1975 he has been prevented from having any professional contact with political prisoners as one of the conditions of his release.

It is not surprising, given the facts in the T T Rajah case, that the Singapore Bar Association, unlike its counterparts in neighbouring Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines, has not been vocal in the defence of human rights. Likewise the arrest and harassment of many newspaper publishers, editors and journalists such as Lee Eu Seng, Lee Mau Seng, Shamsuddin Tung, Arun Senkuttuvan and Ho Kwon Ping has succeeded in achieving the Government's aim of purging the press of critical voices. We shall deal further in a later chapter with the Government's relations with the press. The Singapore Government has also tried to ensure that the universities not become centres of dissent. Until 1978, students wishing to enter university in Singapore were required to pass a political vetting procedure

in order to obtain a 'suitability certificate'. Successive generations of Singapore student leaders have found themselves subjected to the rigors of imprisonment. Tan Kim Oh, a Nanyang University student who was one of the leading opponents of the introduction of these procedures, has been detained under the Internal Security Act since 1966. In 1974, Tan Wah Piow, President of the University of Singapore Students' Union, was sentenced to one year's imprisonment on rioting charges (see Chapter 3). In April 1979, Tan Teng Lim, a lecturer, and eight other past and present members of the University of Singapore Chinese Society were arrested. All except Tan were reported released in June 1979 after they had admitted involvement in pro-communist activities and 'recanted'. Tan Teng Lim, too, 'confessed' to links with the Marxist-Leninist faction of the Communist Party of Malaya but continued to be held in detention after his 'confession'. In short, the very groups that have been forthright in public criticism of human rights violations in other Southeast Asian countries - the legal and journalistic professions, the churches and universities - have in the case of Singapore been reduced to the role of acquiescent observers.

Arrests in 1976-1977 of persons who had been critical of government policy regarding human rights has had the added effect of further intimidating public opinion in this field. In May 1976 the Government announced that 50 alleged communist suspects had been arrested in recent months. The announcement was made only days before the Socialist International was to meet in London to discuss a motion by the Dutch Labour Party (Partij van de Arbeid) that the People's Action Party should be expelled. When the Dutch Social Democrats refused to withdraw their motion, the PAP announced its departure from the Socialist International. More arrests followed in Singapore of persons alleged to be supporting the 'Eurocommunist plot' against the Republic. Foremost amongst those arrested was Dr Poh Soo Kai, a former Barisan Sosialis leader who had already spent ten years in prison without trial from 1963 to 1973.

The following year, 1977, saw further arrests connected with the PAP's withdrawal from the Socialist International. These started with that of G Raman, one of the few Singapore lawyers who had taken up the cases of political detainees. In a 'confession' made within days of his arrest, Mr Raman implicated many others in alleged plots against the Government including Dr Poh Soo Kai (see further Chapter 4). Other arrests followed. 'Confessions' were made by a number of those detained, but it should be noted that none of these 'confessions' contained any substantive evidence of a 'communist conspiracy'. Indeed, an allegation made in G Raman's 'confession' that Dr Poh Soo Kai had helped an alleged terrorist, was later withdrawn. Nevertheless, Dr Poh Soo Kai remains in detention held without charge or trial.

3. LEGAL BACKGROUND

I. Preventive detention

The legal instruments whereby preventive detention is validated in Singapore are the Internal Security Act (ISA) 1960, the Banishment Act (Banishment Ordinance) 1959 and the Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) Act. Amnesty International believes that the provisions of all three Acts violate elementary freedoms and basic human rights. The rights of the individual are nowhere adequately protected in law and through these Acts the power of the executive assumes extraordinary proportions vis-a-vis the individual.

Amnesty International has found convincing evidence that the following fundamental human rights, set forth in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights* as reflecting the Universal Declaration of Human Rights**, have been violated by the Government of the Republic of Singapore: Article 7 (freedom from torture, cruel and inhuman treatment); Article 9 (freedom from arbitrary arrest and detention); Article 14 (equality before the law, right to a fair and public trial); and Article 19 (freedom of conscience). In effect the powers invested in the Singapore Government by the ISA, the Banishment Act and the Criminal Detention Act, and especially the ISA, endow the security authorities with almost unlimited powers of arbitrary arrest and preventive detention.

Derived from the British colonial government's Preservation of Public Security Ordinance (1955), the Internal Security Act has been consolidated by the post-independence government of Lee Kuan Yew into a means to stifle political dissent in the Republic. Those who have been successively detained under its provisions include parliamentarians, journalists, trade unionists, political leaders and students.

* The International Covenants on Human Rights and Optional Protocol, OPI/562, United Nations, N.Y. (Nov. 1976), p 1

** Universal Declaration of Human Rights, OPI/15, United Nations, N.Y. (May 1976), p 3

Powers of preventive detention are laid down in Section 8 of the Internal Security Act. The Act states, Section 8:

- (1) If the President is satisfied with respect to any person that, with a view to preventing that person from acting in any manner prejudicial to the security of Singapore or any part thereof or to the maintenance of public order or essential services therein, it is necessary to do so, the Minister shall make an order—

- (a) directing that such person be detained for any period not exceeding two years; ...

(An example of a detention order made under Section 8 (1) (a) is attached in Appendix C.) This power has been used by the Singapore Government to detain some individuals indefinitely - in the case of one political detainee, Ho Piao for almost 17 years. Moreover, Amnesty International knows that a total of at least 29 prisoners have now been held for five years or more under the ISA.

The draconian powers invested in the Government of Singapore by Section 8 are supplemented by Section 74 under which:

- (1) Any police officer may without warrant arrest and detain pending enquiries any person in respect of whom he has reason to believe:-
 - (a) that there are grounds which would justify his detention under Section 8; and
 - (b) that he has acted or is about to act or is likely to act in any manner prejudicial to the security of Singapore or any part thereof.

A person detained under Section 74 can be held for 30 days before the Minister of Home Affairs decides whether to release him or serve a detention order. Section 74 (4) reads:

- (4) If an officer of or above the rank of superintendent of police is satisfied that the necessary enquiries cannot be completed within the period of forty-eight hours prescribed by subsection (3) he may authorize the further detention of any person detained under the provisions of this section for an additional period not exceeding twenty-eight days.

In some cases Amnesty International knows of individuals

who have been held for longer than 30 days without being served a detention order contrary to the stipulation of the Internal Security Act.

The powers of preventive detention granted to the executive under the ISA are implicit in the Constitution of the Federation of Malaysia, the relevant articles of which were incorporated into Singapore's own Constitution when it withdrew from the Federation.* Thus by Article 10 (2) of the Constitution, Parliament is entitled to impose restrictions on fundamental rights to speech, assembly and association in the interest of the security of the Republic. Moreover, Article 149 of the Constitution validates legislation against subversion 'notwithstanding that it is inconsistent with any of the provisions of Articles 5, 9 or 10 (affecting liberty of the person, freedom of movement and freedom of speech, assembly and association) or would apart from this Article be outside the legislative power of Parliament'. And under Article 151 Parliament is implicitly empowered to provide for preventive detention.

In 1966, a Constitutional Commission made recommendations concerning fundamental liberties to be entrenched in the Singapore Constitution. Although the Commission's approach was not 'to depart, except where we think it necessary and desirable, from the form and substance of similar provisions of the Malaysian Constitution', it did recommend the inclusion of additional provisions on fundamental liberties that were not contained in the Malaysian Constitution. Among these recommended provisions were ones on freedom from torture or inhumane treatment, and on the right to apply to the courts for enforcement of articles on fundamental rights and liberties. The Government accepted these particular recommendations in principle and the Minister of Law said they 'will be incorporated in some form in the Constitution to be drawn up'.**

The provisions of the Internal Security Act do not allow effective recourse to the courts for political detainees.

* See Republic of Singapore Independence Act 1965, section 6 (1)-(3).

** Singapore Parliamentary Debates, Vol. 25, col. 1054 (cited in J B Jayakumar, Constitutional Law, Singapore Law Series; ed. Koh Kheng Lian; Malaya Law Review, University of Singapore)

Successful applications for a writ of habeas corpus have not resulted in the permanent release of detainees. Ho Piao, also known by the name Ho Toon Chin, former Secretary of the Singapore National Seamen's Union, was arrested in 'Operation Cold Store' in February 1963. In October 1967 he and four others made a successful application for a writ of habeas corpus and were released by the Chief Justice on the grounds that their detention order was technically defective. However, they were immediately rearrested and served with fresh detention orders. Ho Piao has been detained ever since under the ISA.

Another detainee, Lee Tse Tong, a former Barisan Sosialis (Socialist Front) MP was arrested in October 1963 and held without trial under the ISA. Lee Tse Tong was one of the detainees who made a successful application in October 1967 for a writ of habeas corpus only to be immediately rearrested. In December 1967 Lee Tse Tong's citizenship was withdrawn on the grounds that he could not prove he had been born in Singapore and on 21 February 1968 he was served with a Banishment Order under the provisions of the Banishment Ordinance (see below). Lee Tse Tong was detained at the Queenstown Detention Centre where banishees awaiting deportation are normally confined. In 1975 the Banishment Order was dropped and Lee Tse Tong was served with a detention order under the ISA. He has since been held in Moon Crescent Holding Centre and has now completed more than 16 years in detention.* Once a person has been served with a detention order, the decision is final and cannot be called into question in any court.

The ISA provides the right for detainees to make representation to an 'Advisory Board' (Section 11 (1)). It stipulates that all detention orders shall be subject to review by an Advisory Board at intervals of not more than 12 months (Section 13). The three members of the Advisory Board,

* Lee Tse Tong's case has been taken up by the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), which in May 1979 sent a delegation to Singapore to investigate the reasons for the detention of a parliamentarian over such a length of time. At its Conference in Caracas in September 1979 the IPU called on the Singapore Government to release Lee Tse Tong immediately and unconditionally.

although former members of the judiciary, are government nominees whose role, as its name implies, is strictly advisory. Moreover, it is not necessary that the Minister of Home Affairs disclose all the facts regarding an individual case to the Advisory Board if he feels this would be against the national interest.* The Advisory Board's powers are purely those of recommendation and it cannot direct the release of a detainee on its own authority. It is a non-judicial body and final decisions rest with the Government.** It is a review machinery totally under the control of the Government. The majority of political detainees have boycotted the hearings of the Board, because they regard it merely as an extension of the Government's powers of preventive detention.

Direction for release from detention under the ISA may come from the Minister of Home Affairs (Section 10) or from the President acting on the recommendation of the Advisory Board (Section 12). However, release may be subject to a number of conditions. These commonly include: restrictions on residence, employment and movement both within and beyond the limits of Singapore; notification to the authorities of the ex-detainee's movements; a prohibition on taking part in political activities; and a ban on associating with other ex-detainees. An example of such a 'Restrictive Order' under Section 8 (1) (b) of the ISA is attached in Appendix C.

* Section 16 of the ISA states: 'Nothing in this Chapter or in any rules made thereunder shall require the Minister or any member of an advisory board or any public servant to disclose facts or to produce documents whose disclosure or production he considers to be against the national interest.'

** Section 12 of the ISA states: (1) 'Whenever any person has made any representations under subsection (1) of section 11 to an advisory board, the advisory board shall, within three months of the date on which such person was detained, consider such representations and make recommendations thereon to the President.'

(2) 'Upon considering the recommendations of the advisory board under this section the President may give the Minister such directions, if any, as he thinks fit regarding the order made by the Minister, and every decision of the President thereon shall, subject to the provisions of section 13, be final, and shall not be called into question in any court.'

Provisions for preventive detention are also included in the Banishment Act (Banishment Ordinance) 1959 and in the Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) Act. Under Article 61 (4) of the Constitution, the Singapore Government may by order deprive any citizen who is a citizen by registration or naturalization of his citizenship if the Government is satisfied 'that it is not conducive to the public good that the person should continue to be a citizen of Singapore'. A large proportion of the population of Singapore are recent migrants from Malaysia, India or China and especially open to threat of being deprived of their Singapore citizenship.

The exact number of detainees deported under the provisions of the Banishment Act is not known, but it is believed that at least 30 persons have been deported since the Republic's birth in August 1965 largely to China, but also to India and Malaysia. Moreover, a number of persons deprived of their citizenship have found themselves languishing indefinitely in Singapore jails because of their refusal to accept banishment to the People's Republic of China, Malaysia or India. The Singapore Government detains such a person sine die 'until he can be placed on board a ship or other means of transport' under the provisions of Section 6 (4) of the Banishment Act.

Amnesty International believes that at least five persons are still detained at present under the Banishment Act, including one woman, Wong Ai, who is held in Changi Female Prison.

It is also common for persons held under the ISA who are Singapore citizens by registration or naturalization to be deprived of their citizenship and to be subsequently offered release if they will accept deportation. According to Singapore Government statistics, 90 persons were 'released and proceeded to other countries' in the years 1960-1976.

As well as holding political detainees indefinitely without trial under the ISA and the Banishment Act, the Singapore Government also holds without trial several hundred persons under the Criminal Law (Temporary Provisions) Act. The majority of persons detained under this Act are alleged narcotics smugglers and traffickers together with members of Chinese Secret Societies. However, Amnesty International has received information that a number of political detainees are also held under this Act.

II. Trials

The only known case of a political prisoner who has been put on trial during the last decade is that of Tan Wah Piow. Trial by jury was abolished in Singapore in 1959 for all but capital offences and ten years later, in 1969, was likewise abolished for these offences.

Tan Wah Piow was President of the Singapore Students' Union at the time of his arrest in October 1974. Prior to his arrest he had been engaged, together with the Students' Union, in research into redundancies amongst workers with foreign corporations. On 30 October 1974, together with some other students, Wah Piow went to the office of the Pioneer Industries Employees Union after learning that several hundred workers were to be laid off by a United States concern, American Marine. As a result of a subsequent disturbance at the plant Wah Piow was charged with unlawful assembly and rioting.

An Australian lawyer, Frank Galbally, who observed the subsequent trial found many unsatisfactory features in the Prosecution's case. In particular, he pointed to the lack of credibility shown by Prosecution witnesses:

'From the evidence there did not appear to be any reason for Tan or the other accused acting in the way alleged. The behaviour of the witnesses as described by themselves during the riotous incident was very difficult to understand and would have to be viewed with grave suspicion.'

Moreover, in the opinion of Mr Galbally, Tan was not afforded a proper opportunity of testing the evidence against him, the judge frequently ruling his questions to witnesses out of order. Indeed Tan was unrepresented at the trial because the Court had refused to adjourn the trial to allow Mr John Platt-Mills QC, a distinguished English barrister, time to arrive in Singapore to defend his client, despite the fact that Mr Platt-Mills had been admitted by the Singapore High Court for the specific purpose of defending Tan and the two other accused. Most striking of all, several defence witnesses were arrested on the opening morning of the trial and deported to Malaysia.

The trial ended on 22 February 1975 with Tan Wah Piow being sentenced to one year's imprisonment and two other workers tried with him to one month's imprisonment. Upon his release

from prison in February 1976, Tan Wah Piow was allowed three days of freedom before being conscripted into the army. Fearing for his safety, Tan Wah Piow left Singapore for exile in Europe.

4. ARREST AND INTERROGATION

- 27 -

Through its Internal Security Act, the Government of the Republic of Singapore is endowed with extraordinary powers of arbitrary arrest and detention, as described in the previous chapter. These powers have been used extensively to detain students, workers, doctors, trade unionists, lawyers and journalists.

Arrest takes place in nearly all cases late at night or early in the morning. The detained person is taken in a Black Maria to a Special Branch Holding Centre where he is kept in solitary confinement for 30 days' interrogation. The van might spend several hours circling the city before entering the interrogation centre through an underground entrance. The main Special Branch Interrogation Centre in Singapore is the Whitley Road Holding Centre. There are however other undisclosed Special Branch Centres. In most cases the interrogated person does not know where he is being held. Throughout the 30 days' interrogation the prisoner is not allowed access to a lawyer and in most cases is forbidden visits from his family contrary to the provisions of the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners.* Indeed, frequently the family is not even informed of the arrest. The only human contact the detainee enjoys is with his interrogators. It is a matter of routine that all prisoners undergoing interrogation are denied such elementary necessities as spectacles, watch, soap, comb and towel.

On arrival at the centre the arrested person is forced to change into criminal prisoner's clothing and then taken directly to his cell, or in some cases, to the interrogation room. The cells are walled rooms, often underground, approximately 5' by 7' by 10' high with no windows and completely inadequate ventilation. Many ex-detainees complain of their cells being infested with mosquitoes. There are no blankets, mattress or pillows in the cell and the bed consists of a concrete coffin-like block, sometimes

* Rule 92 of the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners, Section C, 'Prisoners under arrest or awaiting Trial', states: 'An untried prisoner shall be allowed to inform immediately his family of his detention and shall be given all reasonable facilities for communicating with his family and friends, and for receiving visits from them, subject only to such restrictions and supervision as are necessary in the interests of the administration of justice and of the security and good order of the institution.'

covered with wooden planks. Those prisoners who have been provided with blankets and mattress at a later stage of their detention complain of them being insect-infested and urine stained.

The lighting too is designed to increase the prisoner's discomfort. In most cases there is only a single 5-watt bulb kept burning 24 hours a day, so dim, in the words of one ex-detainee that 'I could barely see the lines on my hands'. In other cases a neon light is kept burning 24 hours a day in the cell. No reading material is allowed and detainees are forbidden to write to their relatives during interrogation. Even singing and speaking is forbidden in the cells. The sense of isolation and deprivation felt by the prisoner is enhanced by the Singapore Government's policy of recruiting Gurkha mercenary troops from Nepal as guards at both the Whitley Road Holding Centre and at the Moon Crescent Detention Centre. The Gurkhas speak neither Chinese, the first language of most of the detainees, nor Malay, and speak little English.

During the 30 days a detained person is held under Section 74, his routine alternates between long spells spent in solitary confinement and rigorous interrogation that may continue for as long as 72 hours, and in a few cases even longer. The interrogation is carried out by teams of interrogators who subject the detainee to a constant and merciless cross-examination that in many cases has led to mental breakdown and/or the ritual 'confession' sought by the Government. Amnesty International has established that prisoners have been subjected to serious ill-treatment and torture during this period.

The interrogation room is usually air-conditioned to a temperature of 50° Fahrenheit or lower, whilst the outside temperature is in excess of 90° Fahrenheit and even higher in the hot and humid underground cells. X is an ex-detainee interviewed by Amnesty International who was subjected to 72 hours' continuous interrogation after her arrest in 1977:

'The cold was indescribable. The Special Branch officers wore woollen jumpers and thick jackets. I thought I would never stop shivering. Indeed at one point I thought my heart was going to burst. By the third day, my lips had become very cracked with the cold. My watch had been taken away and I had no idea what time of day or night it was. It was like being in a nightmare. The worst thing was not knowing what would happen next.'

'I had a feeling after a while of extreme exhaustion. You were deprived of everything. Prisoners are even forbidden to sing or talk in their cells. I tried to remember poems that I had learned at school and scolded myself that I could remember so few. It is the complete lack of contact with anything or anybody in the outside world that is so unbearable. I remember distinctly one unforgettable incident that I am sure kept me going during my detention. I had called the guard to ask to go to the toilet, and for some reason was taken to a different one from the usual one, which involved walking through a courtyard. As we walked through it, I could see that it was late evening and suddenly a leaf from a rain-tree blew onto the path. I remember thinking it was some kind of God-send and feeling so grateful that here was something from outside prison. I picked it up and kept it with me for the remainder of my time there. I can never convey how much that one thing meant.'

The complete isolation and deprivation that solitary confinement necessarily entail, combined with the long periods of interrogation, have an extremely debilitating effect on many prisoners. X again remembers:

'The hours in the cell are so very long. After a while, even the interrogation is something to look forward to because it at least breaks the monotony. It is a real effort to try and occupy your mind all the time. One tries to think of family and friends, and of songs and poems and of episodes in one's own life, but after a while even this becomes difficult and rather pointless. There are moments when you think you will never have a creative thought about anything again.'

Other prisoners, particularly those from working class backgrounds, have been subjected to physical torture during interrogation. Beatings are all too common and a much used method of obtaining information is to continually douse the prisoner in cold water while he is being questioned in the air-conditioned interrogation room. In recent years, electric shock treatment has also been employed to torture prisoners, including female detainees. Prisoners in the Moon Crescent Detention Centre have from time to time been removed to Whitley Road Holding Centre for interrogation, where they have been subjected to ill-treatment and torture.

One case that has come to the attention of Amnesty International is that of Chai Chong, at the time of

his arrest in 1976 an engineering graduate from the Singapore Polytechnic. During his interrogation at Whitley Road Holding Centre, Chai Chong was tortured by electric shock treatment as well as beaten several times. On other occasions he had filthy rags forced into his mouth and red ants placed on his mattress.

Conditions at Whitley Road Holding Centre have always been grim. The width of the cells in which the detainees are kept is only the span of a man's arms. The bed is little more than a cement block with, at best, some planks on top of it. Prisoners are allowed out of their cells for only half-an-hour a day to go to the toilet and to wash.

Another detainee known to Amnesty International is Tan Kim Chong who was arrested on 9 April 1977. At the time of his arrest he was a worker in a textile factory. In clear breach of Section 74 of the ISA he was detained at Whitley Road Holding Centre in solitary confinement until 22 July 1977, more than two-and-a-half months after his arrest, before finally being moved to Moon Crescent Detention Centre. During interrogation he was frequently beaten and as a result lost several teeth. Yet another detainee arrested in 1976, Chieu Tuan Sin, also lost several teeth from beatings received during interrogation.

Ho Khoon Khoong, a political prisoner arrested in August 1976 and a construction worker by occupation, was likewise severely beaten during interrogation. He was several times doused in cold water and also had his genital organs beaten.

Pang Hee Fat, a detainee arrested in 1967, had his jaw broken as a result of beatings. He was released in 1973 but was rearrested on 14 July 1976, and was badly assaulted and ill-treated during his subsequent interrogation. He was questioned for periods of up to 12 hours at one time by a group of seven to eight Special Branch officers who assaulted him on numerous occasions. As a result he suffered bruises and vomited badly. Because of his ill-treatment he tried to commit suicide by banging his head against the cell wall. During one interrogation session at Whitley Road, Pang Hee Fat's wife, Wong Kui Inn, also a detainee, was brought in to see her husband being beaten. Wong Kui Inn was herself badly treated during interrogation and was subjected to dousing in cold water and electric shocks.

Some prisoners, as we have already indicated, have spent

extremely long periods in solitary confinement. The lawyer, T T Rajah, was arrested on 20 June 1974 and spent the next six months in solitary confinement. He was taken from his home at 4 am by police car to the Central Police Station and placed in a cell. For the first 24 hours he received no food and although he is a diabetic, his medication was taken away from him. The following day he was taken to Whitley Road Holding Centre where he was held in solitary confinement until December 1974. His cell measured only 6' x 8' x 12'. Ventilation was poor and there were no toilet facilities. He was not allowed to shower for the first ten days of his imprisonment there nor was he allowed exercise for the first month of his imprisonment. Periods of six months in solitary confinement after arrest are not unusual. Another case known is that of Chng Min Oh arrested on 3 August 1970. At the time of his arrest an active trade unionist and Chairman of the Goldsmiths' Association, Chng Min Oh, like T T Rajah, was imprisoned in solitary confinement for six months at Whitley Road.

Solitary confinement and physical and psychological torture are not the only rigours that political prisoners in Singapore are forced to undergo. Threats are also made regarding prisoners' families and in a number of cases the wives of political detainees have been taken into custody. One example is the circumstances surrounding the arrest of Dr Poh Soo Kai.

Dr Poh Soo Kai is a former leader of the Barisan Sosialis (Socialist Front) who was detained without trial for ten years under the ISA, from 1963 to 1973. On 4 June 1976 he was rearrested by the Singapore Special Branch. His recorded statement follows:

'I left my house on 4.6.76 morning and as I was about to enter my car, a Chinese man who had parked his car in front of mine at the private car park sounded his horn. Another Chinese man came, showed me his warrant card and told me I was under arrest. No reasons were given and I did not ask for reasons. I had assumed that they were arresting me because of the publicity given in the papers about me in connection with the expulsion of the PAP from the Socialist International.

Then my house was searched. There were a large number of men who searched the place. They seized some articles from the house including letters, journals etc.

Then I was taken to the clinic. There a search was made and they took away some magazines including Problems of Communism which is an American State Department publication. I was taken by car from the clinic blindfolded. I was taken for an approximately 10-minute drive and then taken to a cell. I did not know where it was.

I was left alone for the rest of the day after I had been interrogated for about two hours.

Early next morning I was awakened about 6.00 am and after a wash I was subjected to day-long interrogation until midnight. My interrogators worked in three shifts. The room was air-conditioned and the cold was quite uncomfortable. This routine had been a daily affair.

They have taken away my watch, my spectacles and I am not given reading materials.'

On 3 July 1976, after four weeks' interrogation from 8 am to 12 midnight, Dr Poh Soo Kai was served with a detention order alleging he supported 'Communist Front activities' and was transferred to Moon Crescent Detention Centre, where he remains in detention. Throughout his four weeks' interrogation Dr Poh Soo Kai was denied access to a lawyer. Dr Poh Soo Kai has now spent 14 of the last 17 years in prison without trial.

On 19 February 1977 Dr Poh Soo Kai's wife, Grace Poh, was also arrested by the Special Branch and taken blindfolded to the Whitley Road Holding Centre. Mrs Poh was detained in solitary confinement for 27 days at Whitley Road before being released. During this period she was questioned and interrogated, for long periods of several days in one session, by teams of Special Branch officers in air-conditioned rooms. At the same time Dr Poh Soo Kai, who was being held at Moon Crescent Detention Centre, was informed of his wife's arrest and detention. This was done in such a manner as to cause Dr Poh great distress and concern for his wife's fate with the aim of obtaining a 'confession' from him and a recantation of his political views. Mrs Poh, for her part, had never been active in politics. Her arrest was not publicly reported by the Government.

Such practices are not unusual in Singapore. We have already cited the case of detainee Pang Hee Fat, who was

beaten in the presence of his wife Wong Kui Inn. Similar cases have also come to the attention of Amnesty International. In March 1977 Francis Khoo, a Singapore lawyer who had defended one of the accused in the Tan Wah Piow trial, left Singapore after the Special Branch had arrested four lawyers, all of whom, like Francis Khoo, had been active in human rights work. After he left the Republic, his wife, Dr Ang Swee Chai, was arrested at her hospital by ten Singapore Special Branch officers and subjected to rigorous interrogation at Whitley Road Holding Centre. She was later released and allowed to join her husband in England.

The Singapore security police, the Special Branch, have combined a number of the above techniques - physical and psychological torture, solitary confinement and threats to families - to obtain 'confessions' and 'recantations' from prisoners in recent years. Amnesty International believes the responsibility for proving the guilt of any individual lies with the Government, in accordance with generally accepted legal procedures. The use of these 'confessions', obtained by the methods described above, can in no way be accepted as justification for preventive detention.

The Singapore Government has in recent years established as a virtual precondition for release that a 'confession' be made by the detainee, often through the Government-controlled media. These 'confessions' purport to supplement and justify the accusations and allegations the Government has made against the detainee, including statements relating to supposed illegal and subversive activities. The 'confessions' often implicate detainees' friends and associates, and are used by the Singapore Government as a pretext to arrest these people. Moreover they are used by the Government to justify its widespread use of preventive detention under the Internal Security Act.

In May 1976 the Singapore Government announced that it had arrested some 50 'communist suspects' since January that year. This announcement coincided with a 'confession' of involvement in alleged underground communist activities made on Singapore television by Madam Goh Lay Kuan, a well-known ballet teacher. The 'confession' of Madam Goh was used by the Singapore Government to justify its contention of a 'communist threat' to the island Republic.

This 'confession' was made only days before the Socialist International was due to meet in London to discuss accusations from other member parties that Singapore was violating human rights by detaining political prisoners without trial.

After Singapore's People's Action Party (PAP) withdrew from the Socialist International, more arrests and 'confessions' followed. Many of those arrested were journalists, others were lawyers, students and businessmen. They were detained under the ISA until they agreed to make public confessions. During the televised proceedings, they stated that they were members of Communist or Marxist groupings and had worked against the best interests of the Republic but were now willing to denounce their past beliefs and actions. They were then cross-examined by Government selected inquisitors.

Such 'confessions' must be seen in the context of the threat of a lifetime in detention without trial, the pressures of solitary confinement, physical and psychological torture and in some cases threats to families. It is in this context that one must evaluate 'confessions' made by well-known journalists of prominent newspapers such as the Financial Times (London) and the Far Eastern Economic Review, which we will examine in Chapter 6.

5. LONG TERM DETENTION

- 35 -

I Moon Crescent Detention Centre

Since May 1970 almost all long-term political prisoners in the Republic of Singapore have been detained in the Moon Crescent Detention Centre, a purpose-built political wing of Changi Prison, the main prison in the country. As we have noted political detainees are frequently kept in solitary confinement for anything up to six months, either at Whitley Road Holding Centre or at other undisclosed Special Branch Holding Centres. Once a detainee is served with a detention order under Section 8 of the Internal Security Act, he is almost invariably transferred to the Moon Crescent Detention Centre.

The number of detainees currently held at Moon Crescent is at least 50. They are kept in isolated units of three to six men with no contact between the various units. Each small block of cells is surrounded by high walls, and exercise yards are very small. The cells themselves are also small, with very poor ventilation. There is no window. The cell door, which consists of bars only, opens into a corridor which is walled to the ceilings. Hence there is no through ventilation. Detainees are not allowed to have watches, clocks or calendars in their cells.

Prisoners are allowed to receive visitors once a week and to send one letter a week. Each prison visit lasts half-an-hour. Detainee and relative are separated from each other by a thick soundproof glass partition and can communicate with each other only by telephone. Prison warders are present throughout the visit and monitor the conversation. Visits are terminated abruptly if any mention is made of prison conditions. Prisoners are allowed out of their cells only between the hours of 6.30 to 10 am, 12 noon to 2 pm and 4 pm to 7 pm. Thus prisoners are confined in their cells for 15½ hours a day. Food is poor and only a limited supplement is allowed from families.

Prisoners at Moon Crescent Detention Centre have extremely limited access to lawyers. In part this is a reflection of the harassment of those members of the Singapore Bar who have been courageous enough to defend political prisoners, but it is also due to restrictions in force at Moon Crescent. The lawyer usually has to state specifically the purpose of his visit, which is always under strict supervision by the Special Branch. Not even a passing mention of conditions of detention is allowed. Frequently requests by prisoners for visits by their lawyer are turned down or ignored by the prison authorities, and letters sent by detainees to their legal advisers often never reach their destination.

From time to time prisoners at Moon Crescent Detention Centre have protested over their conditions. In particular, two long hunger strikes took place in 1971 and 1978. In both cases the prison authorities responded with considerable brutality. In addition, the prisoners have traditionally staged a 36-hour hunger strike on 2 February every year to commemorate the anniversary of 'Operation Cold Store' on 2 February 1963, when 133 persons were arrested in one sweep by security authorities. Two of the prisoners arrested on that day - Dr Poh Soo Kai and Ho Piao - are still detained at Moon Crescent.

The hunger strike in 1970-71 arose over an attempt by the authorities to force the prisoners to do work, which the prisoners themselves rejected categorically on the grounds that they were political detainees. The hunger strike started on 16 December 1970. After it had been in progress for five days, the authorities started force-feeding a number of the detainees, including female prisoners. Several of the prisoners were also brutally beaten during this period. Several of the female detainees at Moon Crescent at the time made sworn complaints of ill-treatment afterwards before a magistrate. Those who made complaints were Law Leh Moi, Sim Teong Hiok, Wong Kui Inn, Toh Siew Tim, Liu Ah Kiang, Lee Yuen Tueng, Goh Peng Hua and Ng Noi Kee.

There have also been occasions when prisoners have staged hunger strikes individually against injustices inflicted on them. For example in June 1972 Lim Hock Koon, younger brother of Dr Lim Hock Siew, staged a hunger strike in protest against a 'confession' allegedly made by him which the Government placed in several newspapers without his compliance.

In the last two years conditions at Moon Crescent have deteriorated considerably and the prisoners have staged several protests against the authorities' actions. Amnesty International has long been gravely concerned about the inadequacy of medical conditions at Moon Crescent and this concern has been increased by the death in March 1978 of Chan Hock Hua, a long-term prisoner at Moon Crescent, only 20 days after his release from prison. Chan Hock Hua was arrested on 17 February 1971. He was initially detained at Whitley Road Holding Centre but later transferred to the top floor of the Central Police Station where he was kept under solitary confinement for two years. During long periods of interrogation at these two interrogation centres, he was frequently beaten and several times immersed in cold water. As a result of this treatment, he also complained in later years of severe rheumatism. In 1973 he was transferred to Moon Crescent.

During the next four years and more at Moon Crescent, Chan Hock Hua suffered frequently from ill health, so much so that other prisoners complained about the inadequacy of the medical treatment he was receiving and urged the authorities to consider his early release on humanitarian grounds. In early 1978 his health deteriorated rapidly and caused considerable unease amongst his fellow-prisoners. As a result of their protests, on 13 March 1978 Chan Hock Hua was transferred from Moon Crescent to Singapore General Hospital. According to the doctors there, Chan was suffering from carcinoma hepatitis (cancer of the liver), and a few days later he was discharged from hospital because of the incurable nature of his illness. On 25 March Chan's family took him to a private hospital, but the following day he died from his illness.

The tragic case of Chan Hock Hua illustrates in a striking way the serious shortcomings of medical attention at Moon Crescent. Moreover, Chan's family have repeatedly alleged that he was suffering in fact not from cancer of the liver but from a lacerated liver caused by beatings he had received in the early years of his detention.

The death of Chan Hock Hua caused understandable unrest amongst the detainees at Moon Crescent and led to a hunger strike on 30 March 1978. Some weeks later, in May, the prison authorities announced new regulations that further limited prison rations and restricted what prisoners could receive from their families. The official reason given by the authorities for restricting the supply of food that could be brought by relatives was that the measure was being implemented to prevent jealousies among detainees by equalizing the amount allowed in for each detainee. The prison authorities had also taken to closing up the little openings at the top of the walls of the tiny cells. The reason given for blocking up this minimal source of light and ventilation was that they wanted to prevent rain from getting in through these openings. These measures rendered conditions at Moon Crescent even more oppressive. The prisoners protested at these new measures by staging sit-down protests after each family visit. Two one-day hunger strikes also took place on 6 June and 17 July to emphasize the prisoners' discontent that the authorities were not even willing to discuss the new regulations. As a punishment for these strikes, family visits were curtailed completely and several prisoners moved to the punishment wing of Changi Prison. The punishment wing at Changi Prison is above the prison bakery and ovens, and groups of prisoners from Moon Crescent were kept in solitary confinement cells here for up to five days at a time. Among the detainees transferred there were Lee Tse Tong (detained since October 1963) and Pang Hee Fat. Two prisoners, Chai Chong and Chow Tien Pao, were beaten by three warders, whom they identified as Mak Tse Wah, C P Lim and Tan Kah Beng.

In August 1978 a dozen prisoners from Moon Crescent were transferred to Whitley Road Holding Centre, where they were placed in solitary confinement and interrogated over long periods. Among those transferred were Chng Min Oh, Ho Koon Kiang, Cheng Nui, Chong Ming Jee and Chieu Tuan Sin. A number of them were also beaten. Among those assaulted were Chng Min Oh, Ho Koon Kiang, Chong Ming Jee and a female detainee, Cheng Nui. Two of the detainees, Chng Min Oh and Ho Koon Kiang, began a hunger strike which resulted in their being hospitalized after 20 days and force-fed.

The prisoners transferred to Whitley Road Holding Centre were asked to sign statements, in return for which they were promised conditional release. Both Chng Min Oh and Ho Koon Kiang repeatedly refused to do this. During interrogation they were beaten, and Chng Min Oh had a bowl of urine poured over his head. Both men were kept in solitary confinement and were not allowed to leave their cells to wash or to go to the toilet. They were interrogated for long periods in air-conditioned rooms. It was as a result of this treatment that they began their hunger strike.

For over a month during the hunger strike the families of Chng Min Oh and Ho Koon Kiang were denied visits. Chng Min Oh has experienced severe difficulties with hearing as a result of beatings he received at Whitley Road and was later transferred to Changi Prison Hospital. Chng Min Oh and Ho Koon Kiang were transferred back to Moon Crescent Detention Centre only on 21 November 1978.

The inadequacy of medical conditions at Moon Crescent in 1978 was further highlighted by the case of Lim Hock Koon. The younger brother of Dr Lim Hock Siew (detained since 1963), Lim Hock Koon has been detained without trial since 1971 under the ISA. In May 1978 he was found to be suffering from chronic high blood pressure. Six months later Lim Hock Koon suffered a stroke resulting in partial paralysis of his body. He has since been transferred to Changi Prison Hospital. Requests by his family that he be moved to an outside hospital for adequate treatment have been ignored. Moreover, Amnesty International has received information that even in hospital Lim Hock Koon has been subjected to renewed interrogation and pressure to consider making a confession and recantation of his political views.

In late December 1978, another group of detainees at Moon Crescent were transferred to the Whitley Road Holding Centre. Amnesty International received information that they were held in solitary confinement and were physically assaulted during

interrogation. Amongst those transferred to Whitley Road was Ho Piao. For five months, until May 1979, Ho Piao was kept in solitary confinement at Whitley Road and subjected to repeated beatings, dousings with cold water and prolonged interrogation in an air-conditioned room. In a statement to his lawyer on 11 May 1979 at the Moon Crescent Detention Centre, Ho Piao described his interrogation as follows:

'I was transferred from Moon Crescent Prison to Whitley Holding Centre on 27 December 1978. The authorities forbade me from bringing along my personal effects and books. This is an abnormal measure. They took me by car from the clinic to an office, from there to an interrogation room, No. C9, and finally to room E4.

For the following few days, they interrogated me continuously and put me under solitary confinement. It was like being locked in a zoo. There was a small metal cap in the door, and the prison warders occasionally kept me under surveillance through the hole covered by the metal cap. This practice wholly contravenes the position of the "International Law Committee" (translation) on solitary confinement.

On 8 April 1979, I was taken to an underground cubicle, C9, where they switched on the air-conditioner to full blast and directed the cold blast at my body. There were four people - I would recognize them. They handcuffed my hands behind my back, removed my clothes, and poured cold water over my body. I was numb. According to my calculation, they poured water over my body 46 times. The main person was Liu (translation). I was shivering and could not talk.

After eight hours, another batch came to torture me. I would recognize them. One of the four is Quan Tek Kee (translation) who is the main person.

This time they poured water over me for 18 times. After Quan left, another batch tortured me in the same manner. This time they poured cold water on me 132 times. Although I do not know the name of the chief in this batch, I would recognize him. He slapped me and one of them slapped me four times.

This whole day I was tied to a wooden chair. They pulled my hair, pressed my nose and poured water through my nose and mouth. They pressed my throat and hit my lower abdomen three times until I suffered spasmodic pain. They then tightened their grip on my hands, and pressed their fists against my

abdomen until I could hardly breathe. My body was in pain, I could neither eat nor drink. They hit my ribs with their knuckles and one of them applied a karate chop to my chest. One of them threw me on the floor. They then poured water over me and hit my head.

They said, "This is how we treat animals. For the last 16 years, you did not get such treatment. This is an introductory gesture".

Their torture made my body feel like a corpse. I could not move. They pulled me up from the floor and tied me to the chair. Another group came to torture me. I would recognize them. They used the same method. They poured water over me 64 times. This torture went on for four days. I lost count of the number of times they poured water over me. My body was drenched and shivering. They shouted in my ears and prized open my eyes. I did not sleep, or eat or drink for four days.

Not long after, a person came and introduced himself as director of the Political Bureau. He wanted me to accept the conditions proposed by the authorities on 17 January 1977. Of their three conditions, the main one stipulated that I could not involve myself in nor support the activities of the Communist United Front.

I would not forego my political beliefs, and would resolutely wait for the change of the government policies towards myself and my friends.

Before long, an officer came and lifted my chin with his shoe. I would recognize him. Another person used a plastic cup to hit my forehead. The pain in my abdomen was beyond description, and it became numb and hard. There was a pain in my chest. One of the officers said, "This man is strange, when we poured water over him, he did not shiver. But when we stopped, he started to shiver". During the process, he struck me continuously.

Two officers came to interrogate me. I vomited continuously. I felt my abdomen and chest burning. Occasionally I moaned. I felt that I was being carried away. When I awoke, I was on the bed in a prison room, E8. My body was in pain, my limbs were numb. I wanted to shit. I banged on the door and the warder opened it.'

II Release of Long-Term Detainees

The release of long-term detainees is governed by Section 10 of the Internal Security Act, which states that a detention order may be suspended at any time by decision of the Minister of Home Affairs. The Minister is also empowered to impose conditions on a released detainee, such as directing that he live at a specified residence, prohibiting overseas travel, requiring the ex-detainee to notify his movements to the police, prohibiting any participation in politics, and imposing a curfew on the ex-detainee. In addition to the restrictions on released political prisoners authorized by Section 10 of the ISA, it is also common practice for the Singapore authorities to impose two other conditions: 1) that an ex-detainee not speak of conditions during his imprisonment; 2) that he become a member of the Ex-Detainees Association, a government-sponsored front organization consisting of former political prisoners who have made 'confessions' or recanted their political views.

In practice, not all these conditions are imposed on every released political prisoner. However, all former political detainees are denied the full restoration of their civil rights and are forced to live under very stringent conditions. Thus, for example, Shamsuddin Tung, former editor of the newspaper Nanyang Siang Pau, was released from detention on 22 January 1979. Under the conditions of his release, he may not leave Singapore, move his residence, or take part in political or public activities, and he is prohibited from associating with any former political prisoner except members of the Ex-Detainees Association. As we have noted earlier, the last restriction has been used by the Singapore authorities to prevent lawyers who have been imprisoned from defending or representing persons detained under the Internal Security Act.

On 18 November 1978 the Singapore Government 'conditionally released' from Moon Crescent Detention Centre two of its longest term political detainees, Dr Lim Hock Siew and Said Zahari, both of whom had spent nearly 16 years in prison without trial under the ISA. In addition to the restrictions mentioned above, the two men were exiled to two offshore islands, Dr Lim Hock Siew to Pulau Tekong Besar and Said Zahari to Pulau Ubin. On 22 August 1979 Said Zahari was freed from his condition of exile and has been allowed to return to his home in Singapore. Dr Lim Hock Siew remains exiled on the island of Pulau Tekong Besar, and Amnesty International continues to work for his full and unconditional release.

6. THE PROFESSIONS IN SINGAPORE

I. Journalists

Amnesty International has been concerned for many years that journalists, newspaper editors and publishers who have been critical of government policy have been detained without trial in Singapore under the ISA. The best known case is that of Said Zahari, the former editor of Utusan Melayu, the leading Malay-language paper in Singapore in the early 1960s, who was detained for nearly 16 years without trial under the ISA and then spent another nine months in exile on the island of Pulau Ubin before his final release in August 1979.

The Singapore Government has consistently sought to curb press freedom in the Republic in a number of ways. In 1971, for instance, Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew publicly forced an American bank in Singapore to foreclose on a newspaper, the Singapore Herald, which had been critical of the Government. Through the Printing Presses Ordinance every printing press in Singapore requires an annual licence from the Government, and the same is true for every newspaper publisher. Moreover, through the Essential Information (Control of Publications and Safeguarding of Information) Regulations, the Government decides what is fit to print. The Government used this in 1969, for example, to prevent public discussion in the press of the Government decision to abolish trial by jury for capital offences. Under Section 20 of the ISA, the Minister of Home Affairs is also empowered to prohibit any publication, inter alia, which he qualifies as 'prejudicial to the national interest, public order, or security of Singapore'.

These instruments together with the frequent detention of journalists under the ISA have secured for Singapore an almost totally uncritical press. Thus, when detainee Chan Hock Hua died of cancer in March 1978, no newspaper in the Republic was willing to carry an obituary notice from his family.

The most draconian crackdown on the press occurred in May 1971, when in the space of a few weeks the Government detained four members of the staff of the Chinese-language newspaper Nanyang Siang Pau, including its editor, Shamsuddin Tung, and its former manager Lee Mau Seng, deported the editor of a new English-language daily, the Singapore Herald and closed down both the Herald and the Eastern Sun. The four staff members of Nanyang Siang Pau were accused of glamorizing the 'communist way of life', despite the fact that two of them had a long history of supporting the virulently anti-communist Kuomintang.

Despite these arrests, the Nanyang Siang Pau continued to publish and in January 1973 its managing editor, Lee Eu Seng, was also arrested and detained under the ISA. The four senior members of staff arrested in 1971 were all released by the end of 1973 after making 'confessions' to secure their freedom. Lee Eu Seng himself was detained for five years without trial under the ISA before his release on 1 February 1978.

The former chief editor of the newspaper, Nanyang Siang Pau, Shamsuddin Tung, was rearrested in December 1976 during general elections in which he was candidate for the United Front party. He was again detained under the ISA, allegedly for exploiting communal issues, and remained in detention until 22 January 1979. As well as imposing on him the usual stringent conditions forced on an ex-detainee, the Government in October 1978 deprived Shamsuddin Tung of his Singapore citizenship under the Banishment Ordinance, thus making him a stateless person.

Further arrests of journalists took place in 1976-77 following the forced withdrawal of Singapore's People's Action Party (PAP) from the Socialist International. In June 1976 Hussein Jahidin and Azmi Mahmud of the Berita Harian Singapore were detained under the ISA. Within a short period both made 'confessions' that they had attempted to slant the news in their journal in a manner critical of the Government. Their arrest was followed in February 1977 by that of Arun Senkuttuvan, Singapore correspondent of the Economist and the Financial Times. Some weeks later the arrest took place of the correspondent of the Far Eastern Economic Review in Singapore, Ho Kwon Ping.

Both journalists made televised 'confessions' within a month of their detention acknowledging government accusations that they had sought to defame the Government of Singapore by their reports. The editors of both the Financial Times and the Far Eastern Economic Review issued categorical statements that there was no cause for suspicion that the journalists had written in a slanted fashion and placing the 'confessions' in the context of continuous interrogation and the prospect of indefinite detention under the ISA. Both men were released on 29 April 1977. Arun Senkuttuvan was deprived of his citizenship while in detention.

II . The Legal Profession

The position of the judiciary and the legal profession generally in Singapore has been gravely undermined by the Government's use of its wide provisions for preventive detention. Those lawyers who have been active in defending political detainees have exposed themselves to harassment and the Government has not hesitated to include lawyers among its political detainees.

T T Rajah, a distinguished member of the Singapore Bar was imprisoned without trial under the ISA from June 1974 to December 1975. Since his release he has been hindered from the free practice of his profession as a result of restrictions imposed on him by the Government; in particular, he has been barred from taking any work in connection with political detainees under the ISA. Another lawyer, G Raman, who had also been active in assisting political detainees and had criticized the Government's human rights violations, was arrested under the ISA in February 1977 and detained until February 1978. On his release Mr Raman was barred from returning to the legal profession for two years and is, like T T Rajah, forbidden indefinitely to represent political detainees.

Lawyers who have sought to interview clients who are political detainees have frequently found themselves requested by the security authorities to specify in advance those matters which they wish to discuss with their clients. When interviews do take place between lawyers and their clients these communications are never private but in fact take place via monitored telephone calls through a glass partition. During the initial 30 days' interrogation that all political detainees are subjected to, they are invariably refused access to a lawyer. In Amnesty International's experience, this greatly increases the likelihood of ill-treatment and torture of detainees.

7. THE DEATH PENALTY

Under the Criminal Procedure Code (Amendment) Act of 1969, trial by jury for capital offences was abolished, largely because of the argument that juries were reluctant to pass death sentences in murder trials. The Act states that offenders liable to the death penalty shall be tried by a court consisting of two judges of the High Court, one of whom shall be the presiding judge, and that the decision of the Court as to the guilt of the accused shall be arrived at unanimously. At the time the amendment was passed newspapers in the Republic were forbidden to publish a critical resolution, passed by the Singapore Bar Association, on this matter.

An examination of the Singapore Penal Code reveals that the following offences may be punished by death: waging war against the Government (section 121); intending hurt, death or restraint of the President (mandatory under s. 121A); perjury resulting in execution of a person indicted on a capital charge (s. 194); murder (mandatory under s. 302); abetting the suicide of a person under 18 or an 'idiot, insane or delirious person' (s. 305); kidnapping, for murder or where the victim is placed 'in danger of being murdered' (s. 364); robbery by a gang of five or more (s. 396); certain offences relating to mutiny in the armed forces (s. 132).

An amendment in 1975 of the Misuse of Drugs Act specifies that any person found trafficking in more than 30 grammes of morphine or heroin faced a mandatory death sentence.

The possession of certain types of arms is proscribed by the Arms Offences Act. This Act covers armed robbery and use of a firearm with intent to cause injury.

The Singapore Criminal Procedure Code provides that sentence of death shall not be passed on persons under 18 or pregnant women (sections 203-4). By s. 206 the death sentence is to be executed by hanging; by s. 228 the President has the power to exercise clemency.

The total number of persons under sentence of death and the number of executions carried out in the past four years is not known. Executions are carried out in prison by hanging and are not always reported. However, a few cases have been publicized since 1973, and some examples are given below.

The London Times of 27 July 1973 reported that a woman and her husband, both sentenced to death in December 1970 for the murder of a Japanese woman, were hanged in Changi Prison, after a last appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in London had been rejected.

- 45 -

In the same prison, 11 other executions were reported to have taken place in 1975. The first case concerned a group of eight men convicted of murder in 1971 and 1973, and hanged in jail on 28 February 1975. The eight men, aged from 21 to 35, included four Chinese, three Indians and one Malay. According to one report, quoting a prison source, they were hanged in three groups with hoods over their faces. A 24-year-old convicted murderer, sentenced to death by the High Court in September 1973, was executed in the same prison in April 1975. The execution of two men, aged 25 and 29, who had been sentenced to death for a murder committed in 1972, was later reported in June 1975.

In the summer of 1976, the High Court of Singapore sentenced to death three young men found guilty of seven charges under the Arms Offences Act. The charges included a robbery in which guns were involved (section 5) and use of a revolver with intention to cause injury (section 4), although no injuries were sustained.

The first person sentenced to death under the amended Misuse of Drugs Act was a young Malaysian aged 25, Too Hook Seng. He was sentenced on 13 July 1976 after a seven-day hearing by the High Court. He was found guilty of trafficking in 46.38 grammes of morphine in January of the same year. He was hanged in July 1978. Seventeen other people were awaiting trial under the same law at that time. In May another man, Tan Sin Tong, had also been hanged for drug trafficking.

A 19-year-old girl, Siti Aminah Jaffar, was sentenced to death for drug trafficking in 1978.

8. A SELECTION OF PRISONER CASE HISTORIES

The following are some typical cases of persons known to Amnesty International to be detained without trial under the Internal Security Act.

HO Piao

Ho Piao was arrested on 2 February 1963 in 'Operation Cold Store'. At the time, he was Secretary of the now banned National Seamen's Union. He is the only 'Operation Cold Store' detainee to have been held continuously since 1963 and remains in prison today.

In 1967, the release of Ho Piao and four other detainees was ordered by the High Court after they had made a successful application for a writ of habeas corpus. The five were immediately rearrested.

During his detention, Ho Piao has undergone long periods of solitary confinement and has been subjected to a rigorous interrogation including beatings. In 1970-1971 he took part in a 100-day hunger strike in protest against attempts by the authorities to compel political prisoners to undertake forced labour. In August 1978, he was one of 12 prisoners removed from the Moon Crescent Detention Centre to the Whitley Road Holding Centre. He was placed in solitary confinement, broken only by long periods of interrogation. On 8 April 1979 he was taken to an underground cubicle where he was tortured for four days. When he subsequently refused to accept the conditions offered by the authorities for his release, he was again beaten. He was moved to Changi Prison Hospital for treatment of injuries sustained during this period (see Chapter 5.).

LEE Tse Tong

Lee Tse Tong was arrested on 8 October 1963. He was held under the Internal Security Act until November 1967. In that month, he was released after bringing a successful application for a writ of habeas corpus but was immediately rearrested under the ISA. He was then deprived of his citizenship on the grounds that he had no proof that he was Singapore-born. In February 1968, he was served with a Banishment Order and transferred to Queenstown Remand Prison 'awaiting deportation'. Since 1975, when the Banishment Order was dropped, Lee has been held under the Internal Security Act. He has now been imprisoned without trial for more than 16 years.

A former Secretary of the now banned Singapore Busworkers' Union, Lee Tse Tong was elected to the Singapore Assembly for

- 47 -

the Barisan Sosialis in the elections in 1963. His case has been taken up by the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU). At its conference in Caracas in 1979 the IPU passed a resolution urging the Singapore Government 'to release Mr Lee Tse Tong immediately and unconditionally'.

Lee has been kept in solitary confinement for long periods during his detention. On 31 August 1978, he was transferred from Moon Crescent Detention Centre to the Whitley Road Holding Centre where he was held for nine months. He is currently detained in the Moon Crescent Detention Centre.

Dr LIM Hock Siew

Dr Lim Hock Siew was arrested on 2 February 1963 in 'Operation Cold Store'. The former Secretary-General of the Barisan Sosialis, Dr Lim was exiled to the island of Pulau Tekong Besar in November 1978. Amnesty International continues to regard him as a prisoner of conscience.

In the course of his detention, Dr Lim has been at various times offered both release and exile outside Singapore. In 1972, he was offered release on condition that he made a statement saying he would give up politics and support 'parliamentary democracy'. He refused on the grounds that such a statement was self-contradictory.

In 1967, Dr Lim and four others successfully applied for a writ of habeas corpus. The High Court granted the writ and ordered the release on the technical ground that the detainees' detention orders had not been signed by the President. The five were immediately rearrested under the Internal Security Act. Dr Lim was held in Moon Crescent Detention Centre until his 'release' to Pulau Tekong Besar.

CHIA Thye Poh

Chia Thye Poh was arrested under the Internal Security Act on 30 October 1966 shortly after resigning from the Singapore Parliament together with his fellow Barisan Sosialis MPs in protest against government-imposed restrictions on the opposition. In July 1966, Chia had been convicted for publishing a 'seditious article' in the Barisan's Chinese-language newspaper, Chern Sien Pau, of which he was editor. In the same month, he was arrested with 25 others and charged with unlawful assembly for his participation in a demonstration against United States involvement in Vietnam.

Chia was closely associated with the Chinese Schools' movement in his student days. As an undergraduate he was vice-chairman of the Student Union at Nanyang University where he was subsequently appointed as assistant lecturer.

He is detained in the Moon Crescent Detention Centre.

CHNG Min Oh

Chng Min Oh was arrested on 3 August 1970. He was Chairman of the Goldsmiths Employees Union. He was held in solitary confinement for the first six months of his detention. In August 1978, he was transferred to Whitley Road Holding Centre for interrogation. While undergoing interrogation at Whitley Road, he was assaulted and forced to pour his urine over himself. In protest at these conditions, he went on hunger strike. By late September 1979, he had lost 40 pounds in weight and both he and Ho Koon Kiang, another prisoner who had been subjected to similar treatment, were transferred to Changi Prison Hospital. Chng Min Oh later complained of multiple injuries including damaged ears resulting in a loss of hearing. In November 1978, Chng was returned to the Moon Crescent Detention Centre.

TAN Kim Oh

Tan Kim Oh was arrested on 4 July 1966 and charged with unlawful assembly for engaging in a demonstration against United States involvement in Vietnam. He was subsequently held under the Internal Security Act.

A student at Nanyang University, he was one of the leading opponents of the introduction of 'suitability certificates', issued by the Government and required by all students wishing to gain entry to university.

CHUA Kee Seng

Chua Kee Seng was arrested on 27 October 1966 and initially detained under the Internal Security Act. Although he claimed to have been born in Singapore in 1933, he was unable to produce a birth certificate. In February 1968 he was deprived of his Singapore citizenship and in August of that year was served with a Banishment Order. From 1968 to 1976, he was held in the Queenstown Remand Prison 'awaiting deportation'. In June 1976, the Banishment Order was dropped and Chua was once again served with a detention order under the Internal Security Act.

At the time of his arrest, Chua Kee Seng was Assistant Secretary of the now proscribed Singapore Commercial House and Factory Employees Union. He had also held various posts at local branch level in the Barisan Sosialis. He is believed to have been arrested for participating in protests against the Trade Union (Amendment) Act.

LIM Hock Koon

Lim Hock Koon, the younger brother of Dr Lim Hock Siew, was arrested in January 1971. At the time of his arrest, the authorities said he had been on the 'wanted list' since 1954 when he had been a leader of student demonstrations against obligatory military service. In 1961, the Singapore Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew referred to him as a 'very high and important' member of the Malayan Communist Party.

Lim Hock Koon was held in solitary confinement for the first two-and-a-half months of his detention. In February 1972, after being transferred to the Central Police Station lock-up, he began a hunger strike in protest against his conditions of detention. Already suffering from stomach ulcers, he experienced severe kidney pains as a result of the hunger strike. The state of his health continues to give rise for concern. In February 1979, he was reported to be suffering from chronically high blood pressure and to have suffered a stroke which had left him paralysed down one side.

Dr POH Soo Kai

Dr Poh Soo Kai was one of 133 persons opposed to the terms of Singapore's joining the Federation of Malaysia who were arrested on 2 February 1963 in 'Operation Cold Store'. At the time, he was Assistant General Secretary of the opposition Barisan Sosialis. He was released in December 1973, but was rearrested in June 1976 and is currently held in the Moon Crescent Detention Centre.

After his release in 1973, Dr Poh returned to the practice of medicine but at the same time continued to be outspoken in his criticism of the Government. He attacked the Government for curtailing the application of the rule of law and for detaining political prisoners without charge or trial. His rearrest came shortly after the withdrawal of the ruling People's Action Party from the Socialist International. At a meeting of the Socialist International in London in May 1976, the Dutch Labour Party had demanded the expulsion of the PAP for, among other things, violating human rights by detaining political prisoners without trial. A Ministry of Home Affairs

statement issued after his rearrest contained the allegation that 'Dr Poh has actively helped pro-communist elements, had established links for collaboration with similarly-minded groups abroad, and was preparing the ground for the revival of Communist United Front activities in Singapore'. The Government also alleged that he had advised 'student agitators' and had supplied medicine to a communist activist said to have been injured by his own bomb while trying to assassinate a local factory manager. This latter allegation was based on a statement made by a political detainee which was later retracted.

In February 1977, Dr Poh's wife, Grace Poh, was detained for 27 days during which she was held in solitary confinement and subjected to a series of round-the-clock interrogations for periods of up to three days.

CHONG Ming Jee

Chong Ming Jee was arrested in July 1966 probably for participating in the opposition to the Trade Union (Amendment) Act. An active trade unionist who had held the position of Organizing Secretary in the left-wing trade union federation, SATU (Singapore Amalgamated Trade Unions), he was a worker in the Jurong shipyards at the time of his arrest.

Chong Ming Jee was detained under the Internal Security Act and, after three months initial interrogation at the Whitley Road Holding Centre, he was held at Moon Crescent Detention Centre until 1970. In that year, Chong, who was born in Malaysia, was served with a Banishment Order and transferred to Queenstown Remand Prison. After five years in Queenstown, he was again served with a detention order under the Internal Security Act and returned to Moon Crescent. Chong was one of several prisoners transferred to the Whitley Road Holding Centre in August 1978 after engaging in a hunger strike. While there, he was beaten by guards and Special Branch officers.

WONG Kui Inn

Wong Kui Inn was arrested in July 1976. In a 'confession', she said she had acted as a courier passing medicine from Dr Poh Soo Kai to a Malayan Communist Party cadre. During her interrogation she was subjected to torture with electric shocks and the repeated pouring of cold water over her body. Her husband, Pang Hee Fat, was also arrested in July 1976. During his interrogation, Wong Kui Inn was brought in to see him and he was beaten in front of her.

Articles of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 16 December 1966, referred to in this report.

Article 4

1. In time of public emergency which threatens the life of the nation and the existence of which is officially proclaimed, the States Parties to the present Covenant may take measures derogating from their obligations under the present Covenant to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation, provided that such measures are not inconsistent with their other obligations under international law and do not involve discrimination solely on the ground of race, colour, sex, language, religion or social origin.
2. No derogation from articles 6, 7, 8 (paragraphs 1 and 2), 11, 15, 16, and 18 may be made under this provision.

Article 6

1. Every human being has the inherent right to life. This right shall be protected by law. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his life.

Article 7

No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. In particular, no one shall be subjected without his free consent to medical or scientific experimentation.

Article 9

1. Everyone has the right to liberty and security of person. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest or detention. No one shall be deprived of his liberty except on such grounds and in accordance with such procedure as are established by law.
2. Anyone who is arrested shall be informed, at the time of arrest, of the reasons for his arrest and shall be promptly informed of any charges against him.

3. Anyone arrested or detained on a criminal charge shall be brought promptly before a judge or other officer authorized by law to exercise judicial power and shall be entitled to trial within a reasonable time or to release. It shall not be the general rule that persons awaiting trial shall be detained in custody, but release may be subject to guarantees to appear for trial, at any other stage of the judicial proceedings, and, should occasion arise, for execution of the judgement.

4. Anyone who is deprived of his liberty by arrest or detention shall be entitled to take proceedings before a court, in order that that court may decide without delay on the lawfulness of his detention and order his release if the detention is not lawful.

5. Anyone who has been the victim of unlawful arrest or detention shall have an enforceable right to compensation.

Article 14

1. All persons shall be equal before the courts and tribunals. In the determination of any criminal charge against him, or of his rights and obligations in a suit at law, everyone shall be entitled to a fair and public hearing by a competent, independent and impartial tribunal established by law. The Press and public may be excluded from all or part of a trial for reasons of morals, public order (ordre public) or national security in a democratic society, or when the interest of the private lives of the parties so requires, or to the extent strictly necessary in the opinion of the court in special circumstances where publicity would prejudice the interests of justice; but any judgement rendered in a criminal case or in a suit at law shall be made public except where the interest of juvenile persons otherwise requires or the proceedings concern matrimonial disputes or the guardianship of children.

3. In the determination of any criminal charge against him, everyone shall be entitled to the following minimum guarantees, in full equality:

(a) To be informed promptly and in detail in a language which he understands of the nature and cause of the charge against him;

(b) To have adequate time and facilities for the preparation of his defence and to communicate with counsel of his own choosing;

(c) To be tried without undue delay;

(d) To be tried in his presence, and to defend himself in person or through legal assistance of his own choosing; to be informed, if he does not have legal assistance, of this right; and to have legal assistance assigned to him, in any case where the interests of justice so require, and without payment by him in any such case if he does not have sufficient means to pay for it;

(e) To examine, or have examined, the witnesses against him and to obtain the attendance and examination of witnesses on his behalf under the same conditions as witnesses against him;

(f) To have the free assistance of an interpreter if he cannot understand or speak the language used in court;

(g) Not to be compelled to testify against himself or to confess guilt.

DRAFT CODE OF CONDUCT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALSTHE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Adopts the following Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials to serve as a body of principles for observance by law enforcement officials of all nations:

1. Law enforcement officials must at all times fulfil the duty imposed upon them by law, by serving the community and by protecting all persons against illegal acts, consistent with the high degree of responsibility required by their profession.

Commentary

(a) The term law enforcement official includes all officers of the law, whether appointed or elected, who exercise police powers, especially the powers of arrest and detention.

(b) In countries where police powers are exercised by military authorities, whether uniformed or not, or by state security forces, the definition of law enforcement officials shall be regarded as including officers of such services.

(c) Service to the community is intended to include particularly the rendition of services of assistance to those members of the community who by reason of personal, economic, social or other emergencies are in need of immediate aid.

(d) This provision is intended to cover not only all violent, predatory and harmful acts, but extends to conduct by persons not capable of incurring criminal liability.

2. In the performance of their duty, law enforcement officials should respect and protect human dignity and maintain and uphold the human rights of all persons.

Commentary

(a) The human rights in question derive from national and international law. The human rights under international law are guaranteed under the

Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Being Subjected to Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, the United Nations declaration on the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination, the International Convention on the elimination of racial discrimination, the International Convention on the suppression and punishment of the crime of apartheid, the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners, the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations and other international instruments.

(b) National commentaries to this provision should identify regional or national provisions identifying these rights.

3. Law enforcement officials may never use more force than necessary in the performance of their duty.

Commentary

(a) This provision emphasizes that the use of force by law enforcement officials should be exceptional.

(b) While it implies that law enforcement officials may be authorized to use such force as is reasonable under the circumstances for the prevention of crime or in effecting or assisting in the lawful arrest of offenders or suspected offenders, any force used beyond what is essential for these purposes is not tolerable.

(c) National law ordinarily restricts the use of force by law enforcement officials in accordance with a principle of proportionality. It is to be understood that such national principles of proportionality are to be respected in the interpretation of this provision. In no case, however, should this provision be interpreted to authorize the use of force which is disproportionate to the legitimate objective to be achieved.

4. Matters of a confidential nature in the possession of law enforcement officials should be kept confidential, unless the performance of duty or the needs of justice require otherwise.

Commentary

By the nature of their duties, law enforcement officials obtain information which may be potentially harmful to the interests,

especially the reputation, of others. By law, such information can be utilized only for the conduct of legal proceedings. Any divulgence not in the performance of duty, nor serving the needs of justice, is improper.

5. No law enforcement official may inflict, instigate or tolerate any act of torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, nor may any law enforcement official invoke exceptional circumstances such as a state of war or a threat of war, internal political instability or any other public emergency as a justification of torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Commentary

(a) This prohibition derives from the General Assembly's Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Being Subjected to Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, which declares that:

"Such acts are offensive to human dignity and are 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 and other international human rights instruments."

(b) The declaration defines torture as follows:

"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."

(c) The terms "cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment" have not been defined by the General Assembly but should be interpreted to extend the widest possible protection against abuses, whether physical or mental.

(d) The provision is intended to cover all persons who are in any way involved in conduct covered by this provision.

6. Law enforcement officials having custody of persons needing medical attention should secure such attention and take immediate action to meet the needs of the person in custody.

Commentary

(a) The term "medical personnel" encompasses certified medical practitioners, including para-medics. While in practice the medical personnel referred to is likely to be attached to the law enforcement operation, the provision should be understood to require law enforcement officials to take into account the judgement of medical personnel from outside the law enforcement operation. This envisages that the person in question has access to medical attention from other medical personnel, including such person's own physician.

(b) All medical personnel must act in conformity with principles of medical ethics.

7. Law enforcement officials must refrain from and rigorously oppose and pursue all acts of corruption.

Commentary

(a) Corruption is intolerable in all phases of life, particularly in the public service agencies. Governments cannot expect to enforce the law among their citizens if they cannot, or will not, enforce their law against their own agents and within their own agencies.

(b) While the definition of corruption must be subject to national law, it should be understood to encompass the commission or omission of an act in the performance of or in connection with one's duties, in response to gifts, promises or incentives demanded or accepted, or the wrongful receipt of these once the act has been committed or omitted.

8. Law enforcement officials must refrain from and prevent and rigorously oppose all violations of this code by taking appropriate action to the best of their capability. When violations have occurred, or can be expected to occur, law enforcement officials should report the matter within the chain of command or take such other actions as are lawfully open to them, including, when necessary, the reporting to any agency with reviewing or remedial power.

Commentary

(a) The provision seeks to preserve the balance between the need for internal discipline of the agency on whom the public safety is largely dependent, on the one hand, and the need for dealing with violations of basic human rights, on the other. A law enforcement official should report violations within the chain of command and take legal action outside the chain of command only when no other remedies are available.

(b) The term "agency with reviewing or remedial power" refers to any agency existing under national law, whether internal to the law enforcement agency, or independent thereof, with statutory, customary or other power to review grievances and complaints arising out of violations within the purview of this code.

(c) While in most countries such agencies are statutory bodies, in some countries the mass media may be regarded as performing similar complaint review functions so that a law enforcement official, on his own initiative, may be justified in bringing his report to public attention by such means, as a last resort, consistent with the laws and customs of the country in question.

9. A law enforcement official who, in fulfilling the obligations of this code, erroneously exceeds the limits of law despite honest and conscientious assessment, is entitled to the full protection afforded by national law.

10. A law enforcement official who complies with the provisions of this code deserves the respect, the full support and the collaboration of the community and of the law enforcement agency in which such official serves, as well as the support of the law enforcement profession.

THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT
(CHAPTER 115)

ORDER OF DETENTION UNDER SECTION 8 (1)(a)

To: The Director of Prisons,
Singapore

and to: The Commissioner of Police,
Singapore, all other police
officers and to all others
whom it may concern.

WHEREAS the President of the Republic of Singapore is satisfied with respect to the undermentioned person that, with a view to preventing that person from acting in any manner prejudicial to the security of Singapore or to the maintenance of public order or essential services therein, it is necessary to make the following Order:-

NOW, THEREFORE, the Minister for Home Affairs, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 8 of the Internal Security Act -

- a hereby directs under subsection (1)(a) of the said section 8 that * * * NRIC No. of * * * * , Singapore be forthwith detained for a period of two years; and
- b hereby directs under subsection (2) of the said section 8 that the said * * * be detained at Moon Crescent Centre or at such other place as he may from time to time direct.

Made this 3rd day of July , 1976

(signed) LUM CHOONG WAH
Ag. PERMANENT SECRETARY
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS
SINGAPORE

* Amnesty International has for reasons of confidentiality deleted the name and address of the prisoner.

THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT
(CHAPTER 115)

RESTRICTIVE ORDER UNDER SECTION 8 (1)(b)

To: The Commissioner of Police, Singapore,
and all other police officers and all
others whom it may concern.

WHEREAS the President of Singapore is satisfied that.....
.....NRIC No.....of.....
is acting in a manner prejudicial to the security of Singapore:

AND WHEREAS with a view to preventing the said.....
from so acting, it is necessary to impose upon him certain restrictions:

NOW, THEREFORE, the Minister for Health and Home Affairs, in
exercise of the powers conferred by section 8 (1)(b) of the Internal
Security Act hereby orders that the said.....shall be subject
to the following restrictions for a period of..TWO.....years:-

That he shall not associate with or take
part in, or in any way assist in the
activities of any organisation which
through its publications, statements or
other activities, has shown itself to be
sympathetic to the Communist cause or
allowed itself to be used in propagating
communist ideologies.

Amnesty International Publications

Report on Allegations of Torture in Brazil. A5, 108 pages, first edition September 1972, re-set with updated preface March 1976: £1.20.
Prisoners of Conscience in the USSR: Their Treatment and Conditions, A5, 154 pages, November 1975: £1.00.
Professional Codes of Ethics, A5, 32 pages, October 1976: 40 pence.
Report of an Amnesty International Mission to the Republic of the Philippines, A5, 60 pages, first published September 1976, second (updated) edition March 1977: £1.00.
Dossier on Political Prisoners Held in Secret Detention Camps in Chile, A4, March 1977: £1.00.
Torture in Greece: The First Torturers' Trial 1975, A5, 98 pages, April 1977: 85 pence.
Islamic Republic of Pakistan. An Amnesty International Report including the findings of a Mission, A4, 96 pages, May 1977: 75 pence.
Evidence of Torture: Studies by the Amnesty International Danish Medical Group, A5, 40 pages, June 1977: 50 pence.
Report of an Amnesty International Mission to the Republic of Korea, A4, 46 pages, first published April 1976, second edition June 1977: 75 pence.
The Republic of Nicaragua. An Amnesty International Report, including the findings of a Mission to Nicaragua 10-15 May 1976, A4, 75 pages, July 1977: 75 pence.
Indonesia. An Amnesty International Report, A5, 148 pages, October 1977: £2.00.
Political Imprisonment in South Africa, A5, 105 pages, January 1978: £1.00.
Political Imprisonment in the People's Republic of China, A5, 192 pages, November 1978, £1.50.
The Death Penalty. Amnesty International Report, 209 pages, September 1979, £2.00.

In addition to these major reports, Amnesty International also publishes a monthly Newsletter, an Annual Report and a regular series of Amnesty International Briefing Papers.

The Amnesty International Newsletter. This eight-page monthly bulletin provides a regular account of the organization's work for human rights throughout the world. Articles include summaries of the latest published reports and findings of Amnesty International missions; new information on arrests and releases; and reports of torture and executions. The newsletter provides basic information for activists, one or more appeals on behalf of likely victims of torture and includes the Campaign for Prisoners of the Month.

The newsletter is available in English, French and Spanish from London, Colombo, Paris, Barcelona and San José. National section newsletters in various languages are available from Amnesty International national section offices.

The Amnesty International Report. This annual report provides a full survey of Amnesty International's work in response to violations of human rights that have come to the organization's attention from more than 100 countries. The book is devoted almost entirely to a country-by-country survey.

Annual subscriptions for individuals: **Amnesty International Newsletter** £5 (US \$10), **Amnesty International Report** £2.50 (US \$5). Annual subscriptions for institutions including the newsletter and report £10 (US \$25).

Amnesty International Briefing Papers. This is an occasional series of human rights reference booklets on individual countries, averaging between 12-16 pages each.

Briefing Papers Numbers 1-16.

Singapore*	Malawi*	Taiwan (Republic of China)*
Paraguay*†	Guatemala*†	Czechoslovakia*†
Iran*	Turkey*	German Democratic Republic*
Namibia*	Peru*†	Guinea*†
Morocco*	People's Democratic	Syria†
Rhodesia/Zimbabwe	Republic of Yemen	

*also available in French †also available in Spanish †also available in Arabic
Single copies 40 pence (US \$1.00), plus 20 pence (50 cents) for postage and handling.

Amnesty International Publications are available in English and in most cases have been translated into other major world languages by the International Secretariat or by the national sections of Amnesty International.

Copies of Amnesty International publications can be obtained from the offices of the national sections of Amnesty International. Office addresses and further information may be obtained from the International Secretariat, 10 Southampton Street, London WC2E 7HF, England.



aip

Amnesty International Publications